

00174

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3

4

5 VOLUME III

6

7 October 2, 2002

8 9:00 a.m.

9 ANS/ANB Hall

10 Hoonah, Alaska

11

12 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

13

14 William C. Thomas, Chair

15 Dolly Garza

16 Marilyn R. Wilson

17 Bert Adams

18 Floyd Kookesh

19 Clarence "Butch" Laiti

20 Richard Stokes

21 Patricia A. Phillips

22 Michael Douville

23 John Littlefield

24 Harold Martin

25

26

27 Robert Schroeder, Coordinator

00175

1 PROCEEDINGS

2

3 (Hoonah, Alaska - 10/2/2002)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Please find your seat.

8 We have still a lot of agenda ahead of us. We are going

9 to be addressing number 12 and number 13 on the agenda.

10 On the hot seat is Mr. Pete Probasco, and he has other

11 commitments, and so he'll be leaving sooner, and he

12 requested to be moved up on the agenda. And so we'll be

13 hearing from Pete. These are a couple of areas that are

14 very sensitive and important to remind the people in this

15 area, so I would recommend that you pay close attention

16 and organize your questions as they come to your mind,

17 and let's work our way through customary trade. Good

18 morning, Pete.

19

20

21 MR. PROBASCO: Good morning, Mr.

22 Chairman. I hope each of the -- for the record, my name

23 is Pete Probasco, I'm with the Office of Subsistence

24 Management. I would hope each of the regional council

25 members have a copy of the customary trade supplemental

26 materials before them. My presentation will address

27 customary trade, and all of you are familiar with it.

28 You've been going through this for the past little over a

29 year and a half now, and we're in the process of working

30 towards a final rule on defining customary trade.

31

32 If you recall, Mr. Chairman, back in May

33 of 2002 that the Federal Subsistence Board was originally

34 scheduled to take final action on customary trade. Based

35 on comments received primarily from the Regional

36 Councils, Federal Government, and some of the public, the

37 Federal Subsistence Board elected to defer action on

38 customary trade until this January, 2003. And at that

39 meeting they may take final action, and it's their goal

40 to take final action at the meeting of January 2003.

41

42 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pete, if you would, can

43 you I think back up a little bit and explain to the

44 people in attendance here the process we went through to

45 getting to this point, and the reason we're bring this

46 before the RAC now?

47

48 MR. PROBASCO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

00176

1 MR. PROBASCO: As I said in my
2 presentation we will cover some history and then we'll go
3 through the steps that we've gone through, and then
4 identify the steps that are yet to occur.

5
6 Mr. Chairman, I'd like to review a few of
7 the reasons why the issue of customary trade is before
8 you. Title VIII of ANILCA specifically identifies
9 customary trade as a recognized part of subsistence uses.
10 The term customary trade is defined in regulation as the
11 cash sale of fish and wildlife resources to support
12 personal and family needs, and does not include trade
13 which constitutes a significant commercial enterprise.

14
15 It is important to know that the
16 distinction between the terms customary trade and barter.
17 Customary trade is the exchange of subsistence resources
18 for cash. Barter is defined as the exchange of
19 subsistence resources for something other than cash, and
20 is provided specifically in Title VIII.

21
22 Where exchanges of subsistence resources
23 as customary trade may involve fish, shellfish or other
24 wildlife resources, this proposed rule that you're
25 working on with the Federal Board only addresses fishery
26 resources. The reason that it's before the Federal
27 Subsistence Board is in regulation, when they adopted the
28 adopted the regulation that define customary trade, they
29 failed to define the bounds if you will of what is meant
30 by significant commercial enterprise. It's very unclear.
31 The lack of definition has been hampering effective law
32 enforcement to prevent abuses, and the Board wants to
33 preserve traditional customary trade practices and
34 recognize regional differences while preventing abuses.

35
36 The proposed rule adopted by the Board in
37 December 2001, which on page one of this document,
38 recommends that no dollar limit be set on the exchange of
39 cash for subsistence caught fish, parts or eggs between
40 rural residents. There's no limitation from rural to
41 rural. The proposed rules prohibits such exchanges from
42 fishery businesses, whether rural or non rural. In other
43 words, fishery businesses cannot purchase subsistence
44 harvested fish. However, the exchange between rural
45 residents and others, non rural residents, would be
46 allowed as long as the exchange does not constitute a
47 significant commercial enterprise. The Board purposely
48 left that language in the proposed rule for the purpose
49 of getting additional clarification and comments from
50 each of the councils, the Federal Government and the

00177

1 public, and hopefully to clearly defined what is meant by
2 significant commercial enterprise.

3

4 You will note that in your booklet there
5 are three alternatives, and if you recall, as we worked
6 through the proposed rule, your Council along with the
7 others had put specific actions to define customary
8 trade. So along with the proposed rule on page one, you
9 have three alternatives which are based on Regional
10 Council comments and the written comments received from
11 Federal Government, the public and other Federal and
12 State agencies.

13

14 Let me briefly summarize these
15 alternative for you. Alternative 1, which is on page
16 three, this option would maintain the status quo, which
17 permits customary trade unless it results in significant
18 commercial enterprise. In other words, alternative 1 is
19 recommending no change, and would only be addressed in
20 the future if any perceived abuses would be addressed and
21 brought before the Board in regulatory action. This is
22 responsive to comments that question the need for any new
23 regulation or change to present to present this to --
24 present regulations regarding customary trade.

25

26 Alternative 2, which is on page four,
27 addresses probably where we would view the potential for
28 any significant abuse, and this option would prohibit
29 subsistence caught fish from entering into any commercial
30 markets, not just fishery business, but any commercial
31 market, while permitting customary trade practices to
32 continue between individuals. This option would be
33 responsive to comments that the primary concern is to
34 prevent subsistence-caught fish from entering the
35 commercial market.

36

37 Alternative 3, page four, the best way to
38 summarize that is it captures each individual region if
39 they elected to define customary trade different from the
40 proposed rules. It tries to capture unique circumstances
41 for that particular region. However, alternative three,
42 the majority of the regional Councils, with the exception
43 of one, still supported the recommendation of preventing
44 subsistence harvested fish from entering or be purchases
45 by fishery businesses, and in some cases enter the
46 commercial market.

47

48 Mr. Chairman, if you go to page nine of
49 your booklet, this will give you where we're at today,
50 and where we will be going for the next few months.

00178

1 Currently we're in the process of trial consultation,
2 which is headed up by Carl Jack, and Regional Council
3 meetings, which are occurring in September and October.
4 The public comment period ends November 1st. The Federal
5 Subsistence Board meeting will occur on January 14th of
6 2003, and the goal is to have the publication of final
7 rule in February, and, of course, the final rule goes
8 through numerous steps, regulatory requirements, and the
9 goal is to have a final rule effective by 2003 fishing
10 season.

11

12 What the Board is requesting again of
13 your Council is to review your past actions, which is
14 primarily alternative 3, and/or, if you so elect, make
15 further recommendations on defining customary trade.
16 Your Board did quite a bit of that at your last meeting,
17 and you actually did develop recommendations. What the
18 Board is looking for is to define the limits of a
19 significant commercial enterprise. They want you to
20 clearly distinguish or recommend if there should be
21 limits between rural and non rural residents, and they're
22 asking you if there should be a catch limit between rural
23 residents to rural residents. And they also want to know
24 if you recommend any limitations on customary trade, what
25 effects that you view this having in subsistence needs,
26 traditions, hunting values and subsistence way of life.

27

28 Mr. Chairman, my purpose here today is to
29 listen to your questions and concerns and either bring
30 back your earlier actions as captured in alternative 3
31 and/or additional information back to the Board at the
32 January meeting. Mr. Chair, that concludes my
33 presentation on customary trade.

34

35 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Mr.
36 Probasco. Last year in Yakutat we gave this considerable
37 consideration. And I don't see us necessarily quarreling
38 in this publication. But I was seeing at that time, and
39 it still does -- oh, here it is right here. I take that
40 back.

41

42 MR. PROBASCO: Page 13, Mr. Chairman.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Page 13, right in the
45 middle of the page. The customary trade of eulachon to
46 others is permitted as long as all sales are to
47 individuals and the fish do not enter commerce at any
48 point. Now that's a change from what we had. We had it
49 doesn't enter the commercial market. That's easier to
50 identify than commerce. And what we'd like to stay away

00179

1 from is ambiguous language, and I think that commerce at
2 least to a majority of council members is a little more
3 ambiguous than commercial market would be. Everybody
4 readily understands a commercial market. Commerce would
5 represent a multitude of things. Anybody else have any
6 observations, questions? Pete?

7

8 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, if I may,
9 commerce -- this is based on a regulation specialist,
10 which I'm not a regulation specialist. We'd either Mr.
11 Ken Lord or Bill Knauer here, but my understanding is
12 commerce is defined in regulation, but commercial market
13 isn't, that commerce does capture the intent of including
14 commercial market, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Perhaps it would help
17 then if we're going to use that language to have in some
18 highlighted fashion the intent of the word commerce.
19 Also, the language of significant commercial enterprise,
20 I think should be struck. That was entered in -- that
21 was submitted as a consideration by somebody that really
22 didn't have a place at the table at the time when this
23 came up, and I've always objected to that. It should
24 never have appeared. And those are my observations.
25 Does the Council have any questions or observations? If
26 you do, we can come back to them later. Would that be
27 okay, if something comes up on this? We'll move on to
28 your next agenda item.

29

30 MR. PROBASCO: Yes, Mr. Chair. Right now
31 what I have is you may have additional action later on in
32 the meeting?

33

34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah.

35

36 MR. PROBASCO: If you do not take
37 additional action, do I assume that you are reaffirming
38 what's on page 13, that you took at your January meeting,
39 or do you want to do that later?

40

41 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I think we need some
42 time to chew on that for a little while in our own
43 thoughts.

44

45 MR. PROBASCO: Okay.

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: And in our own
48 thoughts, and give us a chance to get our hat (ph) on.
49 Dolly.

50

00180

1 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I think that
2 Mr. Probasco stated that it's his job to take our
3 feelings back, and so I think we should have that
4 discussion now if he's leaving, because I certainly have
5 my comments.

6
7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Then we'll do it.

8
9 MS. GARZA: And Floyd's raising his hand.

10
11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Floyd.

12
13 MR. KOOKESH: I was looking on page 13,
14 and it says that subsistence harvested fish may not. Is
15 that that they can or -- at any point is another word a
16 little further in the sentence. May not to me is kind of
17 like it can or it shall not enter.

18
19 MR. PROBASCOS: Well, I guess we're
20 playing words with regulatory. This regulatory language,
21 subsistence harvested fish may not enter commerce at any
22 point says it cannot enter, period.

23
24 MR. KOOKESH: May not. That's a may
25 though.

26
27 MR. PROBASCOS: Well, this is the language
28 that the regulation specialist put in, and it still reads
29 that you can't, if you read though.

30
31 MR. KOOKESH: I just read -- like I say,
32 we grew up in the time of ANCSA when shall and may nearly
33 devastated our communities, and....

34
35 MS. WILSON: Yeah.

36
37 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: When what?

38
39 MR. KOOKESH: When shall and may
40 devastated our communities, the language that was in
41 ANCSA.

42
43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah.

44
45 MR. KOOKESH: A lot of us as a native
46 people, the playing with words.

47
48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah.

49
50 MS. GARZA: So are you looking for

00181

1 something stronger there, Floyd?

2

3 MR. KOOKESH: It seemed like that's what
4 you were asking, what we were asking for is something
5 strong, not may not.

6

7 MS. GARZA: So you could take that point
8 to the legalese.....

9

10 MR. PROBASCO: I've got Floyd's comment
11 here that his concern is that the word may, and you're
12 recommending shall, is that how.....

13

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Or it will not.

15

16 MR. KOOKESH: Will not, yeah.

17

18 MS. GARZA: So the concern is just that
19 it's not strong enough.

20

21 MR. PROBASCO: Okay.

22

23 MR. KOOKESH: Or cannot or is strictly
24 prohibited, you know.

25

26 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: No, not, nada.

27

28 MR. KOOKESH: Or you'll lose your rights
29 to subsistence.

30

31 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Or you lose your
32 license.

33

34 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, lose your right to
35 subsist.

36

37 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Dolly.

38

39 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, Pete, I guess
40 the point that I want to make is I think the Council was
41 happy with the recommendations, the changes that we made.
42 I agree with Floyd, I think that we need to make that
43 language strong enough, and I'm not sure how to change
44 it. The question I have with that last sentence, may not
45 enter commerce at any point, I don't have any problem
46 with the intent of it. And commercial enterprises versus
47 commerce, either way. The concern that I had was I know
48 that in Southeast there was interest in actually taking
49 it to Silver Lining (ph) or whatever, but that in other
50 regions there interest in selling it to something like

00182

1 sea life centers, so is Sea Life Center commerce?
2 Because the intent from the Cordova people I've talked to
3 is that the fishery that sells it to the Sea Life Center
4 directly competes with subsistence uses in that area, and
5 that's something that they've had a hard time competing
6 with. There's problems with State versus Federal
7 jurisdiction there. But I would like to figure out how
8 to in that sentence address an enterprise like Sea Life
9 Center, and I don't think it's commerce, but I don't know
10 if their purchasing it makes it commerce.

11
12 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Garza,
13 my interpretation on the scenario that you just laid out,
14 that that would be a commerce activity.

15
16 MS. GARZA: Okay.

17
18 MR. PROBASCO: The way that fishery is
19 captured is through a commercial fishery that takes place
20 in the Copper River, and, of course, you're familiar with
21 the debate on the potential impacts to the subsistence
22 fishery. If the subsistence users wanted to capture and
23 participate in that potential to sell to, they would have
24 to do it through a commercial fishery which is provided
25 by the State at that point the way this language is
26 written right now, Ms. Garza.

27
28 MS. GARZA: So, Mr. Chairman, Pete, in
29 that process, then the guys -- I mean, I've heard that
30 they're just like a long huge hose into the river and
31 basically sucking it into the back of their trucks. Do
32 those guys have to have a -- they don't need a CFEC. Do
33 they need to have an experimental or scientific permit or
34 something from ADF&G, and then do they have to have
35 something from Commerce or whichever that would be,
36 business or seafood? Are there permits required in that
37 process?

38
39 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Garza,
40 that fishery is treated just like the commercial herring
41 fishery, commercial salmon fishery. It's conducted under
42 the auspices of a permit issued by the commissioner.
43 They still are -- the individual has to be licensed as a
44 commercial fisherman, and the product is sold by the
45 means of a fish ticket, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

48
49 MS. GARZA: One other question. So this
50 process actually will have no impact on it since that

00183

1 process is through ADF&G?

2

3 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct.

4

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'll get to you in a
6 second. Now, there was a discussion about one
7 determination not applicable in other regions that will
8 be applicable in one region. Is it the intent of the
9 Board to have one description of C&T for the whole State?

10

11 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, that's a good
12 question, and that's why you had the three alternatives
13 before you, and that's why I want to bring back a
14 specific recommendation from this Council. And if you
15 were to recommend your past action, essentially what
16 you're recommending is the Board to address regional
17 differences versus having an across-the-board regulation
18 that affects all regions the same. Your action that you
19 took in January recommended regional -- to recognize
20 regional differences, so you'd have from Regions 1
21 through 10, there may be similarities, or there may be
22 significant differences addressing the same species of
23 fish, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Then we'll let
26 that be noted on the record that we are requesting that,
27 because there are obvious distinctions and differences in
28 how this exercised from region to region, because of the
29 variation of resource. The variation and the use of
30 resource, so I think that should be a consideration that
31 they should take another look at. Mr. Littlefield.

32

33 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 I support the comments that we made previously that are
35 listed on page 13. When we discussed this, if you look
36 at the language, it says the exchange for cash between
37 rural residents and customary trade of subsistence
38 harvested fish, their parts, their eggs, legally taken
39 under the regulations of this part, we felt that was the
40 key, at least one of the keys when we were discussing
41 this. Legally taken under these existing regulations.
42 For Southeast Alaska, and maybe Cal can summarize these,
43 but that is 40 coho annually, six trout, 10 dolly varden.
44 I mean, we're talking about an insignificant amount of
45 fish that are legally taken. If you were selling 500
46 coho, you could not possibly legally take those under the
47 existing regulations. So maybe Cal could summarize what
48 is the maximum amount that could be legally taken under
49 the regs, because I remember our discussions, we felt
50 that was self-limiting on significant commercial

00184

1 enterprise which is mentioned in the definition of
2 customary trade. And another thing that we talked about
3 was that any dollar limits, while they might be fine for
4 one person, may not work for another. In other words,
5 some may sell 25, some may sell 1,000. I don't know.
6 And we did not want to put a limit on that. So I support
7 the language on 13, and maybe if Cal could summarize what
8 we could legally sell today.

9

10 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
11 Mr. Littlefield, I'm not sure you want me to go through
12 all the sockeye systems, because, you know, the sockeye
13 limits are different in various places, you're right, at
14 least for coho, you know, regionwide, it's a 40-fish
15 annual limit except on the west coast of Prince of Wales
16 where there is no annual limit in our regulations. We go
17 through all the sockeye stuff, but there are various bag
18 limits for various systems, and they're all different.

19

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 50.

21

22 MR. CASIPIT: There's not a region-wide
23 sockeye limit. But they're all less than -- you know,
24 there are a few places with 50, a couple places with 25,
25 there's one place 150. I mean, it's not anything on the
26 order of magnitude like Mr. Littlefield was saying, about
27 500 or 1,000 or whatever.

28

29 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair?

30

31 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pete.

32

33 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, the other -- I
34 agree with Mr. Littlefield's comments that your
35 discussion felt that the current regulations are self-
36 limiting as far as the sale. In addition, you also
37 captured -- when you made the question to me, are these
38 regulations set in stone, and I need to clarify that
39 point. These are regulations that are up for review
40 annually. So you would go and develop these regulations,
41 and if things needed to be adjusted for a particular,
42 whatever reason, they could be done on an annual basis,
43 Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

46

47 MR. LITTLEFIELD: That's enough.

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: One request, I was
50 struggling to hear you. My hearing isn't that keen in

00185

1 any case, so if we could accommodate that, I'd appreciate
2 it.

3

4 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, while I support
5 the work of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council at
6 the Yakutat meeting, I'm also concerned that the Federal
7 Subsistence Board will look at alternative 1, alternative
8 2 and alternative 3, and make their decision based on
9 those. And so I'm not sure if we should -- if we stick
10 with what we're saying, then we may simply be throwing
11 our vote out. In any extent, I think that regardless of
12 what the Federal Subsistence Board goes forward with,
13 that we would like to have our particular paragraph on
14 hooligan put in whatever they pass. And I don't know if
15 we should as a Council go through the three alternatives
16 and say this is the closest one that we would take as a
17 second, because ours I don't think resembles any of the
18 other regions, I don't think we're going to take what we
19 want and make it happen statewide.

20

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, I think at this
22 point the opportunities that are before us could be
23 somewhat premature, because if they're not premature,
24 that would really dilute our effectiveness to comment as
25 a RAC in the process. So I think that we would be safe
26 in considering these alternatives probably as a draft or
27 suggested alternatives at this point. Pete?

28

29 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, I follow Ms.
30 Garza's comments, and if I may, what I would recommend is
31 that you -- I'm sorry, I follow Ms. Garza's comments, and
32 what I would recommend if I may is that you specifically
33 reaffirm whatever decision and make it clear that what
34 you've said so far is that you are in favor of the
35 language that you adopted at your January meeting, you
36 would like to make the language in section 12 that Floyd
37 identified stronger. You want the paragraph eulachon
38 stated, and that you want a regulation that addresses
39 customary trade that goes forward that recognizes
40 regional differences. That's what you've stated, and I
41 think you need to reaffirm that as a council through your
42 process, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: They could probably
45 insert that in the most appropriate alternative. Dolly.

46

47 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or separate.

48

49 MS. GARZA: I guess my other comment is I
50 don't think this is premature. If they make their

00186

1 decision in January, this is the last time we're going to
2 see it, and that decision will be made. It will not come
3 back to us.

4

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.
6 (Affirmative)

7

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Oh, that's true.
9 What's the wish of the Council?

10

11 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chair, I move that we
12 reaffirm our position as stated on page 13 or whatever it
13 is.

14

15 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Second.

16

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Moved and second.
18 discussion.

19

20 MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Hal.

23

24 MR. MARTIN: I have the same concerns
25 that Floyd has. I think we should change the word may.

26

27 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Change what?

28

29 MS. GARZA: May.

30

31 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All right. May to
32 shall.

33

34 MR. DOUVILLE: Is that what your motion
35 is?

36

37 MS. GARZA: Shall not?

38

39 MR. MARTIN: I think, yeah, shall not.

40

41 MR. KOOKESH: Second.

42

43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Will not?

44

45 MR. KOOKESH: And I seconded it.

46

47 MR. MARTIN: Shall not.

48

49 MR. KOOKESH: May to shall not.

50

00187

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Better not.

2

3 MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

4

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Better not.

6

7 MR. PROBASCO: We have the intent

8 captured, Mr. Chair. I don't know, you know, what

9 English version they'll use, but it's very clear that you

10 want it stronger.

11

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, since the

13 language is made official.....

14

15 MR. MARTIN: Shall not.

16

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS:we're trying to be

18 as official as we can.

19

20 MR. PROBASCO: Correct, but also know

21 that through the regulatory process it will go back to

22 our house of lawyers and we'll have all kinds of

23 interesting.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. What do we

26 desire for stronger language.

27

28 MR. KOOKESH: Those lawyers don't know

29 everything either.

30

31 MR. PROBASCO: No.

32

33 MS. GARZA: Shall.

34

35 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Shall? Shall? Is

36 shall the new word?

37

38 MR. MARTIN: Yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

41

42 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mike had a question.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike?

45

46 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You may not

47 (indiscernible).

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike.

50

00188

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
2 just have a question about the term may not enter or
3 shall not enter commerce. Was that protected from being
4 laundered, second or third exchange down the line? You
5 know what I'm referring?

6
7 MR. PROBASCO: Yes. Mr. Chair, if I may,
8 Mr. Douville.

9
10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Uh-huh.

11
12 MR. PROBASCO: This would prevent it from
13 entering anywhere on down the exchange. It can't enter
14 commerce, or as Mr. Thomas said, a commercial market at
15 any point. This is, I don't want to say identical, but
16 very similar to the language that was adopted by the
17 North Pacific Fisher Management Council in addressing
18 halibut subsistence issues. So the fish could not be
19 laundered and then at some point later enter the
20 commercial market. It would still be an illegal
21 activity, Mr. Douville, Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I think some of concern
24 here is that there may be a need for cash to be involved
25 in some cases, and if it's to help with fuel or something
26 like that, I think that's one of the determinations.
27 Does that come under barter?

28
29 MR. PROBASCO: No, Mr. Chair, this only
30 deals with commercial entities.

31
32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

33
34 MR. PROBASCO: You as an individual could
35 pay somebody to harvest fish or whatever.

36
37 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

38
39 MR. PROBASCO: You know, rural to rural,
40 rural to others.

41
42 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: So this is speaking
43 specifically to commercial.

44
45 MR. PROBASCO: Correct, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

48
49 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, I'm going to
50 support the motion to adopt on page 13, and I'd like to

00189

1 address the comments that the board asked us about
2 significant commercial enterprise. In my opinion, I
3 believe that it is self-limiting by the language legally
4 taken. Significant commercial enterprise under the
5 existing legal regulations is \$500 bucks a year or less.
6 It's a very insignificant amount currently. So I think
7 it's self-limiting by itself. What limitations shall be
8 placed on the exchange of case, we've define those
9 already in 11 and 12, as long as they don't enter
10 commerce, we're happy with that. Should there be a limit
11 on the exchange of cash, no. What -- the key here is
12 customary trade. It defines that as long-term,
13 generational things. You cannot invent customary trade.
14 Customary trade cannot be invented in one year. So if
15 it's something that you have done or your family has done
16 for years, generational use, it's legal no matter what
17 that amount is, in my opinion. And also I think that if
18 we do not accept that, that is an infringement upon the
19 existing customary and traditional rights that the
20 residents of Southeast Alaska enjoy, and I'm comfortable
21 with the language that's in there, and I'm going to
22 support it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

25

26 MS. GARZA: I'm not sure if you were
27 jumping ahead, John. I think we should vote on what's on
28 the table, and then perhaps take these up separately,
29 because I have some differing than you do on my answers
30 to those four, and I'm not sure that this council can
31 come to agreement on them, because we do have differing
32 opinions, and it may be necessary, but I don't know if
33 the proper process is that we would tell you individually
34 now, or if we should just write down our comments and
35 give them to you or what. But I don't know that this
36 Council will come to a consensus on this is how I feel on
37 point 2 or point 3. I just.....

38

39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, we'll come up
40 with consensus.

41

42 MS. GARZA: We didn't in Yakutat.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, we will this
45 time.

46

47 MS. GARZA: So I would call for the
48 question on the motion to re-affirm our position.

49

50 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been

00190

1 called.

2

3 MS. GARZA: Marilyn.

4

5 MS. WILSON: Before we vote on that main
6 motion, I thought there was another motion from John and
7 Mike to change the word may on page 13. Or was that
8 just.....

9

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: That's part of this
11 motion.

12

13 MS. WILSON: That's part of -- I thought
14 it was an amendment.

15

16 MS. GARZA: Friendly.

17

18 MS. WILSON: Okay.

19

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was an
21 amendment.

22

23 MS. GARZA: Friendly amendment, Marilyn.

24

25 MS. WILSON: Hmm?

26

27 MS. GARZA: Friendly amendment.

28

29 MS. WILSON: Oh, okay.

30

31 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nobody was opposed
32 to it.

33

34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. All those in
35 favor of the motion with that one editorial of changing
36 fish may to will not, signify by saying aye.

37

38 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Shall not.

39

40 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Shall not. Say aye
41 anyway.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 MS. GARZA: So you're going to tell your
46 daughter you shall not go to the dance tonight.

47

48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Those opposed,
49 same sign.

50

00191

1 (No opposing votes.)

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.

4 With regard to other language in getting back to a
5 significant commercial enterprise, I think that we can
6 probably make that an action item and request that be
7 deleted from wherever it sat up here in front. Dolly?

8

9 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I guess, John,
10 you were kind of on a roll there, so I kind of lost you
11 right in the beginning. Did you say that significant
12 commercial enterprise under state is 500 bucks? I heard
13 you say.....

14

15 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Pardon me?

16

17 MS. GARZA: I was probably doing the same
18 thing when you were talking. On the first bullet, the
19 definition of the limits of a significant commercial
20 enterprise, did you say that the State had a definition
21 that included \$500?

22

23 MR. LITTLEFIELD: No, Mr. Chair, Ms.
24 Garza, what I said was it was self-limiting. In other
25 words, if you were to add up -- if cohos were going for a
26 dollar a pound, and you were to add up what if you were
27 to add up what you could get for 40 cohos at \$1 a pound,
28 and I don't know, maybe a seven or eight-pound average if
29 you're lucky, I know of a limit of 150 sockeye, but those
30 are Neka Bay sockeye, those are a couple pounds apiece,
31 and you add up the cutthroat and you add up the 10 dolly
32 varden, and if you could get \$500 for those fish, you'd
33 be -- I'm just saying that it's already insignificant
34 because of the legally taken. In other words, you could
35 get a lot more than that, but not legally. So it's self-
36 limiting to the amount of fish that we've already
37 approved in the regulations, and to me that's something
38 less than \$500 today. We may change that next year, but
39 today. That was my interpretation. And I don't want
40 that \$500 to enter as a suggested limit. I'm just saying
41 that's what it would appear to me today to be, that you
42 maybe could make \$500 off of it.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, I'm going to
45 discontinue my bantering on that, and wait for an example
46 to present itself on the point I was trying to make. Who
47 had their hand up? Dolly?

48

49 MS. GARZA: Floyd.

50

00192

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Floyd.

2

3 MR. KOOKESH: \$500 is nothing by the way.
4 I remember Dolly saying that a fishery that makes up less
5 than one percent of the total commercial catch. How can
6 you find that a significant commercial enterprise when
7 it's something that makes up like one percent of the
8 total fishery? It's ridiculous.

9

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

11

12 MS. GARZA: Okay. So my question was --
13 I just heard \$500, so I wasn't sure if there was a State
14 definition. I wasn't trying to support it. I was just
15 trying to clarify it. I guess I would like to ask you,
16 Mr. Probasco, on that first point, in the only meeting
17 that I went to, it was my understanding that other
18 regions are looking at a monetary value. If that's true,
19 do you know what they're bantering around? Is there
20 something that there appears to be a consensus towards?

21

22 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Garza,
23 yes, that is correct. Other regions are looking at
24 dollar specifics. Probably a good example would be to go
25 to Bristol Bay on page 14 which captures their
26 recommendation. I don't know if they're going to
27 reaffirm this position at their meeting that's currently
28 taking place right now, but what they passed last winter
29 was \$500 annually between rural residents, and \$400
30 annually between rural residents and others. So they
31 elected to do a cash value. And other regions did
32 similar. Kodiak/Aleutians recommended a dollar value.
33 Cook Inlet had a dollar value that captured \$1,000
34 annually, but only 50 percent of the fish that they
35 harvested could be sold. So each region took a little
36 bit different twist on how to define significant
37 commercial enterprise. I believe Mr. Littlefield did a
38 good summary of defining the definition of significant
39 commercial enterprise as viewed by the Southeast Regional
40 Council, based on you reaffirming your decision. A
41 significant commercial enterprise is limited by the
42 limits that are currently established in regulation. You
43 view them as self-limiting. And so a significant
44 commercial enterprise is defined in that context for
45 Southeast, Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

48

49 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair?

50

00193

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

2

3 MR. LITTLEFIELD: As an example, four
4 weeks ago I purchased fish, subsistence caught fish, but
5 I paid a lot more for them, because they were completely
6 dried newspaper-type fish, so they have a little bit
7 higher value. In other words, the \$500 may not be right.
8 And last year I purchased about \$2,000 worth of fish from
9 the Interior as well as Southeast for a potlatch for my
10 nephew. They're one-time things, and others might do
11 that similar, and I know of that have done much more than
12 that. And that is a custom and tradition that I do not
13 want to put a limit on that is too low. And I do not
14 know what that limit is, and that's why I'm uncomfortable
15 with any limit, and it's insignificant in between rural
16 residents anyway.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

19

20 MS. GARZA: So I think that if we're
21 trying to send points on, I think we make it clear that
22 we do not support monetary limits for rural to rural,
23 because I do see that in other regions, and I think
24 that's one point that we strongly disagree with.

25

26 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

27

28 MS. GARZA: I think there's Mike, then
29 Patty and Harold.

30

31 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike.

32

33 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
34 I'd just like to make a comment addressing something
35 similar. There's only two or three people that fish
36 hooligan, and I know that by the time they're done, they
37 probably -- if you put a \$500 limit on something like
38 that, it would affect that, right? In my mind it would,
39 but that's just one, another issue that would be in line
40 with John's.

41

42 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: With regard to the
43 hooligan?

44

45 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah.

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: And the sale of?

48

49 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah. That's a good -- it
50 doesn't enter commerce, but....

00194

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: No.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE:the dollar limit goes
4 much higher than 500.

5

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Oh, yes.

7

8 MR. DOUVILLE: And I'm sure it does, so,
9 I mean, that is a limiting factor you need to consider.

10

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Right. That's being
12 recognized and acknowledged.

13

14 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay.

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Patty?

17

18 MS. PHILLIPS: In our village there's a
19 couple of people who are really good at doing up fish,
20 and let's say it's Marilyn. And we all went and got our
21 sockeye or coho, but we want Marilyn to do up some of our
22 fish. Well, the practice is that Marilyn will get to
23 keep a part of my catch that's processed. I get to take
24 mine, go home and eat it, and she gets to keep a percent.
25 Well, then you might have either someone within the
26 village that didn't go get coho or sockeye that they want
27 to get some, and they'll go see Marilyn. Or you've got
28 briefcase Indians from Juneau, Sitka, Seattle that, oh, I
29 want some dry fish. I know someone I can call, and it's
30 going to be more than \$500 worth of income. So, you
31 know, I don't want significant amount -- I don't want
32 that, I don't want parameters around the value, and I
33 can't reiterate that enough. They're not like going out
34 and buying a Mercedes Benz.

35

36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: If you don't sell that
37 product to Sitka Seafoods or Safeway, you're not entering
38 commerce. Pete?

39

40 MR. PROBASCO: I'm not sure if there's a
41 confusion here amongst the council, but the language that
42 you just reaffirmed captures exactly what you
43 articulated, Ms. Phillips. There are no limits of rural
44 to rural and rural to others, only in the commercial
45 arena. So you've captured that, what's been articulated
46 here, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. Harold.

49

50 MR. MARTIN: On thing, Mr. Chair, I agree

00195

1 with John. I think what we do in customary trade is
2 self-limiting. As I remember, last year we talked about
3 that no one goes out with the intent of selling
4 subsistence caught fish to commercial enterprises. It's
5 our personal use. In the old days we very rarely traded
6 for cash. We traded food for food.

7

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Yeah. Go ahead.

9

10 MR. MARTIN: I'm not done, Mr. Chairman.

11

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

13

14 MR. MARTIN: I lost my train of thought.

15 I'll remember later.

16

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. I'm sorry if I
18 contributed to your losing your train of thought. I
19 apologize. We have a member of the community that wants
20 to offer some input on this topic, and I'm going to allow
21 that at this time, and that may expand our discussion or
22 reaffirm our discussion. Mr. Thomas L. Miller, Senior,
23 Snake House and Head House. Pete, you could stay up
24 there and field some more questions and comments if you
25 would. Just talk into the cassette.

26

27 MR. MILLER: My Tlingit name is Ka-shu-
28 tel. And I'm a master (ph) of Snail House. When my
29 grandmother, she was a medicine woman, her name was Mary
30 Wilson Serabia, and we're the owners of Snail House and
31 Head House through her. And when her brothers died,
32 Frank Wilson and Alexander Wilson, we had put up 5,000
33 sockeye, newspaper style sockeye for the pay-off party.
34 We had 2500 silver salmon, the same newspaper style. We
35 had 2500.....

36

37 REPORTER: Could you bring the microphone
38 a little further away from you mouth? Just a little.....

39

40 MR. MILLER: Excuse me?

41

42 REPORTER:further away. That's it.

43

44 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Put it on the table.

45

46 MR. MILLER: Okay. I'm sorry. We put up
47 2500 chum salmon as the newspaper style also. And then
48 the other half tribe Miday (ph), that was also put all
49 kinds of species of sockeye, silver and chums. So in
50 different Tlingit families and different ways, you have

00196

1 different levels of like the queen and king of England
2 and stuff, there are different ratings in your family.
3 And we were always told that our family -- we can use any
4 crest under the Raven as long as we acknowledged the
5 tongue first. So in our family, when someone in our
6 family is deceased, we put up as much as we can so we can
7 give as much as we think always make the spirit feel good
8 and comfortable, that he is well thought of. It also
9 depends on the -- how well that person was liked in the
10 community. If he was well-liked by a lot of people over
11 there, we gave plenty, because that feeling still
12 radiated out to everybody. And our family was always
13 known that whenever people were hungry, we never asked
14 for anything, we just packed up a box of food for them
15 and took it over there and left it on their porch. They
16 didn't have to know where it came from. And today that
17 custom is still going on. And over in Excursion Inlet
18 last summer, I had my son and my daughter, and my son is
19 12 and my daughter is nine, and they're Woosh-kee-ton.
20 And I taught them the old Tlingit way of making gaff
21 hooks that Uncle Pete Duncan had showed me as a child.
22 My son had asked me, Dad, there's going to be a time that
23 you're going to be too old to make these, so if you show
24 us now, it's not going to die.

25

26 And traditionally that's how we always
27 gaffed our fish in the rivers in the Excursion area is we
28 used gaff hooks, because people can manipulate the laws
29 to find a way to harass us, cite us. And this is still
30 going on with the Department of Fish and Game. When
31 we're over there, we're treated as criminals before when
32 they see us in the river. They're hiding away,
33 videotaping us, and then they come out and ask us about
34 permits and ID cards. Instead of that, they can just
35 come right out and ask us, and we'll provide it with them
36 up there. If we have our children up there, we're not
37 violating the law. We're teaching them. And it was kind
38 of hard with my kids. It was pretty stressful, because
39 they would sense the guy watching us, and I would just
40 ignore them, because I already knew he was there and I
41 didn't know who he was. But a lot of us, we grew up with
42 weapons, and a lot of us are still pretty active from the
43 Vietnam war, and some of us are still having a hard time
44 dealing with it, so if people start sneaking up on us,
45 the reaction could be awfully deadly, and this isn't a
46 threat or anything. This is reality.

47

48 The Fed fish and game guy, he knows
49 better, because he's our nephew. My nephew. And he's
50 always instructed, he says, don't play favorites, because

00197

1 it's going to come back to you. So I didn't have my
2 Federal fishing permit with me, and he told me, he said,
3 this is a warning. He said, you carry it with you at all
4 times, so I apologized to him, because normally I keep it
5 in my wallet and I don't take my wallet with me when I go
6 up the rivers, because it's easy to lose.

7

8 But all this fish and stuff, that's not
9 counting all the other game that we go out and get, too,
10 that's always presented at all the pay-off parties,
11 because a lot of it's on behalf of myself as well as from
12 Snail House and Head House. I would ask you guys to just
13 take no action, because it's our customary right to take
14 what we need or what we think we need to give out to the
15 people. It's not being sold. It's not being traded out
16 for money. This cash flow business, we're already in it.
17 We're already saving up our money for the party. We're
18 not selling what we're catching. It's too much work.
19 There's not price value on the amount of work that goes
20 into putting up one dried fish. I have a hard time
21 standing in front of people and speaking.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You're doing a good
24 job.

25

26 MR. MILLER: Well, thank you. This is,
27 we want to just say that we're still living our customary
28 life over here, and it's been here longer than
29 Christopher Columbus. It was still going on before he
30 was here. So this is just something -- we're very
31 conservative. We don't just go in there and waste
32 things. When we take it, we're always thinking about the
33 next generation, tomorrow, the next person.

34

35 Another example over there in Excursion
36 Inlet that I've noticed is during the summer and the fall
37 season before the fish tenders go south, they're up in
38 the creek and they use gill nets inside the river to
39 round up all the cohos. They've had garbage bags of
40 clean cohos stacked there and the bears got into them, so
41 they couldn't get back to them, and all that fish was
42 just gone for the bears. And nobody seems to check on
43 them at the end of the season, because everybody figures,
44 well, fishing's over. And us, we're just only allowed so
45 much fish, 20 sockeyes is all that's allocated, and it's
46 already consumed, so I've got to go get some more
47 somehow. Okay. That's all I have to say.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00198

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Thomas. I'm
2 really glad that you shared that with us, because that is
3 a true depiction of what customary trade is in a
4 traditional sense. And there isn't anything that we're
5 going to do here that's going to interfere with what you
6 just described. What we're doing is having to satisfy
7 Federal requirements on making these determinations.
8 That's why we're deliberating as careful as we can to
9 make sure that we don't compromise or jeopardize anything
10 that you just shared with us. We will not do that. So
11 you can be comforted in knowing that our job -- Title
12 VIII tells us that we must provide an opportunity for you
13 to continue to do what you're doing. That's the law.

14

15 MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Kunacheesh. Dolly,
18 you've got some question, you've got some.....

19

20 MS. GARZA: No, just a comment.

21

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Comment.

23

24 MS. GARZA: And that's just to make
25 clear, Mr. Chairman, that we're also not the decision-
26 makers, so our recommendation to the Federal Subsistence
27 Board is quite strong and mirrors your concerns.
28 However, the decision will not be made by us.

29

30 MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman.

31

32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Harold.

33

34 MR. MARTIN: Mr. Mills hit on what I
35 forgot earlier, that customary and traditional practice
36 of sharing is very much alive in our communities.

37

38 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yes.

39

40 MR. MARTIN: Thank you for bringing that

41 up.

42

43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Good job. Kunacheesh.

44

45 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

46

47 MR. KOOKESH: I have a question.

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Floyd.

50

00199

1 MR. KOOKESH: Patty and I were just
2 talking, and I was asking her what's the penalty if you
3 violate any of this? What's the penalty going to be if
4 you violate the commercial significant enterprise
5 and.....

6
7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You'll lose your hair.

8
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five years in the
10 electric chair.

11
12 MR. KOOKESH: Is there penalty systems in
13 place there?

14
15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: (Indiscernible)

16
17 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, there are
18 penalties, but I do not know what they are. I apologize.

19
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. We have another
21 member of the public. Ernestine Hanlon, speaking on
22 customary trade, can offer her own views. Good morning
23 to you.

24
25 MS. HANLON: Thank you. Good morning. I
26 have the view from my father, Sam Hanlon, who is the
27 leader for the Woosh-Kee-Tons, and my views combined.
28 After today I'll separate the letters and I'll have it
29 more formally presented.

30
31 To the Subsistence Board on customary
32 trade, customary trade is not up for limitation or
33 regulations. I'm afraid that now the Federal Government
34 is trying to define the undefinable to be used against us
35 and not for our protection. The Federal and State
36 governments interpret of what we do as Tlingits, it does
37 not come to who we are at all, or our culture.

38
39 We do not use the customary trade with
40 the term monetary, and trade on a monetary basis, I see
41 in ANILCA barter is in there. And I think it should be
42 left alone. If a Tlingit wants to trade or use the
43 monetary basis, it is our business, and I have not yet
44 seen any Tlingit get very wealthy off of trading or
45 selling a little bit of fish. Just recently my son was
46 going fishing, and he really needed some money, and I
47 didn't have any money to help him out, but I had some dry
48 fish. I'm not going to tell you how much I sold it for,
49 but my son didn't go away broke.

50

00200

1 What I see is more enforcement, and what
2 this telling me is we're the law breakers, and I think
3 that we abide by our own laws very well.

4
5 And I also see that this is creating a
6 division between all the users, the commercial as well as
7 the people who aren't commercial. And I don't think that
8 we should -- we need any more division. I think that as
9 a whole, I see a lot of indigenous people here. I think
10 we need to be together, united so that we can make a
11 statement, not divided, and I see more of a division
12 coming, and it's not right.

13
14 I just don't agree with more enforcement.
15 That does not solve what you think is a problem. I don't
16 think this is a problem. And I tend to agree with
17 several of the statements that were in the book all
18 right, how the book said on customary trade. It says in
19 here, I'm in support of the published rule. I tend to go
20 along with the take no action on this. And if monetary
21 comes in the picture, I don't think that we should have a
22 limit or a cap. Let me see if there's something else.
23 And there are several things in here that are written
24 that I know it's public comment, and I don't tend to
25 agree with it, like customary trade should be restricted
26 to transactions -- oh, wait. Customary trade is unknown
27 in Yup'ik culture. I don't think that's true. But, you
28 know, this is personal comments, and this is my personal
29 view as well. And this is something we've been doing all
30 along, and I just don't think that we should pose a
31 threat. I believe that's all I need to say right now.
32 Let's see. Oh, I'll finish off the letter. Oops, I'm
33 sorry.

34
35 It's a tradition to always make room for
36 others from other places to fish, hunt and gather. We
37 gave what we have. Others in turn would give to us, like
38 the herring eggs from Sitka, the hooligan roe from
39 Klukwan are examples. It's a balance. It's a sharing
40 without calling it a trade. We haven't really, you know.
41 And I strongly support alternative 1, take no action.
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Ernestine.
45 Again, we agree with and respect the view that you've
46 shared with us, but as Dolly said, we don't make the
47 decisions.

48
49 MS. HANLON: Uh-huh.
50

00201

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: We bring
2 recommendation. And a no action from us would not
3 prohibit them from making a decision. They would make a
4 decision without our input is what would happen, and I
5 don't think we're going to do that. We're going to have
6 our input, and like I said earlier, Section 801, the very
7 first words of Title VIII on subsistence management says
8 that our job is to provide a continued opportunity for
9 the use of subsistence resources. It doesn't say we take
10 away, it doesn't say we prohibit. It doesn't say we
11 interrupt or interfere. It says we must provide
12 continued opportunity. And that's all it says. There's
13 no place else in the law that says that that can be
14 interrupted. It's a priority. It's a number 1 priority.
15 Everything else comes after that. So that's the position
16 that we take. That's what we hope to get the public to
17 understand. That's why we meet in eligible communities
18 that are for subsistence, and your input, the local input
19 to this process is super important, and we're really glad
20 that you're here. And I want you to know that in
21 whatever form we take is going to represent you as strong
22 as we can. This is a Federal -- this is a process of the
23 change-over from State management to Federal Management,
24 and this is something that didn't occur with the State
25 structure, but it's a mandate to occur under the Federal
26 structure. And it's just a bureaucratic way of doing
27 business. None of us like it, but we have to make the
28 best of what we've got to work with.

29
30 MS. HANLON: So what position is the
31 Federal Board going to take? What alternative are you
32 supporting?

33
34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: On page 13.

35
36 MS. HANLON: Page 16.

37
38 MR. PROBASCO: 13.

39
40 MS. HANLON: Oh, 13.

41
42 MR. PROBASCO: Under Southeast.

43
44 MS. HANLON: Under Southeast. Okay.

45
46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly?

47
48 MS. GARZA: Ernestine, when you look at
49 alternative 1 that says take no action, there are still
50 regulations that exist. So taking no action doesn't mean

00202

1 that nothing will happen. It means that the current
2 regulations will stay in place. If you compare that,
3 which is on the bottom of page three, to what we
4 recommend on page 13, our attempt at the Council is to be
5 more liberal. And so you might (indiscernible -
6 simultaneous speech).....

7

8 MS. HANLON: Compared to what page?

9

10 MS. GARZA: Page 13.

11

12 MS. HANLON: Compared to what other page?

13

14 MS. GARZA: Page three where it says take
15 no action.

16

17 MS. HANLON: Three?

18

19 MS. GARZA: At the bottom of page three.
20 When it says take no action, below that you'll see what
21 the current regulations are. And it was our opinion as a
22 Council that those regulations were not as good as the
23 ones that we recommended on 13.

24

25 MS. HANLON: And this is regulations from
26 ANILCA?

27

28 MS. GARZA: From OSM.

29

30 MS. HANLON: OSM?

31

32 MS. GARZA: Office of Subsistence
33 Management.

34

35 MS. HANLON: Oh.

36

37 MS. GARZA: Pete.

38

39 MS. HANLON: And this is the only people
40 that we could work with?

41

42 MS. GARZA: Well, the ultimate decision
43 is by the Federal Subsistence Board, so each region is
44 giving their version of what they would like, which is in
45 this packet, and then it's -- Pete reported earlier that
46 the Federal Subsistence Board intends to make a final
47 decision in January based on these comments.

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: See, there's 10 regions
50 in Alaska.

00203

1 MS. HANLON: Uh-huh.

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Southeast is Region 1.
4 And each region right now is considering the same thing
5 we are. And we can only expect a lot of differences on
6 how to approach this, comparing ourselves to other
7 regions. And.....

8

9 MS. HANLON: Well, I'll go further to say
10 that I support a government-to-government relationship on
11 the decision.

12

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Right. That would be
14 up the tribe.

15

16 MS. HANLON: Uh-huh.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The tribe and the
19 government, yeah.

20

21 MS. HANLON: Okay.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Uh-huh. Pete.

24

25 MS. HANLON: Thank you.

26

27 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, I was just
28 going to provide some additional clarification, and what
29 the Southeast Region just reaffirmed is what Dolly, Ms.
30 Garza just pointed to on page 13, which recommends no
31 limits on cash exchange between rural residents to rural
32 residents, or rural residents to others. It only
33 addresses what happens to the product if it goes into a
34 commercial market.

35

36 MS. HANLON: I see.

37

38 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Another thing, the
39 chairman is more sympathetic when he's got a newspaper
40 style folded up in front of him during deliberations and
41 then we can get more serious.

42

43 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chair.

44

45 MS. HANLON: I have sekalish (ph).

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Marilyn.

48

49 MS. WILSON: I don't know where my mike
50 is, but I see.....

00204

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Your mike?

2

3 MS. WILSON: I guess my voice is pretty
4 small. But I see a future member out there, Ernestine.
5 I think she would be a good candidate to sit on this
6 council.

7

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Be ready. We like the
9 silent type on this council. Pete.

10

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what I'm on.

12

13 MR. PROBASCO: Just that you said that
14 you were going to submit a letter?

15

16 MS. HANLON: Yeah, I'll get something
17 drafted up.

18

19 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Schroeder will assist
20 you in making sure that letter gets to the Board.

21

22 MS. HANLON: Okay.

23

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Oh, that's another
25 thing. These people here, they all have different
26 responsibilities. They sit with us, we pass on
27 instructions, because they are assigned to work with us,
28 so that they can get it up to Pete and his office, and
29 then among themselves they'll get the message and
30 consider everything that we furnish them. So there is
31 actually a process. Do not like it, but it's there. Did
32 you have anything else?

33

34 MS. HANLON: No, not at this point.

35

36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Would you like some
37 hostile questions from the Council?

38

39 MS. HANLON: Yeah.

40

41 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Anybody have any
42 comments or questions? Patty.

43

44 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman Thomas,
45 Ernestine and Tom, I wanted to thank you for putting on
46 the public record your comments, and reaffirming the
47 long-term consistent pattern of use in your community.

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Good job. Kunacheesh.
50 Uh-huh. Dolly.

00205

1 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, following the
2 discussion, we still have those four bullets of public
3 comments that will help the Board decide. The last one
4 was how any limitations set on customary trade will
5 affect subsistence needs, traditions and the values of
6 subsistence ways of life. And I think rolled through
7 that, but you were talking too fast for me.

8
9 Two other points that I got from
10 listening to Council discussion as well as the two
11 members from the public is that it would negatively
12 impact our ability to acquire resources for potlatches.
13 I think that's obvious. That's been mentioned several
14 times. The second one is that I think it will negatively
15 impact the tradition -- of putting a monetary value.
16 Okay. So putting a monetary value will negatively impact
17 potlatching, acquiring materials for potlatching, and
18 will negatively impact traditional practices of
19 recognizing expert fish smokers that we buy from. As
20 Patty had mentioned, there are people like Ernestine or
21 Yosem (ph) in Pelican that you just know that that's who
22 you want to get some strips from, because they're the
23 best, and you can't compare. One of the final points I
24 wanted to make in terms of the potlatching is that while
25 someone like Mr. Littlefield may pay \$1,000 or \$2,000 for
26 fish from the Yukon for a potlatch, and that may be once
27 every 10 years that he does that, those Yukon people may
28 be paying \$1,000 for herring eggs for their potlatching,
29 and so in the end that money means nothing. It's
30 exchanging resources for resources, and the cash is just
31 merely a temporary, like a marker, so that I can buy
32 something back from you further down the line. So as
33 Ernestine had said, nobody ever makes money from it,
34 because you use that money to turn around and buy food
35 from other regions that you can't get yourself, you know,
36 and so it's -- the point that was made is we don't rich,
37 and that's absolutely true. Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Anybody else? Dick?
40

41 MR. STOKES: I was going to say most of
42 the time it's usually just to buy the gas to get there.

43
44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah, this is a good
45 year, because even the commercial guys didn't find their
46 enterprise paid enough for the gas. So it's a tough life
47 out there.

48
49 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair.
50

00206

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Wait a minute. Keep
2 your hand up there. John.

3

4 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, for the
5 benefit of the people that do not have a rules and
6 regulations in front of them that are in the audience, I
7 just -- I want to clarify what barter means and what
8 customary trade means so that they're not confused, and
9 maybe Pete could clarify this, but my interpretation of
10 barter is no money is exchanged. In other words, in a
11 potlatch, that would be bartering to me. And customary
12 trade is defined in the regulations as cash. So when
13 cash is exchanged, that's customary trade. And any other
14 things that you do is barter. And maybe Pete could
15 explain that so that there's no confusion here, and what
16 we're talking about is only the customary trade. The
17 existing regulations on alternative 1 have the word
18 barter in there, but the proposed regulations and the
19 proposed rule eliminated the word barter, so we're only
20 talking about cash at this time, not barter. So it's
21 important that some of these things are not going to be
22 affected at all. It's only the cash sales that is on the
23 table right now. Maybe Pete.....

24

25 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, Mr. Littlefield
26 did a good job explaining the difference, I couldn't add
27 any more to it without repeating what you just said, Mr.
28 Littlefield, so you captured it.

29

30 MS. GARZA: Okay. We need to keep
31 rolling, you guys. Any other comments on customary
32 trade? Is there any other public testimony?

33

34 MS. HANLON: Wanda is typing a letter
35 now, and it was for this specific thing.

36

37 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It could come later.

38

39 MS. HANLON: I don't know what
40 (indiscernible - away from microphone)

41

42 MS. GARZA: Yeah, we'll make sure we hear
43 from her. Yeah. Okay. Was there something else you
44 were doing?

45

46 MR. PROBASCO: The easy one.

47

48 MS. GARZA: Okay.

49

50 MR. PROBASCO: (Indiscernible)

00207

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The easy one?

2

3 MR. PROBASCO: Yeah. Do you want to do
4 that now, Ms. Garza?

5

6 MS. GARZA: I thought that Bill had said
7 he was going to wrap up so you could fly out and leave
8 us?

9

10 MR. PROBASCO: I leave today.

11

12 MS. GARZA: Okay.

13

14 MR. PROBASCO: And I believe
15 Transboundary Rivers is next. That's what Mr. Thomas
16 wanted to do.

17

18 MS. GARZA: Okay. So what was skipped
19 over was 9, 10, 11, so we're going to 13(a), Stikine
20 River, transboundary rivers. There's nothing in the
21 packet, is there?

22

23 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct, nothing in
24 the packet.

25

26 MS. GARZA: There's nothing in the
27 packet, Marilyn.

28

29 MR. PROBASCO: Madame Chair, the purpose
30 of this briefing is essentially bring the Board up to
31 speed on the actions that the Federal Subsistence Board
32 took this summer addressing the transboundary river
33 issue, and offer up myself as far as being able to answer
34 questions and concerns. Your Regional Council through
35 Ms. Garza and Mr. Thomas provided some very detailed
36 comments and questions during the Federal Subsistence
37 Board deliberations on these issues, and there may still
38 be lingering questions on where we're going with the
39 transboundary rivers.

40

41 I think it's important that I bring
42 everybody up to speed. Everybody's aware what we mean by
43 transboundary rivers. There's three that we address in
44 Southeast: Stikine, Taku, and Alsek. In this case we're
45 strictly talking about Stikine and Taku on the
46 transboundary rivers. Alsek is covered separately as far
47 as the issues that are before us.

48

49 If we go back to September 2000, you had
50 a proposal before you, Proposal No. 27, that requested

00208

1 that a Federal subsistence and season harvest limits be
2 established on the Stikine River for sockeye. As you
3 recall, the Board deferred action in December of 2000,
4 and recommended attempted coordinations between the
5 Pacific Salmon Commission. Since then we also addressed
6 another proposal, Proposal No. 35, which requested that
7 new regulatory language be developed to protect coho
8 salmon by limiting the fishery to federally qualified
9 subsistence users, and that a Federal permit, harvest
10 data, limits, and methods and means be established. The
11 Board adopted this Proposal 35 with modifications in
12 December of 2001. Nonfederally qualified uses were not
13 excluded, for federally qualified users, a subsistence
14 coho fishery is established for Southeast Alaska, except
15 for Sections 3(A), 3(B), and 3(C), Prince of Wales Island
16 where regulations have been established earlier. And
17 then we had a federal permit, and we addressed methods
18 and means.

19
20 Since the Proposal 35 addressed
21 regulations for areawide, technically it included Stikine
22 and Taku River. On the other panel, if you will, that
23 deals with transboundaries, concerns through their
24 process raised by Canada and the State of Alaska,
25 Department of Fish and Game regarding this action in
26 relation to the requirements under the Pacific Salmon
27 Treaty. The Board received Federal legal counsel that
28 the Pacific Salmon Treaty outweighs ANILCA when these two
29 do come in conflict. On July 10th of this summer, 2002,
30 the Board rescinded the coho regulations as they pertain
31 to the Stikine and Taku effective through February of
32 2003 to allow coordination with the Transboundary Panel
33 to establish the subsistence fishery through that process
34 under the Pacific Salmon Treating process. And I won't
35 go into details about the Pacific Salmon Commission.

36
37 But essentially where we're out, the
38 Federal Subsistence Board, program is going to continue
39 to move forward with the implementation of the
40 development of subsistence fisheries on these rivers, but
41 also at the same time respects the bi-lateral protocols
42 that have been established under the Pacific Salmon
43 Treaty. Even though there's a commitment to a
44 collaborative approach to fishery implementations, in
45 other words, developing these subsistence fisheries,
46 there's still continuing questions that were raised by
47 the Council and others as to whether this issue may
48 legitimately be interpreted as a domestic matter, in
49 other words, within the State, or for resolution amongst
50 U.S. interests, or does it still need to go through the

00209

1 Pacific Salmon Commission and the treaty process.
2 Further inquiry will be made to the State Department or
3 to the National Marine Fisheries, we're still trying to
4 sort that one out, to resolve the question of ANILCA and
5 the Pacific Salmon Treaty authorities. However, we still
6 need to move forward, and we understand the frustrations
7 of the Council and the public on getting these fisheries
8 established, and so staff with the Office of Subsistence
9 Management and the Forest Service are continuing to work
10 through the bilateral Transboundary Panel to establish
11 these fisheries, consistent with the annexes that are
12 identified in the treaty process that abundance-based
13 management plans have to be developed for these
14 transboundary rivers, and they've given themselves until
15 May 2004 to develop these management plans. The Alaska
16 section of the Transborder Panel intends to hold a
17 planning meeting this December of 2002. Federal
18 substance staff and a member of your Southeast panel will
19 attend this meeting. In the past it was Mr. Stokes.
20 Whoever the Council elects to attend this meeting is up
21 to you. And we'll attend this planning session. The
22 goal is to have these fisheries established no later than
23 May of 2004. I want to stress that that's not a
24 guarantee. It's a Federal process, State process, but
25 that is the goal, and we're working towards that end, to
26 establish these subsistence fisheries.

27

28 Madame Chair, that is a brief summary of
29 where the Federal Board is with this issue since their
30 decision of July of 2002.

31

32 MS. GARZA: Okay. Are you ready? I was
33 and continue to be very disappointed with this whole
34 process. I feel that we have been misled by the State
35 of Alaska. I can pull out the Pacific Salmon Treaty and
36 point to paragraphs, point to -- I have read the previous
37 letters by ADF&G, and they were absolutely misleading.
38

39 The first question is, does this process
40 need to go through the Transboundary Panel of the Pacific
41 Salmon Commission. If you look at article 11, page 10 of
42 the Pacific Salmon Treaty, it states clearly that it does
43 not affect aboriginal rights or existing federal laws.
44 That's ANILCA. That's subsistence. We can simply get a
45 legal opinion from the Federal Government that states we
46 fall through that exemption, and we do not have to go
47 through Pacific Salmon Commission. I have stated earlier
48 that I know people on the Commission. When this whole
49 process was first brought to them, they said it's an
50 allocation issue, we don't even know why it's before us.

00210

1 Simply stated.

2

3 A letter written by ADF&G earlier talked
4 about the Pacific Salmon Treaty, said that it cannot
5 establish new fisheries it stated for coho, chinook or
6 sockeye. If you read the Pacific Salmon Treaty, Annex 4,
7 Chapter 3.2 on page 17 of the Pacific Salmon Treaty, it
8 states clearly that that is only for chinook. It does
9 not include coho or sockeye. The Federal Subsistence
10 Board two years ago could have voted for coho and
11 sockeye. It would already be in place. The Pacific
12 Salmon Treating and the Commission would have nothing to
13 do with that process. It would simply be an allocation
14 issue, which apparently, in my opinion, the ADF&G does
15 not want to address.

16

17 In terms of conservation, I did go to the
18 last Pacific Salmon Commission meeting on my own time. I
19 did meet with Talkan people and people on the
20 Transboundary from the other side. They made it clear to
21 me that they were told by the Transboundary Alaska Panel
22 that this was an absolute conservation concern. This is
23 despite the fact that there are commercial fisheries for
24 sockeye, for coho, and for kings. If there were a
25 conservation concern, there should not be any fisheries
26 for any of those species on Stikine River fish. That is
27 again nothing but an allocation issue that says there's
28 not enough so it's only going to commercial. But the
29 Transboundary panel was led to believe if there was a
30 subsistence fishery, that anybody could go there and take
31 as much as they want. They made that clear to me that
32 that is what they were told. I had to explain to them
33 that that is not the case, that through this process it
34 would be for customary and traditional use, that C&T
35 would likely be Wrangell, possibly Petersburg people,
36 only. That's it. Small numbers. And if there were
37 conservation issues, it could be dealt with through Tier
38 I, through Tier II, through looking at who has a right to
39 fish with that area.

40

41 In terms of the Pacific Salmon Commission
42 process, it is one of the most -- I don't know if you've
43 been to their meetings, it is one of the most secretive
44 processes that I have ever known about. The Pacific
45 Salmon Commission can meet for five days, and they have
46 exactly 45 minutes that's open to the public. When they
47 have Transboundary Panel meeting, people can be kicked
48 out of those meetings. You're invited not to be at those
49 meetings, and people don't see what's going on. And so
50 you don't have the opportunity to talk to the Talkan

00211

1 people or the Canadian side people and say, that's not
2 true. You have to pull them aside after the fact. And
3 so the concerns that I came off with was I think that we
4 need to as a Council say this is who we want on the
5 Transboundary Panel so we now have somebody that's inside
6 that room that can represent our interests. Well, I have
7 a list of who's on that panel There is no one there
8 who's pro-subsistence. It is from my understanding the
9 only panel of the whole Pacific Salmon Treaty process
10 that does not have a Federal appointee. So it's
11 primarily commercial fishermen. On other panels there's
12 someone from NMFS, but they're not dealing with it,
13 because they don't care about the transboundary. That's
14 Alaska/Canada in-river, it's not their marine waters.
15 And I would suggest that this council recommend that
16 somebody like Cal Casipit or somebody on OSM serve on
17 that panel, because there is a requirement for a Federal
18 position. There is no federal person on that panel. I
19 appreciate the fact that OSM is continuing through this
20 process. I think that it could have been finished much
21 earlier if we had been more aggressive. I think that the
22 harvest that will occur from that fishery will be very
23 small, and it is a customary and traditional practice.
24 It is not a new fishery, which is another argument that
25 has been thrown out. The people of Wrangell have a long-
26 time historical use of that fishery. They have a treaty
27 which we haven't found yet, but we know exists between
28 the Talkan and the Wrangell people that says they traded
29 and bartered. That was part of their process. The
30 Pacific Salmon Commission is moot when it comes to
31 established fisheries like that.

32

33 So I think (1) we need to recommend that
34 someone serve on that panel. I know in talking to
35 Tlingit and Haida that they were forwarding the name of
36 Caroline, who's Byron Mallot's wife's sister. I can't
37 remember her last name.

38

39 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Powell.

40

41 MS. GARZA: Caroline Powell. And
42 secondly is John Feller from Wrangell. I think we should
43 support those names. I think that we should support
44 somebody from OSM or Forest Service to sit on the
45 Transboundary Panel, because there is a spot that is
46 unfilled for a federal seat. I think that we should have
47 communications between them. I think we should be able
48 to sit down with the Talkan people and explain and ease
49 their concerns about conservation, because it is not a
50 conservation issue. it's merely an allocation issue.

00212

1 And it has been misrepresented to those people time and
2 time again. It is an issue I'm thankful that you are on,
3 because I will not stop until it's resolved. I will not
4 stop until it's resolved. If I have to file a lawsuit
5 against and go after FOYA (ph) through National Marine
6 Fisheries Service to find out what's going on in the
7 Transboundary Panel meetings, I will. It's been a
8 horrible, horrible process. John and then Butch.
9

10 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, I've do a
11 motion to do just that, but I think that you could
12 clarify exactly how many of those things you wanted
13 included in that motion? You mentioned Cal as well as
14 the other names, Tlingit and Haida, and perhaps you could
15 refresh me with what those names were that you intended?
16

17 MS. GARZA: Okay. For the Transboundary
18 panel, it's my understanding that Tlingit and Haida was
19 forwarding two names. That's Caroline Powell from
20 Yakutat, since Yakutat has transboundary rivers,
21 alternate John Feller from Wrangell. That Cal Casipit as
22 the Southeast fisheries/Forest Service person be the
23 federal person, an alternate would be someone from OSM.
24 In terms of the December 2 meeting, we need to make sure
25 that we have somebody there. If Dick is that person, I
26 would also like to be involved. I would gladly get there
27 on my own dime, but I think I would -- if the Council
28 would allow me, I would like to continue with this
29 process.
30

31 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

32

33 MS. GARZA: Uh-huh.

34

35 MR. LITTLEFIELD: If I could try. Madame
36 Chair, I would like to move that we support the Tlingit
37 and Haida nominees to the Transboundary Panel, Caroline
38 Powell and John, what did you say, Feller?

39

40 MS. GARZA: Yes.

41

42 MR. LITTLEFIELD: And also support the
43 OSM's local biologist, Cal Casipit, or other officer as
44 designated by the Office of Substance Management. And
45 also that SEARAC have a representative at the December
46 meeting. Two people. Two representatives.

47

48 MS. GARZA: Is there a second?

49

50 MR. STOKES: Second.

00213

1 MS. GARZA: Okay. Under discussion,
2 Butch?

3
4 MR. LAITI: I think we're getting ahead
5 here a little bit.

6
7 MS. GARZA: Excuse me?

8
9 MR. LAITI: I think we're getting a
10 little ahead here. I'd like to make a couple comments
11 first.

12
13 MS. GARZA: Go ahead.

14
15 MR. LAITI: I agree with everything Dolly
16 said, and I'd like everybody in here to read Monday's
17 newspaper of the Douglas Indian Association members. In
18 the paper they state their customary and traditional use
19 on the Taku for the last, oh, starting in the early
20 century where they had villages on the Taku. I'd like
21 the Taku to be included. But if everybody reads the
22 Monday newspaper, they'll find out that the Douglas
23 people have customary and traditional use on the Taku.
24 And the Taku River for the last couple years has been
25 showing record returns on king salmon, sockeye and cohos.
26 And for a different question, the Federal Government
27 still has not defined the headwaters of the Taku.

28
29 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought we could
30 only talk about the Stikine and the Alsek.

31
32 MS. GARZA: Is the Taku in the
33 transboundary?

34
35 MR. PROBASCO: Yes, ma'am.

36
37 MR. LAITI: Yes, it is. The
38 transboundary.....

39
40 MR. PROBASCO: (Indiscernible) rivers.

41
42 MS. GARZA: Okay. So we can add it.

43
44 MR. LAITI: And I think.....

45
46 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's all
47 transboundary rivers. The Taku, the Alsek, the Stikine,
48 all of them are transboundary rivers.

49
50 MR. LAITI: I think before we go

00214

1 supporting certain individuals, I think we should get a
2 few more names to go to this meeting.

3

4 MS. WILSON: Do we want another name

5

6 MS. GARZA: So, Butch, do you have any
7 names that you would.....

8

9 MR. LAITI: The person in the newspaper,
10 I don't know if he'd be willing, but it would be John
11 Morris.

12

13 MS. GARZA: John who?

14

15 MR. LAITI: Morris.

16

17 MR. LITTLEFIELD: He's from Douglas?

18

19 MR. LAITI: Yes, he's from Douglas.

20

21 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Are you offering that
22 as an amendment?

23

24 MR. LAITI: I'd have to talk to him first
25 and ask him, because his wife's kind of sick. There's
26 not very many of our elders left.

27

28 MR. MARTIN: Madame Chair, can somebody
29 from the Council, Dick Stokes, serve on that Panel?

30

31 MS. GARZA: Yeah. Yeah. We were
32 thinking maybe Dick instead of Feller.

33

34 MR. MARTIN: That's what I was thinking.
35 I'd like to offer Dick Stokes instead of John Feller.

36

37 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Do we need to identify
38 that? I said just a member. All I did is say a member,
39 we could pick that.

40

41 MS. GARZA: No, for the Transboundary
42 Panel.

43

44 MR. LITTLEFIELD: For the Transboundary
45 Panel? Do you want to do that in this motion? Or an
46 amendment to this?

47

48 MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

49

50 MS. GARZA: That's Harold's preference.

00215

1 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I agree with you 100
2 percent, but I don't know if it needs to be -- we could
3 do it separate.

4

5 MS. GARZA: Make it one step?

6

7 MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh.

8

9 MS. GARZA: Can the seconder agree to a
10 friendly amendment of changing John Feller's name to Dick
11 Stokes? Marilyn?

12

13 MS. WILSON: To change John Feller?

14

15 MS. GARZA: To Dick Stokes.

16

17 MR. MARTIN: Dick Stokes.

18

19 MS. GARZA: We can let T&H know that.

20

21 MR. MARTIN: Pardon me?

22

23 MS. GARZA: We can let Tlingit and Haida
24 know that.

25

26 MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh.

27

28 MS. GARZA: And then for the meeting we
29 can add John Morris. You can talk to him and let us
30 know.

31

32 MR. LAITI: Sure. Yeah.

33

34 MS. GARZA: That's an option.

35

36 MR. LAITI: Because he has traditional
37 knowledge of the river.

38

39 MS. GARZA: Okay.

40

41 MR. LAITI: Okay.

42

43 MS. GARZA: Good. Pete.

44

45 MR. PROBASCO: Madame Chair, you may want
46 to ask the State to come up and make some comments, since
47 we've been dialoging with the State since July, and
48 they've made some commitments as well also.

49

50 MS. GARZA: Okay.

00216

1 MR. PROBASCO: Madame Chair. Ms. See.

2

3 MS. SEE: Madame Chair, members of the
4 Council, for the record, my name is Marianne See with the
5 Department of Fish and Game. And although I am very new
6 to this issue, we are concerned at the Department that we
7 provide answers to the questions that you've asked. And
8 a number of those issues have been discussed with Office
9 of Subsistence Management in the attempt to provide
10 background information on this. But if that is not
11 satisfactory, then we pledge to address your concerns
12 more specifically. I am aware that there has been some
13 correspondence. Again, I'm fairly new to this topic, but
14 if there are ways that that has not been satisfactory,
15 then we would want to work with you to find out where
16 specific background questions or other issues may need
17 further clarification from the State's perspective and
18 involvement in the past. But I do have to point out that
19 I'm not an expert on this at all, but I will pledge to
20 make sure that you get the answers that you need.

21

22 MS. GARZA: Okay. So in terms of that
23 process, I think if you compare the earlier letters that
24 were written by the Chair of the Transboundary Panel, and
25 I'm trying to be polite and not using names, and you
26 compare that to the actual Pacific Salmon treaty, those
27 letters are riddled with inaccuracies. And I couldn't
28 find my letter that I had Bill present to the Federal
29 Subsistence Board at the May meeting where they rescinded
30 the whole thing anyway, but I would be glad to forward
31 that to you, because I have gone over the Pacific Salmon
32 Treaty, and I have compared what was stated versus what
33 is actually in the treaty, and I think those inaccuracies
34 clearly led people to believe what is not true, and led
35 to believe that we were trying to do something that may
36 be detrimental to conservation, which is also not true.

37

38 MS. SEE: Madame Chair, we will look at
39 that letter and address your questions.

40

41 MS. GARZA: John.

42

43 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you for comments.
44 I'm going to support this motion. I think it's important
45 that we go ahead and support this motion and send it
46 forward, because that somehow seems to get the State to
47 act. This is not a new fishery. Subsistence fisheries
48 are not new. They predate contact with Europeans. The
49 Pacific Salmon Treaty does not talk about coho. And I
50 think fully the intent and discussion at Yakutat on

00217

1 Proposal 35 was to include all of the rivers in Southeast
2 Alaska. And I still stand behind that and believe that,
3 that all of the rivers where we have a customary and
4 traditional use, that we need to be allowed to access
5 those, and therefore I'm going to support this. We need
6 to have a voice in this matter. This will ensure that
7 our point of view is heard, and hopefully provide the
8 Commissioner with some impetus to look at some different
9 thoughts, so I'm going to support it.

10

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.

12

13 MS. GARZA: The question has been called.

14 All in favor signify by saying aye.

15

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 MS. GARZA: Opposed?

19

20 (No opposing votes.)

21

22 MS. GARZA: Thank you. Thank you very
23 much.

24

25 MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chairman, a
26 question. Perhaps someone can make sure that I have the
27 correct wording of this motion?

28

29 MS. GARZA: Okay.

30

31 MR. SCHROEDER: Or we could do that right
32 now on the record.

33

34 MS. GARZA: Two minute break to check
35 with Schroeder to make sure he has the right wording for
36 what you said. Before that, Pete, did you have another
37 comment?

38

39 MR. PROBASCO: You clarified my question
40 in the motion.

41

42 MS. GARZA: Okay. Five minute recess.

43

44 (Off record)

45

46 (On record)

47

48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. We had a motion
49 to do on 13? Agenda item 13.

50

00218

1 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman?

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Uh-huh.

4

5 MS. GARZA: I think we wanted a
6 clarification on the motion on the Stikine River.

7

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is the clarification
9 ready?

10

11 MS. GARZA: The clarification on the
12 motion on Stikine.

13

14 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, I wanted to
15 clarify that when we selected Cal Casipit or another
16 member from OSM that our intent was that that be a
17 biologist, a Forest Service biologist from Southeast. In
18 other words, the intent was not just to select a
19 secretary from OSM in Anchorage. It was someone who had
20 a hands' on and knew what was happening in Southeast, and
21 I want to make sure that that's clear on the record.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is that clear on the
24 record?

25

26 MR. CASIPIT: It's clear.

27

28 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Clear enough?

29

30 MR. PROBASCO: The intent is to have
31 either Cal Casipit, who's the Southeast District
32 biologist or Larry Buklis who's with OSM staff who's got
33 a lot of experience with transboundary rivers also.

34

35 MR. CASIPIT: I think it's both of those,
36 Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah, okay.

39

40 MR. MARTIN: Yeah, I'd like to add that I
41 think it is very important that we make sure that Cal get
42 seated. I understand he was kicked out of the last
43 meeting.

44

45 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He was kicked out of
46 the last meeting?

47

48 MR. MARTIN: That's what I understand.
49 He's not allowed to attend.

50

00219

1 MR. CASIPIT: I think Mr. Martin is
2 referring to the last Transboundary Panel meeting that I
3 went to where I was alternately invited and excluded from
4 various discussions at the Panel level, and I think maybe
5 that's what Mr. Martin was referring.

6
7 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman?

8
9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

10
11 MS. GARZA: In my discussions with the
12 Canadian Transboundary First Nations people, they were
13 absolutely confused with that process. They had no idea
14 why he was coming and going. And I thought that was very
15 disruptive to the meeting. They had questions of him
16 that they didn't think that -- that they felt that he was
17 not allowed to answer. So from the Canadian side, it was
18 an absolutely disruptive process.

19
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. I wasn't here
21 for the discussion, but all three rivers that are
22 identified are in this region, and so it only makes sense
23 that the biologist from this region be more visible and
24 more active on that process.

25
26 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman?

27
28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

29
30 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Another clarification
31 or a requirement was that one of the members of SEARAC,
32 and we did not designate a member of SEARAC, and I would
33 like to -- I don't know how you would like to handle it,
34 but I would nominate Ms. Garza for that position.

35
36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Say that again?

37
38 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Part of the motion was
39 that one of the members of SEARAC be an official
40 representative at the meeting, and Dick Stokes was
41 nominated as the Tlingit and Haida representative, and
42 the SEARAC representative has yet to be identified, and I
43 would like to nominate for that position Ms. Garza.

44
45 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly?

46
47 MS. GARZA: I think you're confusing two
48 different things. I didn't understand it. Tlingit and
49 Haida has put two names forward for the Transboundary
50 Panel to seat on the Panel, and that was Caroline Powell,

00220

1 John Feller. Through our motion, we supported Carolyn
2 Powell and Richard Stokes.

3

4 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Correct.

5

6 MS. GARZA: When those names go forward,
7 I don't know. I don't know when the consideration
8 process is, and so just through that process Mr. Stokes
9 is not guaranteed even an invitation into the next
10 Transboundary Panel. So for purposes of the December '02
11 meeting, my preference is that it be clear that there
12 will be two SEARAC people invited to that meeting, and
13 that was the original motion.

14

15 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I would therefore
16 nominate Dick Stokes and Ms. Garza.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is there a second to
19 the motion?

20

21 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Moved and seconded.
24 Discussion?

25

26 MS. WILSON: Who seconded it?

27

28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike.

29

30 MS. WILSON: Mike.

31

32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Why?

33

34 MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible)

35

36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Further discussion?

37

38 MR. MARTIN: Question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Come on, you guys know
41 the drill.

42

43 MS. GARZA: Question.

44

45 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
46 asked for. All those in favor say aye.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All opposed?

00221

1 (No opposing votes.)

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carries. So
4 we've got two nominees from, or two people from this body
5 designated for that. Was there anything else on 13?

6 Before we move, we have a Chu-ka-nati (ph), owner of
7 Glacier Bay, who wants to share some of her wisdom with
8 us. Agu (ph), Wanda. Customary trade.

9

10 MS. CULP: Kunacheesh. Can you hear me?
11 This is to the Federal Subsistence Board through the
12 Southeast Regional Advisory Council meeting in Hoonah
13 Alaska. I am Wanda Culp, Chuk-ken-sha (ph). My Tlingit
14 name is Kashuduhah (ph).

15

16 I'm here before you again to address
17 customary trade and more. There is also much concern
18 about the 70/30 percent dilution of the Regional Advisory
19 Councils and other attempts to intrude on not only our
20 traditional and customary usage, but also intrusion into
21 our sacred and other ceremonial co-EEK (ph), known at
22 potlatches. It is time to look at the big picture as it
23 pertains to Alaska natives and our real life relations
24 with the Federal Agencies that make up the Federal
25 Subsistence Board.

26

27 Regarding customary trade issue. For the
28 record, I support the Southeast Alaska Advisory Council's
29 liberal position. There are no significant commercial
30 enterprise elements to customary and traditional use.
31 Monetary value is not our value. It is the white man's.
32 The Federal Government's initiation of this action,
33 specifically the Fish and Wildlife Service's Office of
34 Subsistence Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service
35 law enforcement is an insult not intended to protect our
36 usage. All of this started because a white man was
37 selling native smoked Yukon salmon to Cabela's Sports
38 Outfitters at a time when the Yukon River was closed to
39 both subsistence and sport fishers. Fish and Wildlife
40 investigators found that it was not native smoked or
41 subsistence caught. Now Fish and Wildlife enforcement
42 feels that the term significant commercial enterprise
43 hampers them to prevent abuses. Hog wash. This incident
44 is not real in the non native world. It just happened to
45 occur in a white man catalog. This is a non native
46 problem, and to shove it off on customary and traditional
47 users is wrong, wrong, wrong.

48

49 Alaska natives and Alaska native cultures
50 are being targeted. We are forced to play on an uneven

00222

1 field while Federal and State governments continuously
2 misinterpret our cultural way of life within the
3 conservation economy way we exist.

4

5 The current customary trade law that is
6 in place is within the intent of ANILCA Title VIII
7 protections. Leave it alone. All this effort does is to
8 create problems where there are none.

9

10 Regarding Resolution FP 0327, entitled
11 Allow the Harvest of Fish Outside Open Seasons for Food
12 and Traditional Ceremonies submitted by the Fish and
13 Wildlife Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage,
14 again Fish and Wildlife Service is attempting to intrude
15 on traditional ceremonies without even understanding what
16 they are all about. Both the Federal and State
17 governments can learn much from traditional fisheries
18 conservation uses and methods, methods that are perfected
19 throughout generations of time, knowledge, observations
20 and skill. Alaska natives use less than one percent of
21 the natural resources, and the Federal Government wants
22 to create a bureaucracy for our food gathering for sacred
23 and other ceremonial co-eeek (ph). How real is this? How
24 foolish is this? My words to the Fish and Wildlife
25 Service and the Federal Subsistence Board is stay out of
26 our business, stay out of our ceremonies. You do not
27 understand them, nor is it your business to intrude.
28 Leave us alone.

29

30 Regarding the Secretary of Interior's
31 illegal attempt to weaken the Regional Advisory Councils
32 to the Federal Subsistence Board, this effort stinks to
33 the high heavens with more hog pooh. The Regional
34 Advisory Councils were created under ANILCA Title VIII, a
35 Federal law. This action negatively effects the
36 subsistence priority within that law. The Southeast
37 Regional Advisory Council members are well versed on
38 their role, because they are committed to their purpose
39 under the law. To bring in other interests will not
40 change that fact that customary and traditional users
41 have existed since time immemorial, and must be involved
42 and recognized. To bring opposing interests like sports
43 and recreational users into the Regional Advisory
44 Councils will not change that fact. And for all those
45 who want to change the facts, I say, get over it, and get
46 on with the program at hand. The current system works.
47 It is not broken. Leave it alone.

48

49 With just the above three heavy-duty
50 issues, it is easy to feel afraid an Alaskan native

00223

1 customary and traditional user of the natural resources
2 that surround us. This is the same feeling of dread that
3 we have whenever the bigoted Alaska State Legislature
4 meets. What are they going to do to us next we ask each
5 other and ourselves.

6
7 I cannot help but scrutinize the make up
8 of the Federal Subsistence Board, five Federal agencies
9 that have done much harm previously to the unique Alaska
10 native peoples and Alaska native cultures. The National
11 Park Service promised the Hoonah Tlingit that we would
12 always be welcome in our sacred homeland. Yet after
13 years of in-house manipulations we have formally been
14 banned by Federal regulation out of Glacier Bay in 1991.
15 ANILCA Title VIII is of no use to us in Glacier Bay. The
16 1955 established white community of Gustavus enjoys
17 personal use subsistence in Glacier Bay while we are
18 banned.

19
20 The Bureau of Land Management who is
21 responsible for patenting our so-called native allotments
22 when all they did was eliminate most applicants for
23 bureaucratic reasons and kept qualified applicants
24 pending for generations. Meanwhile, every other interest
25 in the world is recognized and authorized in our
26 traditional lands and waters.

27
28 The Fish and Wildlife Service has
29 jurisdiction over the Marine Mammal Protection Act that
30 has a moratorium on the taking of marine mammals except,
31 of course, to Alaska natives who use them for subsistence
32 purposes. That Agency is no good to the Hoonah Tlingit
33 in Glacier Bay. Does the Marine Mammal Protection Act
34 say except for Glacier Bay? No, it does not. In
35 reality, the Fish and Wildlife Service is just another
36 law enforcement agency against native Alaskans.

37
38 The Forest Service is situated right in
39 our midst here in Hoonah, yet we do not know them,
40 because they do not come amongst us. The Hoonah Tlingit
41 brought an administrative suit against them because of
42 their neglect to the subsistence protections under
43 Federal law. This did little if any good. Where is the
44 Forest Services Office of Subsistence Management? We are
45 being overrun with hunting and fishing outfitters under
46 the sports laws that intrude totally in our traditional
47 usage area that is so important to us.

48
49 The Bureau of Indian Affairs used to be
50 called the Department of War. That mentality still

00224

1 exists as the inter-office division heads are primarily
2 retired military officers who maintain a bad attitude
3 about Indians. Their record speaks loudly for
4 themselves.

5
6 Each Federal Government branch has bad
7 habits towards Alaska natives from their onset into
8 Alaska. Those bad habits seem hard to break, and that is
9 reflected in the actions that absolutely assault Alaska
10 native peoples and their cultures. There is no real
11 protection occurring, not when we have to be on constant
12 alert and on the defensive mode while seeking the proper
13 predictions to our cultural existence. Our lifestyle is
14 literally under attack and misinterpretation. We are the
15 most regulated and the first to be arrested and standing
16 in court with no due process under your laws.

17
18 The State of Alaska is not in compliance
19 with ANILCA Title VIII and there is no hope for such on
20 the horizon, yet the Federal Subsistence Board insists
21 that the State play a huge role in customary and
22 traditional subsistence lawmaking that makes cultural
23 existence protections a bigger farce yet. The State of
24 Alaska sees only sports and recreational ways of hunting
25 and fishing. That is the limit to their mentality. They
26 don't have to be anyway else with the Federal Government
27 buying into their mentality. The State proves time and
28 again that their data is inadequate and sketchy, yet
29 their data is gospel to the Federal Subsistence Board.
30 The time is coming where we will not play this
31 destructive game, and we will turn our backs to this
32 storm and simply go about our business as Alaska native
33 peoples doing what we have done for literally thousands
34 of years through enormous environmental changes while we
35 protect the resources we hold so near and dear to us. We
36 have lived well and successfully in the world of the
37 conservation economy while passing on the incredible
38 knowledge to our children and grandchildren, just as our
39 parents and grandparents have done for us.

40
41 This is my testimony. Sincerely,
42 Kashuduhah (ph), Tlingit of Glacier Bay. Thank you for
43 hearing me out. I hope it wasn't too long. I will
44 submit this to Bob for the record.

45
46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. He's got a
47 bucket up there he puts his correspondence in. Thank
48 you, Wanda. Anybody else on customary trade? Pete, did
49 you have anything else?

50

00225

1 MR. PROBASCO: No, Mr. Chair, and thank
2 you.

3
4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Pete.
5 Dolly, do you have something?

6
7 MS. GARZA: More information, do you or
8 Cal know when those December meetings are?

9
10 MR. PROBASCO: Do I know where they're
11 at?

12
13 MS. GARZA: When.

14
15 MR. PROBASCO: The date? No, I don't.
16 Cal, did you get the date?

17
18 MR. CASIPIT: No.

19
20 MS. GARZA: Okay. Could you let me know
21 as soon as you know?

22
23 MR. PROBASCO: We will.

24
25 MS. GARZA: Okay.

26
27 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, sir.

28
29 MR. PROBASCO: Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Marianne?

32
33 MS. SEE: Yes, regarding the date, I've
34 been told it's that very first week of December, and
35 they're just now setting the dates, and people will be
36 notified soon.

37
38 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: So on the date.

39
40 MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible)

41
42 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Caffeined out? It's
43 not soon enough.

44
45 MS. GARZA: My coffee's running out.

46
47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: If she wants to be
48 heard, she'll let you hear. Okay. We're going backwards
49 on our agenda, but we're going to get back on track a
50 little closer than we were. We're accommodating these

00226

1 maneuvering of the agenda items to allow for people that
2 have to be other places, and in a very short time, so
3 their time here is limited. That being the case, I'd
4 like to call Doug McBride to talk to us about the FIS
5 projects, review and recommendations. Tell us who you
6 are, where you're from.

7

8 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of
9 the Council. My name is Doug McBride, I'm with the
10 Office of Subsistence Management in the Fisheries
11 Information Services Section, and I'm here to talk to you
12 about the fisheries resource monitoring. With me at the
13 table, I'm sure most of you -- I'm sure all of you know,
14 is Polly Wheeler. Polly is our anthropologist and social
15 scientist that started out, what five months ago? Six
16 months ago?

17

18 MS. WHEELER: Yes.

19

20 MR. McBRIDE: Certainly since the last
21 council meeting, so you won't have McBride just to kick
22 around any more. You get that. Okay.

23

24 Good morning, and, Mr. Chairman, thank
25 you very much for accommodating us. As I'm sure you're
26 aware, the South Central Regional Council meeting got
27 started today in Cordova, and we have to give a similar
28 presentation to them tomorrow, so that's our scheduling
29 conflict.

30

31 There's two things that we'd like to talk
32 with you about today, and both are contained under
33 section E in your council book. In addition to that --
34 or I guess hopefully to simplify it, in front of you are
35 two different handouts, and what I'll be doing is
36 speaking to these handouts that you could follow along
37 under section E if you wanted to. As I say, this is just
38 a more abbreviated version. And as I said, there are two
39 things that we're going to talk about today.

40

41 The first thing is in this blue handout,
42 which also is the very first thing under tab E, and it is
43 the 2003 Fisheries Resources Monitoring Plan. So this is
44 the plan for projects that we're bringing a
45 recommendation forward for your consideration, for your
46 review and for your Council on this. And that's the
47 first thing we'll be talking about. So I'll be walking
48 through this blue handout. If you turn to the first --
49 or, excuse me, the second page of that handout, the
50 purpose of what we want to do again is just to review and

00227

1 discuss the draft 2003 Fisheries Resource Monitoring
2 Plan, and as I say, it's all contained under tab E.
3 We're going to be talking about funding recommendations
4 that we're making for 2003, and at the end of this
5 discussion, we very much would like your review and
6 comment from the Council on these funding
7 recommendations. If you turn the page, just real briefly
8 that I'd like to go through in this presentation, I'm
9 going to -- since most of you've heard this and I think
10 are very familiar with this, I'm going to make this part
11 very, very abbreviated, but I'm just going to very
12 quickly give you a background for the Fisheries Resource
13 Monitoring Plan, very quickly go through the study
14 selection process. Then we'll get into the actual
15 recommendations, the draft plan that we're presenting to
16 you, and then move into the questions, discussions and
17 Council recommendations.

18

19 So if you turn the page, you'll see this
20 draft, and this is only background that I want to go
21 through. This is also page 126 under tab E. In fact in
22 a lot of cases you might be better off looking at what's
23 in the book, because this didn't xerox very well. But
24 what this is, this is just a graph of the finances of the
25 Fisheries Resource Monitoring program, and this is on a
26 statewide basis. It's not specifically Southeast, but
27 the money available for Southeast would follow this exact
28 pattern. There would be really nothing different about
29 it. And really all I want to say about this is if you
30 look at this graph, you'll see along the bottom are the
31 years starting with 2000 and going out to 2004, so that's
32 the start of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program in
33 the year 2000, and that's been going on each year. And
34 then the size of the bar, if you will, is how much money
35 is available in total for the Fisheries Resource
36 Monitoring Program, so you can see, looking at page 126,
37 it started in 2000. That's what those black bars are.
38 And that was the first installment of the program, and
39 how that played out over three years, so here we are in
40 2002, and looking at the final year of what was started
41 in 2000.

42

43 Then actually the first time I met you
44 and spoke with you was at that big meeting in Anchorage.
45 That's when we started the 2001 program. That is the
46 full amount of money that was available, what was it,
47 \$7.15 million. That started in 2001. That's that great
48 big, essentially the biggest part of the bar, that
49 started in 2001. We're just completing the second year,
50 or we just completed the second year of that installment.

00228

1 As we move into 2003, we'll finish the third and final
2 year of that commitment.

3

4 Then last fall we talked about the year
5 2000 program, so if you go to the 2000 bar, and go to the
6 third section of the bar, you'll see that kind of
7 smaller, kind of lighter shaded area second from the top.
8 That's what we did last fall, and then the Board
9 deliberated on that in December, and that program was
10 just started this past year. That very top little piece
11 of the 2000 bar, that's the fisheries, that's the
12 partners for fishery monitoring program. That comes out
13 of this program. That really doesn't relate to Southeast
14 in that that money is completely coming out of the
15 Department of Interior side per Council recommendation.
16 That part of the program, it is not going on down here in
17 Southeast, but when you do the statewide accounting, that
18 affects the total amount of money, but it's completely
19 under the Department of Interior side, so it really
20 doesn't impact anything down here.

21

22 And so really what I want you to focus on
23 is if you go over to the 2003, you'll see the very top
24 part of that bar, and there's a number in there. It's
25 1,287 (sic), that means \$1,827,000. That's how much
26 money is available for new work in 2003 statewide. So
27 that's the total amount of money that is available for
28 projects statewide in 2003. So from our perspective,
29 that is sort of the starting point. That's the target
30 amount of money available. And you need to remember on
31 that, that that includes both brand new projects, in
32 other words, a project that had never been done before,
33 but for the very first time, it also has to address if
34 you have a project that had been started previously, and
35 if there's good reason to continue it, but the funding
36 commitment has expired, then it would be to cover those
37 programs, too. So in this class of proposals that was
38 the new twist if you will from any of the previous calls,
39 was we had to address both of those types of projects.

40

41 So if you flip the page, going back to
42 the blue handout, we'll go back to the agenda. Like I
43 say, I think that's all that I need to talk about in
44 terms of the background for the Fisheries Resource
45 Monitoring Plan. What I'd like to do now is just really
46 briefly talk about the study selection process. And
47 again if you flip the page, I don't think we need to
48 spend a lot of time on this, but clearly our job on the
49 part of the FIS staff is we provide the oversight for
50 this program. The recommendations that we're going to

00229

1 present to you for funding are made by the Interagency
2 Technical Review Committee. We just call them the TRC.
3

4 And their evaluation of any proposals are
5 based on four criteria: strategic priorities, and the
6 strategic priorities really come from the degree to which
7 proposals your issues and information needs. That's how
8 they are graded if you will. Then technical and
9 scientific merit. We want programs that are technically
10 competent. We also look at the past performance of
11 investigators. And then we also look at the degree to
12 which the proposal speaks to partnership and capacity
13 both. So those are four criteria that the Technical
14 Review Committee and the FIS staff look at when we're
15 reviewing and evaluating proposals.

16

17 MS. GARZA: For the record, are those
18 listed in descending order or of equal value?

19

20 MR. McBRIDE: They're not in any
21 particular order, Dolly. It's kind of a combination of
22 things. I guess I would say that probably that strategic
23 priority one is probably the very first thing that's
24 looked at. I mean, if we get a proposal that, you know,
25 isn't even -- isn't on the map for, you know, what's
26 considered a relevant issue, you know, even though it may
27 be technically competent and have great capacity and on
28 and on and on, it's kind of hard to get over that first
29 bar. But there is no -- they're not necessarily
30 represented in order of priority.

31

32 Okay. Just going back to the agenda now,
33 we'll actually get into the draft 2003 Fisheries Resource
34 Monitoring Plan as recommended by the TIC. If you flip
35 the page, it's titled 2003 Fisheries Resource Monitoring
36 Plan for the Southeast Region. Again, this is based on
37 your issues and information needs. In fact, we updated
38 those last March when we met in Juneau. And just to
39 review for you your priorities are in order, traditional
40 ecological knowledge and harvest monitoring, sockeye and
41 coho assessment, and regulation review. So when we
42 looked at strategic priorities, we're trying to evaluate
43 those against those issues and information needs. For
44 2003 when you go through all the math and look at what's
45 available for Southeast, the target dollar amount that
46 we're looking at for Southeast for 2003 was \$286,000. So
47 out of that \$1.3 million, that was the amount that we
48 were looking at for Southeast. And our starting point
49 for recommendation to you is based on a two-thirds/one-
50 third split between stock size and trends projects and

00230

1 harvest monitoring/TEK. That's out starting point for
2 getting you a recommendation.

3 So now if you flip the page you'll see a
4 table that looks like this. This is the identical table
5 to what's on page 134 in the Council book, and this is
6 what was available for project proposals, and what is
7 recommended under the stock status and trends category,
8 so this get at assessment of stocks, and it really keys
9 in on sockeye stock assessment. There were four projects
10 originally on the table that had, you know, completed
11 investigation plans, and you can see them there. I won't
12 read them. One of them, the top one, was a project that
13 was started 00, the Falls Lake sockeye assessment, and
14 that was withdrawn. That's why it says withdrawn over
15 there, and there's no dollar amount. But it was only
16 withdrawn because we worked with the investigators, which
17 are the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of
18 Commercial Fisheries and Organized Village of Kake. They
19 do that in cooperation. And that work is included in the
20 next project down, 01-125. So in the recommendation we
21 are addressing False Lake, which clearly is a very major
22 issue. It's certainly been the subject of regulatory
23 action on the part of the Board and some in-season action
24 on the part of State and Federal managers. So again the
25 original project, 00-044, Falls Lake sockeye assessment,
26 that administratively isn't on the table, and what is on
27 -- but the subject matter is included in the next
28 project, 01-125. So what we're really left with are
29 three projects. The first one, 01-125, addresses Falls
30 Lake, Gut Bay, and Kutlaku Lakes. Those are all in the
31 immediate Kake vicinity, and again that's a cooperative
32 project between ADF&G and OVK. Then the next project,
33 01-128, Lag Bay subsistence sockeye stock assessment,
34 that's in the Sitka area. That's a project that's run by
35 Sitka Tribe of Alaska, and the Alaska Department of Fish
36 and Game and the Forest Service. That's an on-going
37 project, was a previously funded project on which the
38 funding commitment had expired. We had that one. And
39 then the third one is a brand new project, Eek Lake
40 sockeye stock assessment. That's in the (indiscernible)
41 lakes (ph) of Hydaburg. And again that's a new system
42 that had not previously been investigated or assessed.
43 And our recommendation really is very straight forward.
44 We're recommending funding all three of those projects.

45
46 And there's one other thing I need to
47 talk about on this, because the only reason that we had
48 enough money to fund all three projects is because the
49 first two projects, the 125, the Falls, Gut and Kutlaku,
50 and 128, Klag Bay, the proposal that we received for our

00231

1 program is only half the cost of those projects. And the
2 reason for that is because the proposal as submitted
3 takes the other half of the cost of that project and
4 makes that request to what's called the Southeast
5 Sustainable Salmon Fund. A lot of people know it as the
6 Governor's Fund, but there's a -- I think a lot of you
7 are aware there's a large, well, certainly by our
8 standards, a large amount of money available through that
9 fund, and their focus goes well beyond subsistence, but
10 it includes subsistence, and so several of us have worked
11 a lot with that program, and what we have in front of us
12 are proposals for those two projects that represent 50
13 percent cost sharing between the Fisheries Resource
14 Monitoring Program, our program, and the Southeast
15 Sustainable Salmon Fund. So if it were not for that cost
16 sharing of those proposals, we'd be looking at not
17 funding all three of these projects. Harold?

18

19 MR. MARTIN: I am probably missing it,
20 but why is the Falls Lake sockeye assessment withdrawn?

21

22 MR. McBRIDE: It was -- it was withdrawn
23 because that project 125 originally was looking at some
24 other lakes, and so some of the lakes were dropped and
25 some of them were moved around, and what we finally ended
26 up with were three lakes in the Kake area, and the three
27 lakes would be Falls Lake, Gut Bay and Kutlaku Lakes. So
28 Falls Lake is included in that project. There was no
29 reason to have a stand-alone project for Falls Lake as it
30 was originally done. And also I think later on Meg
31 Cartwright is here, she's from Alaska Department of Fish
32 and Game, and she's actually their principal investigator
33 for this project, and she's going to be making a
34 presentation later and getting into the details of those
35 three projects.

36

37 MR. MARTIN: Right. Okay. Yeah. Okay.

38

39 MR. McBRIDE: So just to summarize the
40 recommendation for the stock size and trends, all the
41 projects address sockeye assessment, which is your
42 highest issue for stock size and trends projects. We
43 feel that all of them have a very strong capacity
44 building component and local hire components. Most of
45 the projects actually address regulatory and conservation
46 concern issues, and the two largest projects, the funding
47 strategy is to share costs 50/50 with the Southeast
48 Sustainable Salmon Fund, which from a financial
49 perspective is -- allows us to recommend funding of those
50 projects. At this point I'm going to turn it over to

00232

1 Polly and she's going to go through the harvest
2 monitoring/TEK recommendations.

3

4 MS. GARZA: Before we to that, I have
5 some questions. So getting back to page 126, the bar
6 graph of the funds available, so the 1.827 is statewide,
7 and so our share is the 213?

8

9 MR. McBRIDE: 286.

10

11 MS. GARZA: Okay. And of the three --
12 there are basically three proposals that we will consider
13 making recommendations on that you guys have brought
14 forward. Were there any others that were considered or
15 submitted?

16

17 MR. McBRIDE: Well, the way the process
18 works is -- I'll just really quickly go through it
19 chronologically. In November we put out a call for
20 proposals. Then people have basically until February to
21 turn in proposals. Those proposals are screened by FIS
22 staff and the TRC and some number of those are put
23 forward for -- or invited to develop a full investigation
24 plan. Those investigation plans come back. They're
25 again screened, and then based on that screening, that's
26 what's put in front of the Councils in the fall for
27 recommendation, and that's kind of what's on the table if
28 you will. I don't -- I'd have to -- there may have been
29 some other proposals, but if there were, there couldn't
30 have been more than a couple, because when we put this
31 call out, we recognized we didn't have much money for
32 2003. And, for instance, in 2002 we got like \$12 million
33 worth of proposals with about a little over two million
34 available, and it's kind of -- it puts a huge burden on
35 investigators and staff to go through that level of
36 screening, so we really tried to focus this call. So I
37 don't remember off the top of my head -- but actually,
38 I'm sorry. I'm sorry, there were a couple. I couldn't
39 tell you exactly what they were, but there were some.
40 But what we forwarded was well in excess of the amount of
41 money that was available, and they were evaluated on
42 those four criteria and felt to be the strongest
43 proposals that were submitted.

44

45 MS. GARZA: I think in the previous
46 meetings we have looked at the full range of proposals,
47 those that were not recommended as well as those that
48 were recommended. And I that's important to us, because
49 we as Council members need to know if Wrangell submitted
50 something and they didn't get it, we don't want to have

00233

1 someone from Wrangell calling us and say what the heck's
2 going on, you guys aren't even considering it, why should
3 we bother spending a bunch trying to pull something
4 together, and it may also help us to sit down with them
5 and say, okay, what do you need to do to this proposal to
6 make it work? And so it's important for us to know the
7 full range, even if they receive very little
8 consideration as not meeting the objectives, even if they
9 don't meet our objectives, if the tribes are taking that
10 step, that means that they have interest, and we need to
11 figure out how to work with them.

12

13 MR. McBRIDE: Okay. What's really odd
14 about this recommendation, this is the only time you've
15 ever received a recommendation to fund everything that
16 was on the table. Typically you would see projects not
17 recommended for funding. This is -- I can hardly imagine
18 this will happen where we're going to be in a position to
19 recommend everything that's on the table.

20

21 MS. GARZA: Okay. Polly? Or there's
22 another question.

23

24 MR. LITTLEFIELD: It's my understanding
25 that you received only one TEK where -- and these are the
26 only four projects that were submitted? Is that what you
27 said? You're going to fund everything. That means these
28 were the only four that were submitted?

29

30 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Littlefield, these were
31 the only four that were advanced for investigation plan.
32 There were some other proposals submitted last winter,
33 but again they were screened to come up with the
34 strongest candidates and invited to develop a full
35 investigation plan. I mean, a proposal is only a couple
36 pages long, and an investigation plan is typically, I
37 don't know, 15 to 25 pages long, something like that. It
38 has a detailed budget, a very detailed plan and stuff, so
39 only the strongest ones were forwarded for developing
40 that plan, and then that's what's put in front of the
41 Councils.

42

43 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I agree with the
44 Chair, because I would like to see these projects. In
45 other words, we either accept these, or we reject them
46 and leave money on the table. In other words, if we were
47 to reject any one of these projects, we would leave money
48 on the table, and there may be a project, for instance,
49 in TEK which we gave high priority to, and projects which
50 have high partnering, which we also prioritized and then

00234

1 have a project in here with no partnering, we may well
2 want to look at that. And I think the Councils needs to
3 have those range of options available to it, and a
4 community representative from Hoonah or some other place
5 may well lobby for that and convince us that that project
6 is more viable. So I think we need to see them. I would
7 like to see them, I don't know when, but we have only one
8 option, either accept this or reject one of these and put
9 the money back. It goes back into the fund, and I don't
10 think that's -- I'd like to spend all the money, because
11 we don't have enough.

12

13 MR. McBRIDE: Again, this is -- I mean,
14 I've been in front of you three different times with
15 three different draft plans. This is the only one, and
16 it's an oddity that we're in a position that we can
17 recommend funding everything that was on the table, and
18 the only reason we can do that is because of the proposed
19 cost-sharing with Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund. If
20 that wasn't the case, we would be looking at those -- for
21 instance, on the SST side, we'd be looking at not funding
22 all of those. We would come in with a draft with a
23 recommendation, and you may have a different opinion on
24 what should be funded out of those three projects.
25 Typically there would be more projects on the table than
26 we could fund. And I'm absolutely positive that will be
27 the case in year four.

28

29 MS. GARZA: Marilyn.

30

31 MS. WILSON: What is the Sustainable
32 Salmon Fund? I don't understand that one.

33

34 MR. McBRIDE: That's a good question.
35 The Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund, it's Federal
36 money. Its origin really came through the U.S./Canada
37 treaty process. But it's federal money that by and large
38 goes to the State, so the primary administrator of those
39 funds if you will is the Alaska Department of Fish and
40 Game through the State, and it has several different
41 components. It's really aimed at in large part in
42 addressing treating issues, although it's got several
43 different components to it. For instance, there's one
44 component, as part of the treaty process, that actually
45 looks at Columbia River issues, so it's not even part --
46 it's not in Alaska, but what's going on in the Columbia
47 River is affecting Southeast Alaska fisheries in a huge
48 way, so it's addressing that. There's another component
49 in there that's called economic -- I think it's the
50 economic development portion of the fund. There's

00235

1 actually a stakeholder committee that has nothing to do
2 with Federal or State bureaucrats. And what it really
3 gets at primarily are enhancement issues. So it's
4 looking at that. Then there's another segment of the
5 fund that looks at habitat issues, trying to address
6 sustaining salmon production in Southeast Alaska by
7 looking at some of the habitat issues associated with
8 salmon production, and then the fourth part is very
9 analogous to what we would call stock status and trends
10 type projects. And what they've established is a science
11 advisory panel, so they've asked scientists from the
12 State and Federal governments to help advise them on what
13 would be good projects. I'm part of that committee.
14 Mike Turek who's here from the State, he's on that
15 committee. There are people from the Forest Service on
16 that committee, people from both Commercial Fisheries
17 Division and Sport Fish Division with the Alaska
18 Department of Fish and Game, input is being given or
19 being put into that as it relates certainly to
20 subsistence matters, and so we've actually received
21 \$100,000 already for the Klawock sockeye project. If we
22 hadn't already received that money, the Klawock sockeye
23 project would have been in front of you in '03, because
24 the funding commitment runs out in '02 for that project,
25 but we were able to receive \$100,000 which is actually
26 going to fund the Klawock project next year in '03, so we
27 didn't have to consider that for funding here. I think
28 some other money that Mike Turek might talk to you about
29 later actually went into some ethnographic research for
30 Southeast. That came out of the Southeast Sustainable
31 Salmon fund, and then what we have right now are these
32 two proposals that represent 50 percent cost share
33 between our program and their program.

34

35 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

36

37 MS. GARZA: Okay. Polly?

38

39 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Ms. Chair. My
40 name is Polly Wheeler, and as Doug said, I'm a recent
41 employee with the Fisheries Information Services. I'm
42 the lead anthropologist for FIS. I have an assistant,
43 but I'm sort of responsible for all the projects
44 statewide, which is different than how the biology side
45 works. These guys each have an area, but I have the
46 whole state. The two projects that were submitted on the
47 TEK harvest assessment or harvest monitoring side were
48 the subsistence fisheries harvest survey data
49 dissemination, which was actually pulled. It made it
50 through the preproposal stage and onto the -- it was

00236

1 advanced through investigation plan, and it was -- the
2 principle investigator was Mike Turek, but his workload
3 from other FIS projects precluded him from actually
4 working on it. He just didn't have the staff. So it was
5 pulled by -- he decided not to put in an investigation
6 plan, but it may be put forward in subsequent years,
7 because it is a really valuable good project.

8

9 Then the other project that was actually
10 recommended for funding with modification was a
11 regulatory review which is part of the identification
12 needs that have -- or issues and identification needs
13 that have been identified for this area. And that was
14 put forward by Elizabeth Andrews who used to work for the
15 State and the Division of Subsistence Data Management,
16 and that -- the component of that project that was
17 recommended for modification was the capacity building
18 component. The TRC and FIS staff felt that it wasn't
19 strong enough in terms of people getting access to this
20 data base and actually trying to figure it out, so we
21 have built in focus groups, trying to work with the
22 communities, figure out what they actually want in terms
23 of having a data base that actually works for folks. So
24 they're still working on that, their investigation plan.
25 The modified investigation plan is due in a couple of
26 weeks and we'll be looking at that. So those are the two
27 projects.

28

29 As Doug said, you know, the call for
30 proposals was pretty focused. I would like to see, and
31 I'm trying to build up the social science side of things.
32 They haven't had somebody in my position for over a year,
33 and they've had different people fill in, but I'm here
34 for a while. I'd like to build up this side of the
35 program, and I'd be happy to talk with any of you at any
36 point either now or at other points. You know, just call
37 me about ideas for project, reviewing proposals,
38 preproposals, that sort of thing, so with that, if you
39 have any questions on any of these projects or the
40 project I guess, I'm here.

41

42 MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

43

44 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Is it appropriate to
45 talk about the projects right now, the Elizabeth Andrews
46 project?

47

48 MS. WHEELER: Absolutely.

49

50 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay. As I look

00237

1 through this, this is -- the reason I asked this question
2 earlier is this SEARAC went on record as in strong
3 support of partnershiping. And we wanted -- and our
4 intent was that we wanted to involve the tribes, the
5 local communities and others in this program, that we
6 felt that was appropriate. This is one that just has one
7 individual, it's a significant amount of money, and when
8 I read through the book, the lead PI has agreed to hold
9 a, one, training session in Southeast, and for that we
10 are adding \$10,000. I thought there was just -- I mean,
11 it just seemed a little excessive to me. It would be
12 better to send \$1,000 to the tribes. I mean, I don't --
13 that's not capacity building, but -- at least -- I wanted
14 to see these other projects. And it was my understanding
15 before that projects that had been previously submitted
16 and had passed the technical review committee in prior
17 years would be presented to us. And I don't see any of
18 those. There were some steelhead projects that passed
19 review before and whatever. And they just kind of like
20 disappeared. I don't see them any more. So maybe you
21 could address the \$10,000 for one training session in a
22 community?

23

24 MS. WHEELER: Yeah, and I think that's
25 still being negotiated. I guess one thing to make clear
26 is that this is the TRC recommendation that has to go --
27 that's going before you guys right now, and then go
28 before the Federal Board, and you can make
29 recommendations as far as this project goes. If you
30 don't feel that one training session is sufficient, then
31 you can add, you know, additional training sessions, and
32 as the social scientist that would be looking over this
33 investigation plan, I can take that message home, too.
34 So that's still as far as I'm concerned in the
35 negotiation stage. It's not a done deal.

36

37 MR. LITTLEFIELD: And she hasn't
38 identified a community yet?

39

40 MS. GARZA: Okay. So I guess I'm a bit
41 confused. So there are three stock assessments and one
42 TEK? Okay. I guess I didn't see the TEK. So I thought
43 it was pulled. So it is still being considered, but with
44 modification through OSM discussion with the grant
45 applicant?

46

47 MS. WHEELER: Specifically for project
48 03-044, the regulatory review?

49

50 MS. GARZA: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

00238

1 MS. WHEELER: Yes. I mean, it was
2 recommended for funding by the Technical Review Committee
3 with the added component of this capacity building,
4 having the training sessions, working with people to
5 actually figure out the data base. And there was also a
6 focus group. I'm sorry. I can check. Yeah. And the
7 amount actually in you Board book on page 156. It says
8 it was rated low on the capacity building, because it
9 doesn't have a capacity building component, but the lead
10 PI has agreed to improve the capacity building component,
11 blah-blah-blah. So it was recognized by the TRC that
12 there needed to be that focus group training, whatever to
13 make this data base useful for people.

14

15 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

16

17 MS. GARZA: Yeah, John.

18

19 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Since we're on that
20 page, doesn't it say on that page, move to the top, and
21 it talks about technical merit, and the second sentence
22 says objectives are clear, although objective one is
23 extremely ambitious and may not be possible. So, you
24 know, I'm just wondering how this made it through their
25 -- does that mean they're going to come to us for more
26 money for this, or that it may actually cost twice as
27 much money as we are approving, or.....

28

29 MS. WHEELER: Well, the money would be --
30 the money that's recommended for the project is the money
31 that project gets. You know, I suppose they can always
32 come back for.....

33

34 MR. LITTLEFIELD: And they get half a
35 project is what I'm saying. In other words, if it's
36 saying it's not possible to have that, we might have half
37 of a package?

38

39 MS. WHEELER: The concern at the -- and
40 Cal may be able to help me out here, but the concern,
41 when the TRC addressed this project, one of the concerns
42 was if all the permit data were available. There was
43 some -- and the PI subsequently came back and said that,
44 yes, all these permit data are available. And that was
45 -- it was unclear at the time of the review, and when
46 they approached the TRC about the availability of all the
47 different permit data. And that's why that sentence is
48 in there. Keep in mind, because of the bureaucratic
49 machine that churns forward, we have to get -- a lot of
50 these documents were done in early August. They had to

00239

1 be into the printer by early August, so there's been some
2 changes that have occurred since that time that we've got
3 more information now than we had at the time when these
4 -- all the material had to go into the books for
5 publication.

6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have one other
8 question on that project.

9

10 MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

11

12 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have a nice package
13 here that Mr. Casipit was kind enough to send me. It was
14 the Tlingit and Haida package, and i see the objectives
15 of this are to chronologically develop the regs. Well,
16 to me I can find them all in here it looks like to me
17 already. And it's on a computer. It looks to me like it
18 is somewhat or extremely similar to the work that Tlingit
19 and Haida has already done. I mean, I don't want to be
20 the one, you know, down on TEK projects, because I
21 certainly want them to go, but I guess I don't know if
22 we're getting the bang for the buck here, so that's my
23 concern.

24

25 MS. GARZA: Polly?

26

27 MS. WHEELER: Madame Chair, if I could,
28 Cal might be able to speak to that, because I know he's
29 more familiar with that project, and the parallels such
30 as they are between this project that's been recommended
31 for funding versus the Tlingit and Haida project that was
32 already accomplished.

33

34 MS. GARZA: Cal.

35

36 MR. CASIPIT: thank you, Ms. Chairman,
37 Mr. Littlefield. You know, I'm not a social scientist or
38 an anthropologist, so I'm kind of floundering around on
39 this one myself a bit but, you know, if you notice, the
40 Tlingit Haida work is more of a contemporary look at
41 patterns and how the regulations are set now and how they
42 may or may affect -- or how they effect customary and
43 traditional use and harvest patterns. It's my
44 understanding that what you're considering here, the 03-
45 044 project is taking more of a historical approach and
46 going back as far as the permit data basis go to actually
47 look at, you know, each permit and seeing how the
48 regulations, seasons, bags, methods and means has changed
49 over time since permits have been issued in Southeast.
50 So it's a little bit different than what Tlingit Haida

00240

1 did. I don't know, have I done a good job explaining?

2 That's the best I can do.

3

4 MS. GARZA: Okay. So I appreciate your
5 presentation. I would ask the Council that we not make
6 any recommendations until we hear from Meg Cartwright
7 who's been the head of the Southeast stock something,
8 enhancement stock assessment projects, if nothing else to
9 understand how well those projects are going. And I have
10 the same concerns that others have regarding the one TEK.
11 Although we support TEK, we want money to go in that
12 direction. Even with modification, that attempt at
13 capacity building in no way mirrors what has been done
14 with the other projects. Those involve the villages,
15 they involve village members, they involve tribal
16 communities, and we don't see that with this one. And so
17 I would like to hear from Meg later and when we take it
18 up, it would be my intent to not support it or to have it
19 real significantly modified before it can be supported.
20 Are there any other questions? I've got to go help with
21 a herring egg salad. Hey, Bill. Are there other
22 questions? Okay. And then we'll get the list of they
23 guys who submitted that didn't get anywhere?

24

25 MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

26

27 MS. WHEELER: Yes.

28

29 MS. GARZA: And the initial RFP responses
30 that didn't go anywhere? Say yes.

31

32 MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

33

34 MS. WHEELER: Yes.

35

36 MS. GARZA: Okay. Polly.

37

38 MS. WHEELER: I guess one more thing,
39 Madame Chair, we do -- we still have this other issues
40 and information needs to go over, so after....

41

42 MS. GARZA: Okay.

43

44 MS. WHEELER: I guess we're not done yet.

45

46 MS. GARZA: Okay. So Bill's going to

47 chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

50

00241

1 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of
2 the Council, the second presentation that we're here to
3 speak with you about is contained in this green handout.
4 It's called issues and information needs, and this
5 material is also covered starting on page 167 under tab E
6 in the Council book. If you just turn the page on that
7 handout again. I'd just like to go through the whole
8 point why we are even talking about this today.
9

10 At every Council meeting we do try to --
11 or we take the time to review and discuss the issues and
12 information needs as identified by the Regional Council.
13 And the reason for that, there's a really important
14 reason for this, this is the starting point for us and
15 for the proposers. It's the single major source of input
16 for the next request for proposals, so when we go out for
17 proposals then in 2004, we publish these issues and
18 information needs, so this really is the starting point.
19 This is how we identify what is strategically important.
20 So this is a really major piece of information. And so
21 at the end of this, we would like for the Council to
22 review and update their issues and information needs as
23 the first step in the 2004 Fisheries Resource Monitoring
24 Program process.
25

26 If you flip the page in that green
27 handout, or you can follow on page 168 in the book, it's
28 the same graph that we talked about a few minutes ago.
29 It's the finances of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
30 Program. And the reason I'm going to talk about this is
31 to look ahead a year and to see how much money we think
32 is going to be available statewide for this program. I
33 won't take the time to go through all the details of this
34 graph, but what I do want you to focus on is on the far
35 right on the graph for 2004. There's that sort of large
36 open area, and it's got a number, and it's 4,883. That's
37 \$4,883,000. That's how much money we're anticipating
38 statewide will be available for Fisheries Resource
39 Monitoring Program projects in 2004.
40

41 Now, the reason that that money increases
42 substantially over what we just talked about for 2003 is
43 because of how the program is administered. When we make
44 a permit for a project, or actually we do a call for
45 proposals, we allow project proposals that extend up to
46 three years in duration. They don't have to be three
47 years, but they can be that long under a single proposal.
48 And so once a project is finally deliberated upon and
49 accepted by the Federal Subsistence Board, if it was a
50 three-year project, then we make that commitment out for

00242

1 three years. But you can see the way the pattern of the
2 money works in these projects that you start out with
3 whatever the full amount is. Some of the projects are
4 only one year, so you get a lesser amount in the second
5 year, and some of the projects are only two years long,
6 so you get a lesser amount in the third years, and then
7 after three years the commitment ends. Well, in 2004,
8 the single biggest thing that's driving it is our
9 financial commitment from 2001 will be done. The three
10 years ends in 2003, and so those project commitments end.
11

12 And then the other thing we did in our
13 call for 2003, the one we just talked about, is for any
14 project that was being brought as a continuation project,
15 we only allowed them to submit a single year, just a one-
16 year project. And we did that because what we're trying
17 to do is kind of clear the decks if you will in 2004. We
18 wanted to maximize the amount of money available in 2004
19 so that each council could sit down and have a discussion
20 of strategic priorities. In other words, at that point
21 we had gone through three years of program, and for the
22 most part we will have completed our funding obligations
23 and we're trying to maximize the amount of money that was
24 on the table so that you could kind of look at everything
25 and say, okay, what's really important versus what's not.
26 What's important to continue, what's important to start
27 up new. So that's what we were trying to do
28 administratively. So that's a large part of why this bar
29 is a lot bigger than it has been in the last couple
30 years. I mean, we did that by design.

31
32 Back in March when we met in Juneau, I
33 gave you a short presentation. It's very similar to
34 this. And we talked about strategic planning. And what
35 staff had drafted up is a process if you will where we
36 asked a series of questions, and what we were trying to
37 do is ask very pertinent questions to frame in what we
38 think is important to fund on into the future. And so if
39 you turn the page in your green handout, you'll see this
40 page that's listed as future issues for the Fisheries
41 Resource Monitoring Program. And these are the questions
42 that we are proposing to be asked to try to form (ph) our
43 way through what's important versus what's less important
44 for the amount of money that's going to be available.
45 And what we're trying to get at with these questions, for
46 instance, that first one, how well have project
47 selections to date addressed Council issues and
48 information needs. What we're trying to do is look at
49 the issues and information needs that you've identified,
50 look at the history of the projects that we've funded and

00243

1 said, well, is there something here that's -- you know,
2 is there an issue or information need that's just never
3 been funded over the last three years, and that's what
4 that question gets at.

5
6 The second question, which issues or
7 information needs likely require annual collection of
8 long-term data sets? Okay. What that's getting at is
9 there may be an issue and information need on there that
10 have one or more projects that address it, but that
11 doesn't mean the issue and information need is complete
12 now, that it's all done and it's history now. It may be
13 just an on-going issue that's going to require projects
14 to go on longer than three years.

15
16 The third question, are there funding
17 guidelines or alternative funds that should be considered
18 in recommendations for project selection? This gets at
19 issues like the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund. Are
20 there strategies that we ought to think about employing
21 that to be quite honest make use of other people's money
22 to stretch our dollars, get more bang for the buck out of
23 our dollars. That's what that question's about.

24
25 The fourth question is a new one. We did
26 not have this one in March when I spoke to you about this
27 last. Are there additional regulatory or management
28 concerns that should be considered in recommendations for
29 project selection? This is really the opportunity for
30 the agencies, Federal agencies, to say, well, is there
31 something missing in the Council's issues and information
32 needs? So it opens a dialogue between, you know, outfits
33 like the Forest Service or the Fish and Wildlife Service
34 and the Council, from our perspective, from the
35 perspective of the staff, is there something missing in
36 the issues and information needs. So that's what that
37 question is about.

38
39 The last questions, the results of the
40 projects today, that's just about project performance,
41 project results. I think that's what Dolly was speaking
42 about just a few minutes ago, you know, just asking about
43 where some of these projects were at.

44
45 What we're going to do with that down
46 from our perspective is we're going to make that the
47 focus of our presentation to you in March. Right now
48 we're talking about the things that we're talking about,
49 but what we want to come to you with in March then is a
50 more comprehensive look at here's all the projects that

00244

1 have been funded, what are the results to date, what's
2 the performance to date. So I'm just going to very
3 briefly address the first four -- the answers, at least
4 our thoughts on the answers to the first four questions
5 for the Southeast Region. So if you just turn the page.
6 And everything I'm going to present from here on out is
7 actually summarized on page 174 of the Council book.

8

9 The first question, how well have the
10 project selections to date addressed your issues and
11 information needs? The short answer is very well. And
12 that shouldn't be a huge surprise. I mean, we've spent a
13 lot of time, a lot of effort to try to focus project
14 selections on Council's issues and information needs.
15 There are a couple of what we would portray as perhaps
16 more -- you know, maybe not the foremost issues and
17 information needs, but, for instance, we have never
18 addressed TEK of salmon in the Situk and Ahrnklin rivers.
19 That was identified as a specific issue and information
20 need from this Council. The Federal fisheries
21 subsistence regulations of Southeast, that will actually
22 be addressed in the project Polly spoke about, 03-044.
23 And then you also identified Unuk River eulachon for
24 hooligan as a specific issue that needed to be addressed.
25 We've never addressed that issue with a project
26 selection. But by and large, certainly our understanding
27 of the major ones have been addressed with projection
28 selection. So we don't see a giant hole in the issues
29 and information needs as you've previously identified
30 them as needing to be addressed. We've pretty much been
31 on the mark at least in our assessment with the project
32 selections.

33

34 On the next question.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Before you go on.

37

38 MR. McBRIDE: I'm sorry. Yes, sir.

39

40 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: What we'd like to know
41 on the Unuk -- okay. I understand that the Forest
42 Service gathers that information. What do they do with
43 that information?

44

45 MR. McBRIDE: I'm going to defer to
46 somebody from the Forest Service.

47

48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: They thought they were
49 excused. Forest Service, front and center. We were
50 discussing conclusions summary for Southeast, and the

00245

1 question was how well have project selection to date
2 addressed Council issues and information needs. And one
3 of them is the Unuk River hooligan. And I'm wondering
4 who gathers that information, and where does that
5 information ultimately wind up? And what's done with
6 that information?

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: It's my understanding that
9 the Ketchikan Ranger District has undertaken some limited
10 biological sample of the hooligan in the Unuk River.
11 They've sent some off for genetic sampling or something
12 like that, but it's not a stock assessment in the sockeye
13 sense of the word if you will. It's basically just
14 trying to gather some basic information on the fish.
15 It's not really a stock assessment.

16

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. The reason I
18 asked the question is because I've been working with that
19 office. I suggested that they put together a management
20 plan for that fishery. They said they'd have one. They
21 said they'd have one in place by the end of January. I
22 haven't seen it yet. That's a sensitive, very sensitive
23 resource, and use of the resource, and it has to be
24 handled like dry spaghetti, because it doesn't take much
25 to disrupt that system. And the behavior of the experts
26 from the government coming in there to do their studies
27 is like having the running of the bulls through the Unuk
28 River by comparison to how the fishermen harvest and then
29 take care of that system. And that needs to be
30 addressed. It was nothing but chaos this year up there.
31 Okay. The Forest Service was going to use a throw net,
32 collect a few fish for samples. They couldn't catch any.
33 So they got 100 fish from one of the fishermen there to
34 do a study with. So, you know, the fishermen can look at
35 the system, they can look at the conditions and tell
36 whether or not that is going to be a productive effort or
37 not, or if it's going to create a conservation concern.
38 They weigh all that, and determine appropriately
39 according to that. There's summers we don't have
40 hooligan. This year was one of them. They went out and
41 came back empty. And there were other factors. There
42 was ice, lingering ice in the system. But they had
43 helicopters landing on the ice. They had boats and
44 seaplanes running around up there. Somebody needs to get
45 some protocols and disciplines to these people on how
46 they go about these sensitive areas. I'm not sure where
47 the biologists stay, but I'm more comfortable with them
48 studying bivalves and that kind of stuff. It's pretty
49 hard to hurt a clam. But you can hurt them. The reason
50 I'm saying all this is because to me they're real big

00246

1 issues out of no necessity at all. It's real cumbersome.
2 It created a lot of dissention between a lot of people
3 that didn't know each other. And it only occurred since
4 this time last year, see, and so what I'm -- the reason
5 for my comments is try to attract the right parties here
6 that might have access to the appropriate parties to get
7 that point of responsibility and professionalism and
8 caution on these systems. You know, we talk about the
9 delicate balance of things. Well, you don't address a
10 delicate balance with a bulldozer, you know. You do it
11 with little small dram weights. And so that's the point
12 I'd like to make. That's a bone of contention. There
13 isn't a bone of contention like that any place in the
14 State right now, and it's a small system in the State.
15 So I'd like to see that handled a little more
16 professionally. Boy, professionalism went clean out the
17 window this year. Out the window. I mean, it sounds
18 like a bar fight down there at the district office in
19 Ketchikan. But it doesn't need to happen. So Mr.
20 Thompson, Casipit, and those people, I'm hoping you're
21 hearing our words, and get that message across to the
22 people in the Forest Service, because those are the
23 stewards of this system in the Unuk. Ironically there
24 wasn't any hooligan in Southeast at all this year. So I
25 could blame the whole thing on the Ketchikan District
26 office because of their clumsiness at the Unuk, that it
27 spoiled the runs at Stikine, the Chilkat and the Situk.
28 That not being the case, but I just thought I'd interject
29 that. I had to get my hooligan from the Copper River.
30 Part of the ones that were pumped out onto the truck.

31
32 But anyway this just needs to be
33 resolved. It disrupts all of lower Southeast, because
34 all those people down there depend on this harvest
35 whenever it's there. They know there's some years that
36 they hit, there's other years that they miss. They live
37 with that. So this is another -- in the last four years
38 we've had two hits and two misses. So I appreciate the
39 way you have this included as a list of our issues, but I
40 couldn't think of a more appropriate time to bring it
41 forward than right now, so thank you for bearing with
42 that. That's all I have to say on that, and I'm hoping
43 that my comments will reach the appropriate places, and
44 I'll be continuing to work with them. Cal.

45
46 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
47 Consider your comments well taken, and we will check into
48 this and see what's going on with it.

49
50 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. Dolly.

00247

1 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. So looking at
2 your conclusion and summary, is it your intent that we
3 review this and give you additional comments if we think
4 that there are holes that are still out there?

5
6 MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

7
8 MS. GARZA: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would
9 suggest we do that over lunch since it looks like ANS is
10 back there and ready. We may be discussing with each
11 other and then either come back here or just let them
12 know personally areas that we think need to be worked on.
13 We should sit and talk with Polly about how we should
14 increase the ability or interest in doing the TEK
15 projects since it appears that there doesn't appear to be
16 much interest, we're not getting any projects from the
17 tribes or from communities. So we have to help her
18 figure out what to do help.

19
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You've got the gavel.

21
22 MS. GARZA: Polly.

23
24 MS. WHEELER: Just one thing. We have
25 gotten projects, I mean, there's on-going projects right
26 now that are collecting TEK. Mike Turek is working with
27 Wrangell, and also with Hoonah on two separate projects
28 on TEK. So there are projects, but definitely beefing up
29 the projects that are submitted is important.

30
31 MS. GARZA: And to follow up on that, I
32 think you mentioned that that would happen in March, but
33 it would be good for us to know the status of these
34 projects at least on an annual basis, so when we talk to
35 communities, we can let them know what's going on, or we
36 can have a better idea of where the hole should be,
37 because I may have some really good idea and I find out
38 it was started two years ago and I just totally spaced
39 it.

40
41 MS. WHEELER: Yes. A point well taken.

42
43 MS. GARZA: Okay. So is ANS ready for
44 lunch? Okay. So lunch is \$7. It's Indian tacos, little
45 bit of herring egg salad, a little bit of marvelous
46 Haines dry fish that we didn't have to pay over \$500 for.
47 So please support ANS Grand Camp, and we will be back at
48 1:30.

49
50 (Off record)

00248

1 (On record)

2

3 MS. GARZA:until the chairman shows
4 up. Okay. So, Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

7

8 MS. GARZA: Just to get us back on track,
9 we were on page 174 of the manual, the conclusion and
10 summary for fishery information, planning for the future.
11 These are the ideas that we want, and you went off on
12 Unuk. But I think that we need to hear from other
13 Council members on what they think are priorities for
14 subsistence research needs in the future be they sockeye,
15 coho, steelhead, and in addition I was talking to some
16 people over lunch, and they wanted to hear a little bit
17 more from Polly on what types of TEK projects could be
18 funded. Since we're not getting proposals from
19 Southeast, we need to figure out as a Council what can be
20 done so we can go back and encourage our communities and
21 tribes to apply. Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Anybody have any
24 questions or comments. Polly, we'll hear from you. Did
25 you have a response?

26

27 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman?

28

29 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Bert.

30

31 MR. ADAMS: Before we leave here, Polly,
32 maybe I can ask a question she might be able to answer.
33 I heard by the grapevine somehow that the TEK projects,
34 you know, are going to be put on the back burner. You
35 know, this particular Council a couple years ago in
36 Anchorage made that a number 1 priority. And if that is
37 so, you know, I'm wondering what the rationale is, or if
38 it's even true. Thank you.

39

40 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
41 Mr. Adams, it's certainly not true to my knowledge. I
42 don't think they would have hired me if they were going
43 to put these projects on the back burner, because I've
44 never been known to be one that will sit by and watch
45 something like that happen. I'm trying to build this
46 program up. And as Doug said in the.....

47

48 MS. GARZA: Polly, speak up.

49

50 MS. WHEELER: As Doug said in the

00249

1 overview, there's still that, at least on the part of the
2 TIC, the one-third/two-thirds split there, so it's out
3 intention and FIS's intention to build up and strengthen
4 the TEK component of the program, and as I said earlier,
5 I'm really willing to work with people on helping them to
6 develop projects, so, yeah, it's not going away.

7

8 MR. ADAMS: Okay.

9

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I have a question
11 probably for Doug with regards to funding. The funding
12 comparison in the near future, how that compares to
13 funding in regards for TEK?

14

15 MR. McBRIDE: Could you repeat the
16 question?

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: TEK funding. Is there
19 money for TEK? How does that compare now with what it
20 was five weeks ago?

21

22 MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, the funding, as
23 Doug pointed out in the project overview, next year for
24 statewide there's what, a little over \$4 million.

25

26 MR. McBRIDE: Almost five million.

27

28 MS. WHEELER: Almost \$5 million. And
29 that will be split out by region. But within each
30 region, the goal is to have, of the full amount
31 available, the goal would be to have two-thirds for the
32 SST projects, and a third for the TEK projects. So I
33 can't give you an exact amount, but it's still the goal
34 is to have that one-third/two-thirds split of the
35 available funding for the particular region.

36

37 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: One final question. I
38 was hoping to be able to avoid these, but your formula
39 for determining funding amounts for different regions, I
40 was wondering those were -- how that formula was derived,
41 what it is based on, that kind of stuff?

42

43 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, that formula
44 was actually done by the Federal Board. And I don't have
45 it in front of me, but basically what they're trying to
46 do, they recognized that when they looked at fisheries
47 monitoring program, they wanted to put some money
48 everywhere around the State, so then they were trying to
49 figure out, how do we do it? Do we do it just equitably,
50 or what do we base it on? And they really based it on I

00250

1 think their basic understanding of the letter (ph) of
2 issues. And so each region -- it's not equitable across
3 regions, you know, in terms of the same exact same dollar
4 amount. But I think Southeast gets the third highest
5 amount after the Yukon and the Kuskokwim if I remember
6 the way the formula works correctly. And then the other
7 thing that adds to that, it's just the way in which the
8 money comes for our program. There's a total of \$7
9 million. Five million of it comes through Interior, two
10 million comes through Agriculture, which is where the
11 Forest Service is. And all the Agriculture money gets
12 spent where there are forest lands, which is Southeastern
13 and south central Alaska, so, you know, it's kind of a
14 combination of those two things.

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: As you were speaking it
17 just occurred to me that some of the issues we identify
18 here will be figured into that formula probably as issues
19 that need to be addressed through TEK. That is my
20 assumption.

21

22 MR. McBRIDE: Well, I guess maybe I would
23 say as to my knowledge, that formula has never been
24 revisited, but what would be a Board thing, so if that's
25 something that -- that may be something you want to
26 consider is to ask the Board to revisit the basic funding
27 formula by region.

28

29 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Right. See, as
30 representatives of the people at large in the State, we
31 went to ensure the best we can with our participation in
32 assuring that we get the best results from the TEK that
33 we garner, so we want this to be meaningful, and we want
34 some indication from the Board that it is in fact going
35 to be meaningful. But hopefully that will be a nut that
36 you could take back with you. Thank you. Dolly.

37

38 MS. GARZA: So in terms of the one-
39 third/two-thirds split, I think that's fine, and I think
40 our problem is that in Southeast we have not had the
41 proposals, and over lunch Polly had reminded me that we
42 do have a couple projects on-going. I had forgot about
43 them, so maybe you could summarize those and try to give
44 us as a Council a feel for what kinds of projects we
45 could do, and what scale we're talking about for even the
46 next year or for planning that we can go back and work
47 with communities and tribes on.

48

49 MS. WHEELER: Okay. Doug, feel free to
50 step in if I miss a couple. The first year of funding,

00251

1 in the 0 year funding, there was a project funded, the
2 Southeast traditional territories project, and that
3 involved six communities I believe, and that's still on-
4 going. It got a slow start. There were a number of
5 staffing changes. Mr. Schroeder might be able to speak
6 to that project specifically, but it is on-going. I'm
7 trying to work with the communities to get that project
8 going, and that's sort of delineating traditional
9 territories for each of the South -- for some of the
10 Southeast communities.

11

12 The other projects, there's a Hoonah TEK
13 project. There's a Klawock TEK project. There's the
14 Yakutat, east Alsek River project. And those are all in
15 two year funding projects, and those are all -- they are
16 all on-going. They just got started up and running
17 through last spring. And then there's -- what's the
18 Tlingit Haida project?

19

20 MR. McBRIDE: That's the Hoonah project.

21

22 MS. WHEELER: That's the Hoonah project.
23 Okay. And I'm trying to think of what other ones.

24

25 MR. McBRIDE: There's some community
26 baseline survey. Community baseline surveys starting in
27 '01, isn't there?

28

29 MR. TUREK: Yeah, I believe there is,
30 we've got 24 (indiscernible - away from microphone).

31

32 MS. WHEELER: Right. The Subsistence
33 Division has done some baseline community work, and
34 you've done 24?

35

36 MR. TUREK: Twenty-four communities in
37 Southeast.

38

39 MS. WHEELER: Twenty-four communities in
40 Southeast. So I guess in summary there's a number of
41 different projects that are at a number of different
42 levels. There's not been a project that's been
43 completed, a TEK project that's been completed, which is
44 an issue in terms of building up this program. We need
45 to have some projects get completed, have some successes,
46 and be able to build on those successes.

47

48 In terms of projects that would work for
49 TEK, I mean there's a number of different ways of
50 approaching these different projects. I mean, I

00252

1 mentioned to you over lunch there's issue specific
2 projects being one of them, but, you know, documenting
3 traditional harvest and use patterns is clearly important
4 from a management perspective, so that managers can
5 actually understand the kind of activities that go on.
6 My recommendation would be in terms of being able to
7 build a project, and build a program is to have smaller
8 projects that are very focused, and that are maybe one
9 year in duration so that then you can subsequently build
10 on those projects. You can build on those successes
11 rather than having a multi-year, multi-community project,
12 but I think there are certainly enough issues that
13 anybody in this room could sit down for 15 minutes and
14 identify that could merit getting a local perspective or,
15 you know, traditional perspective of use on the
16 particular issue. And you all would know that better
17 than I.

18

19 MS. GARZA: Okay. Mr. Chair?

20

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

22

23 MS. GARZA: So then, Doug, on page 174,
24 did you still want to go that line by line, or you just
25 want us to batter you with these are what we think are
26 important for the next year?

27

28 MR. McBRIDE: Madame Chairman, well, I'm
29 not going to go through it -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman,
30 I'm not going to go through that line by line. The only
31 thing I would point out that, I mean, you guys have this
32 material, and basically these are our answers to those
33 questions, at least as, you know -- as you have comments
34 on those or questions on those, I certainly encourage you
35 to bring them up, bring them to our attention. The one
36 that I would bring to my attention, the very last bullet,
37 other additional regulatory management concerns that
38 should be considered in recommendations for future
39 project selections, our recommendation, and this is very
40 much built on the discussion that you had yesterday, our
41 recommendation is that you include Prince of Wales Island
42 steelhead as an issue and information need. And I won't
43 reiterate the discussion from yesterday, but that's
44 certainly our recommendation.

45

46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John?

47

48 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 Do you have any recommendations how that could be
50 accomplished this year if we decided to -- I think there

00253

1 was 96,000 in the budget, the TEK budget target, and had
2 49,000 for this project, or something like that. Is
3 there any way to tap into some of those funds or
4 alternate funds so that this could happen now? Because
5 we know we don't have good steelhead numbers there. That
6 was really clear. And is there any way that we could
7 utilize some of those funds now in your recommendation?

8

9 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr.

10 Littlefield, our recommendation for right now is
11 contained here. And even though that means clearly not a
12 one-third/two-thirds split, we're in fact recommending a
13 little bit more money than what we have, or at least what
14 we targeted initially, and so there's going to have to be
15 some final accounting and stuff, particularly on the part
16 of the Forest Service and with Cal as the contracting
17 officer, but for the amount of money that's available
18 now, if you -- if we all agree that funding the Kake
19 trilogy, the Klag Lake sockeye, the new Eek Lake project
20 with Hydaburg, and the regulatory analysis project, if
21 you all agree that that's a good package to fund, that
22 will use all the money we have right now. My
23 recommendation on the steelhead is that that get included
24 in the '04, in the next call for proposals, and then very
25 much encourage, you know, the obvious participants, which
26 are going to be Fish and Game, Forest Service, and then
27 some of the local communities on Prince of Wales Island
28 to work together to come up with a good project proposal
29 that we can then consider in '04. That would be my
30 recommendation on how to pursue it.

31

32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

33

34 MS. GARZA: I guess in following up what
35 John was saying, and in some discussions over lunch,
36 there was great concern about the TEK project for this
37 year, and I'm not sure it will receive support from this
38 Council, the regulatory history project. And trying to
39 figure how we can -- how can we jump start on steelhead.
40 Is it possible to through the Klawock TEK project add
41 steelhead now and do just a preliminary survey, because
42 the point that Mike had brought up many times yesterday
43 was that that 600 cap doesn't in any way reflect what the
44 harvest prior to '94, what the historic use, or what the
45 needs are of steelhead. So could that kind of a question
46 be brought into the Klawock project, or is that too far
47 along, and take the money that is currently designated
48 for the regulatory history, add it to the Klawock Lake
49 and say, okay, this gives us a first step. We're still
50 going to focus on the data needs and the stock assessment

00254

1 needs of steelhead under the other two-thirds part.

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Oh, sure. Things get
4 tough, you bring in Mike.

5

6 MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair and Counsel
7 members, Mike Turek, Fish and Game, Division of
8 Subsistence. That's a good idea, Dolly, but we're well
9 along in writing up the report for the Klawock project.
10 We've have -- from both Klawock and Kake projects we had
11 a problem of getting to the point of getting the data
12 ready for the data base from our key respondent
13 interviews, so we're going to request a delay on that, an
14 extension on that part of it. But what we could do, and
15 I'll have to talk to Nancy Ratner (ph), our researcher
16 who's worked in Klawock, and have her talk with the
17 Klawock and Craig tribes, is perhaps go back to some of
18 our key respondents that we asked questions about salmon,
19 and talk to them about steelhead. We did get some
20 information on steelhead, because as you know, you just
21 can't -- people just don't talk about one species often.
22 So we did get some information, but we could probably go
23 back to say six or maybe 10 people, key respondents, very
24 knowledgeable, and interview them on steelhead.

25

26 MS. GARZA: Right. And, Mr. Chairman?

27

28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

29

30 MS. GARZA: I guess I'm sort of thinking
31 off the cuff off of what you were saying of this jump
32 starting. I mean, for like Sea Otter/Sea Lion
33 Commission, if we have an EPA grant and there's more
34 money, they just kind of extend the grant and throw more
35 in and throw more in and throw more in, and we never have
36 to write a new grant if those bits of pieces of money are
37 there. So I guess that's where we're trying to see if we
38 can just sort of tack it onto Klawock and if we do 10
39 more then, you know, the money would used for that part
40 of it, it would be used for the analysis, and part of it
41 maybe to do some historical review. I'm not sure if that
42 has been done. It may not require the whole 49,000, but
43 it would give us an idea of where we should go in terms
44 of the data assessment and the stock assessment needs.
45 Does that sound okay, Mike? Or John?

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Go like this.

48

49 MS. GARZA: So have you done that kinds
50 of things with these grants where you can just tack in

00255

1 more money if a project didn't work and you have extra
2 money?

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
5 Dolly. The particular contract for the Hoonah/Klawock
6 work, I've already let that contract, and it's already in
7 the possession of the cooperators. For us to add -- I
8 could add money to it or amend the contract to do that.
9 It takes some lead time. This is a tough time to do it
10 with our contracting folks, because they're closing out
11 last year and getting ready for the next year, but it can
12 be done. What I need for something like that is a pretty
13 detailed plan of work so I know what the objectives are
14 and the deliverables are so I can let a contract that
15 enforceable and the work gets done. But it's not outside
16 the realm of possibility.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You're fading away.
19 You're sounding like a bureaucrat, and I can't hear you.

20

21 MR. CASIPIT: It can be done.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: When would be a drop
24 dead date to get this in, because at this point we're
25 not worried about how difficult it's going to be. We
26 just want to see that it gets done.

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: The sooner the better. And
29 it would have to depend on what Mike's capabilities are
30 to, you know, to do this work, and also there's some
31 obvious requirements for FIS to get this going, too.

32

33 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

34

35 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and
36 the other thing is, is this is all -- again this is the
37 stuff where it still has to go to the Federal Board to
38 get their approval, and that meeting is in December, so
39 there's still that step that we have to go through as
40 well. We can make your recommendation to the Federal
41 Board, and then that might be the start of the action.

42

43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Ad hoc.

44

45 MS. GARZA: Bob? Can you do something
46 with that? So the recommendation would be to expand the
47 Klawock TEK project to include, and you have to help me
48 on here.

49

50 MR. TUREK: Key respondent interviews

00256

1 concerning traditional use of the steelhead. And Nancy
2 did pick up some of that information, and she's done
3 quite a bit of work on historical data, so we've got
4 actually a start in that direction. The key would be to
5 get the -- especially if we could rehire the two people
6 that worked for us in Craig and Klawock who did a lot of
7 the interviews, that would really help, because they're
8 already trained and they did quite a good job, so.....
9

10 MS. GARZA: So did you hear Mike? Expand
11 the Klawock TEK project to include key respondent
12 interviews for steelhead.

13
14 MS. WHEELER: It would be on traditional
15 use of steelhead is what I heard.

16
17 MS. GARZA: Okay.

18
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20
21 MS. WHEELER: Okay.

22
23 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Are we just making a
24 list of possibilities?

25
26 MS. GARZA: Yeah. But.....

27
28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You've got it, Dolly.
29

30 MS. GARZA: Okay. I guess this is
31 because of you. So I jumped ahead somewhat. You were
32 saying, okay, what if this Council doesn't support the
33 TEK project that's in front of us. If we don't support
34 it, that money could die. So I was trying to figure out
35 can we capture the use of that money by an on-going
36 grant. Separate from that, we have to list what do we
37 think the needs for the next kind of years, which could
38 be steelhead stock assessment on Prince of Wales, which
39 could be Unuk River hooligan, which could be whatever
40 else we as a Council think are important.

41
42 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

43
44 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Yesterday when
45 we were talking, we had no numbers, not just from
46 traditional users. We didn't have -- we're talking about
47 stock assessment, not TEK, but I don't have much problem
48 taking those TEK funds and using them for stock
49 assessment, I mean, if we don't hit the three to one and
50 we don't have a viable project. We haven't voted on

00257

1 that, and maybe it is viable. But in my opinion -- well,
2 I won't say any more right now, but the stock assessment
3 as opposed to the household surveys or whatever that Mike
4 has going on right now would be of more interest to me.
5 We don't have good numbers, and we're not talking about
6 just the harvesters. We're talking about we don't have
7 good numbers in the commercial fishery, we don't have
8 good numbers in the sport fishery. We don't what's
9 happening in those rivers. So that was more my point I
10 think was the over-all stock assessment of what's
11 happening on -- which is outside of TEK, you know, if you
12 try to lock us into that.

13

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike.

15

16 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 I was prepared to make a motion to prioritize the
18 assessment of steelhead on Prince of Wales Island,
19 meaning.....

20

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: A motion is in order.

22

23 MR. DOUVILLE: That is a motion. I move
24 that the assessment of steelhead on Prince of Wales
25 Island be one of our top priorities.

26

27 MS. GARZA: Second.

28

29 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and
30 seconded. Discussion?

31

32 MS. GARZA: Question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
35 called. All those in favor say aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

40

41 (No opposing votes.)

42

43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carried.

44

45 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair?

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly and then John.

48

49 MS. GARZA: But I guess why I was going
50 to do the TEK one is because I don't think the 49,000 is

00258

1 near enough to do the stock assessment, so it's like what
2 can you do with a small amount of money to get this
3 started. One of the big things that Mike kept bringing
4 up yesterday was 600 isn't enough. 600 isn't enough.
5 600 isn't enough, realizing that hopefully next year
6 we'll see a large proposal for steelhead assessment on
7 Prince of Wales.

8

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

10

11 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Just to impart by what
12 happened with that, and why I voted for that, I think
13 it's very high priority. But I want to make clear that
14 I'm defaulting to the priorities that we selected
15 previously. In other words, that has not changed for me,
16 traditional TEK projects were the number one priority,
17 followed by harvest monitoring and followed by the
18 sockeye and coho fisheries, which I still believe are the
19 highest ones. But in this particular case, I think this
20 is important. It's information we need, and that's why I
21 supported it. Just we didn't really have time to comment
22 on it, but that was.....

23

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. So the action we
25 just took doesn't take away from anything we had as a
26 priority before.

27

28 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman?

29

30 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Marilyn?

31

32 MS. WILSON: The motion we just voted
33 for, does that mean we're going to try to include it in
34 Klawock project, or just to prioritize it for 2004?

35

36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Right now. Patty.

37

38 MS. PHILLIPS: First I want to recollect
39 that it was at our last Hoonah meeting which was quite a
40 few years ago, that it was one of the first, it was the
41 first or one of the first meetings where this Council
42 recommended that they fund -- it wasn't titled FIS then,
43 but that we needed resource information. And it was at
44 Hoonah that we began to get it on the record. And so I
45 think it's appropriate that we're back in Hoonah again
46 with some follow up, that we work and it shows. But I
47 want to comment on Dolly's proposal here about adding on
48 to the Klawock TEK project, and I think it's an excellent
49 idea, and if the bureaucracy can be that responsive, then
50 that would be cool. But I put a lot of faith in the

00259

1 system, in a project that's already shown it can work,
2 and I appreciate that Mike Turek has longevity in the
3 State Subsistence Department, and has followed through on
4 these projects to make sure that they come close to
5 completion. And there's a certain level of trust that I
6 have knowing that if you can tack this onto the Klawock
7 project, that we'll get some good numbers. I agree that
8 we do need to do some steelhead assessment. It happens
9 to be one of the priorities at this meeting. At one of
10 our past meetings Situk, Ahrnklin, Alsek were our
11 priorities, and so we identified those as a need for our
12 list. And so because we had presentation in Yakutat from
13 Ms. Ramos, I was very pleased with the product that she
14 presented to us, and there's a certain level of trust
15 within these area. Okay. They've shown they can do it
16 for -- they've shown what they can do for Yakutat. I'm
17 willing to say maybe we should Situk and Ahrnklin,
18 because I know they can do it. They've already shown
19 they can do it. The same would apply with Gutkoo (ph),
20 Hoptahee (ph), Falls Lake. You know, we had a
21 presentation in Yakutat on that with Mike Jackson and Meg
22 Cartwright. They've shown what they can do there. I've
23 approved of it. I think they're doing a great job. And
24 if we know projects are working, then maybe we ought to
25 prioritize funding in that direction.

26

27 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

28

29 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Maybe you could refresh
30 my memory but I believe that project was so good that we
31 gave it \$50,000 more money in Yakutat, isn't that
32 correct? The Julie Ramos project.

33

34 MS. PHILLIPS: That's right. But that
35 was just to complete what she was doing. It wasn't
36 (indiscernible - simultaneous speech).

37

38 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Oh, I agree. It was a
39 good project. I don't where we're coming on this one in
40 particular. Like I said, this does not change my overall
41 Anchorage goal, the Anchorage prioritizing that we did in
42 Anchorage. I still believe in that, and I don't know
43 what the rest of the Council does, but my vote on that
44 didn't change that for me. that's all I was saying.

45

46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The only thing that our
47 vote represents on here is that to take advantage of an
48 opportunity to an issue that we see wants being
49 considered as a priority of use. Dolly.

50

00260

1 MS. GARZA: Right. And so I was just
2 trying to get an idea of what the possibilities were. We
3 have not addressed the four proposals that are before us,
4 and if we chose not to support one, then we would look at
5 that first bit of language and say, can we do that. And
6 so I was just trying to get an idea from FIS staff, is
7 that a possibility if they don't support the one TEK
8 project. So we are a bit out of sequence, but I had to
9 have an idea in my mind if it was even a possibility. So
10 the question I had for your, Doug was in terms of right
11 now we're telling you that right now that we think that
12 Prince of Wales steelhead is it. When you take it back,
13 does that mean that that will go into the RFP proposal
14 process next year, and then when it comes back to us, we
15 still have our own criteria for how we do it, and if
16 there's 10 proposal then we're going to rate them, are
17 they TEK, are they salmon stock, and is the steelhead the
18 one that we wanted if that was so important. So I think
19 we're okay.

20

21 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, I think
22 our past direction then was that this is how we
23 prioritize and this is how we wanted to see them
24 presented in that priority to us. And so therefore it's
25 important to let them know about steelhead, which is
26 outside of those four.

27

28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Doug?

29

30 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I guess in
31 answer to some comments and questions, and, Dolly, you
32 perfectly described what will happen. We will add Prince
33 of Wales Island steelhead in the issues and information
34 needs that will go out in the call for proposals so that,
35 you know, potential investigators know that this process
36 is interested in that subject matter, so that will
37 happen. But in addition, I mean, nothing else is changed
38 in terms of the other issues and information needs, and
39 we're also going to publish TEK and stock assessment for
40 sockeye and coho and harvest monitoring and all of that
41 stuff. And then earlier you were questioning about, you
42 know, are you going to have a choice of projects, that
43 there will be some that are recommended and some that
44 don't. I mean, I think very much what is going to happen
45 this time next year is we're going to bring a package of
46 projects back, and, you know, we're going to make a draft
47 recommendation for funding, but there's going to be a lot
48 of unfunded work left on the table. That's what I think
49 is going to happen.

50

00261

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

2

3 MS. GARZA: I guess the other point, in
4 looking at these four points, Mr. McBride, is that in
5 talking to some of the communities that I've talked to,
6 it sounded like the RFP sort of focused for the TEK on
7 the history of subsistence regulations, and they thought,
8 oh, I don't want to do that, so I'm not going to submit
9 anything for TEK, so we just need to in the next process
10 make sure that the communities in Southeast understand
11 that it's not limited to that, so perhaps we as a council
12 by listing it as a priority directed away some other
13 projects that communities are interested in doing,
14 because I know there's more TEK projects in other parts
15 of the State that's kind of exciting. And perhaps these
16 guys don't understand what the possibilities are.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

19

20 MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, thank you. Ms.
21 Garza, I think, too, that just putting TEK in there can
22 be. Sometimes people don't really know what it means. I
23 mean, they know what it means, but in terms of coming up
24 with projects, so it might be useful to say, you know,
25 projects involving the use and collection of TEK such as,
26 and you as the Council could come up with some projects
27 that are just to give people maybe some additional
28 direction or if people have questions, you might direct
29 them to me, and I can help them out or something. But
30 just to be a little bit more -- give a little bit more
31 information, that might be helpful.

32 MS. GARZA: Uh-huh.

33

34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

35

36 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, I think
37 that's summarized on page 170 in answer to Polly's
38 question. And I just wanted to make clear that I don't
39 really see it in here, maybe it's in here somewhere, but
40 we also discussed that a high priority of the Council was
41 partnership, partnering, that we felt that partnering
42 with tribes, local communities, other entities, Fish and
43 Game, others, spreading this money around with
44 partnerships was a high priority, and I don't really see
45 that mentioned in here anywhere. Maybe I'm missing it.

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

48

49 MS. WHEELER: The partnership and
50 capacity building is a criteria by which all of the

00262

1 projects are judged, but maybe we need to be more clearly
2 about that, too.

3

4 MS. GARZA: But I think Doug covered it
5 in the beginning, so in the very beginning it was.....

6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: (Indiscernible -
8 simultaneous speech) criteria.

9

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dick. John. Who had
11 their hand.....

12

13 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I guess we're putting
14 the cart before the horse. I think we need to talk about
15 this TEK project which has no partnership, because if
16 it's a criteria, how do we get that process? I mean,
17 that's what I'm looking at.

18

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

20

21 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mr.
22 Littlefield, I believe that the Technical Review
23 Committee felt that this was project that addressed an
24 information need that had been identified by the Council,
25 and that was the main issue that they were focused on,
26 that this was an unaddressed information need, or what
27 they considered to be an unaddressed information need,
28 and that this would satisfy that information need. But
29 if you as the Council feel that there's -- that it
30 doesn't satisfy that need or whatever, then that's your
31 prerogative.

32

33 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

34

35 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chair, maybe if we could
36 go into action items on that, I think we could just do
37 it.

38

39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Go ahead. We'll do it.

40

41 MS. GARZA: Okay. Mr. Chair, then I
42 would move that the SEARAC support proposals on page 134,
43 Proposals 125, 128 and 007 on the stock status and trend
44 studies.

45

46 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

47

48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and
49 second. Discussion.

50

00263

1 MR. MARTIN: Question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
4 called. All those in favor say aye.

5

6 IN UNISON: Aye.

7

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

9

10 (No opposing votes.)

11

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carries.

13

14 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

17

18 MS. GARZA: For sake of discussion, I
19 would move that we support on page 135 Project 03-044,
20 Regulatory History of Southeast Alaska Subsistence Salmon
21 Fishery Regulations.

22

23 MR. MARTIN: Second.

24

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and
26 second. Discussion.

27

28 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

29

30 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

31

32 MS. GARZA: I will speak against
33 supporting this proposal, because as Mr. Littlefield
34 mentioned, it does not include partnershiping and
35 community participation as the stock status and trend
36 studies do, and we'll hear more on those from Meg
37 Cartwright later, but those projects incredibly include
38 their communities, and this one absolutely does not.
39 Even with one meeting somewhere in Southeast, that's not
40 the kind of participation or partnering that I think this
41 Council is interested in.

42

43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

44

45 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, I will also
46 be voting against this. I think this is a waste of
47 money. We are trying to fund a project which in the very
48 first sentence of technical merit says it doesn't believe
49 it's possible. Partnershiping is totally nonexistent.
50 Having one meeting. While this may be important, it's

00264

1 not worth that amount of money, and I would like to see
2 that money go somewhere else. And even if it doesn't,
3 I'm going to vote against it.

4

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Does anybody support
6 this motion?

7

8 MS. GARZA: Question.

9

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
11 called for. All those in favor of supporting this
12 motion, say aye.

13

14 (No in favor votes)

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed, say aye.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Opposed. That fails.
21 Dolly.

22

23 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I would move
24 that we seek to expand the Klawock TEK project to include
25 key respondent interviews for customary and traditional
26 subsistence use of steelhead on Prince of Wales.

27

28 MR. DOUVILLE: Second that motion.

29

30 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and
31 seconded. Discussion.

32

33 MS. GARZA: Under discussion, Mr.
34 Chairman, I added the seek to because I understand that
35 it will require Klawock's agreement to do that, FIS's
36 ability to do that, Cal's ability to do that grant, and
37 so that's just a desire of this Council if it can be
38 done. I would like to see it done.

39

40 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. John.

41

42 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, I will be
43 supporting this. At this late date, it's probably the
44 only thing that really makes sense that we can add to,
45 get a contract change, and so therefore I will support
46 it.

47

48 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, could you go
49 over the motion again?

50

00265

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Up there.

2

3 MS. GARZA: It's up there. Steve, you
4 have a question mark there, so you can. Call for the
5 question.

6

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question was
8 called. All those in favor say aye.

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

13

14 (No opposing votes.)

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.
17 Dolly.

18

19 MS. GARZA: So, Mr. Chairman, under the
20 stock status and trends, Mr. Douville has moved and
21 passed that we focus on Prince of Wales steelhead, and
22 looking at the other things on that last page of what we
23 should be doing, on 174. I think the other thing we
24 should do is take out history of subsistence regulation
25 in Southeast from the priority, and allow TEK proposal
26 people to focus on what they think is important.

27

28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Do I hear a motion?

29

30 MS. GARZA: I so move.

31

32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is there a second?

33

34 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and
37 second. Discussion.

38

39 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
42 called to take out that section. All those in favor say
43 aye.

44

45 IN UNISON: Aye.

46

47 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Opposed?

48

49 (No opposing votes.)

50

00266

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carries. John.

2

3 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, in support
4 of what Doug and Polly know that previous action of the
5 SEARAC this morning also showed the hooligans to be an
6 important species. They do not appear on our previous
7 list of prioritized items, and I believe it should be.
8 At least in my opinion it should be known that those
9 projects are also prioritized by a previous action this
10 morning where we listed those specially in the customary
11 trade. So it may be that we need some information. I
12 don't know how to add those, but I think that they're not
13 within the four broad guidelines, but I think it's still
14 a concern of the Council.

15

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

17

18 MS. WHEELER: Just for clarification, Mr.
19 Littlefield, as I understand it, the specific issue not
20 explicitly addressed is as Doug outlines in this first
21 point, the Unuk River hooligan, but did you want just
22 hooligan, not necessarily specifically Unuk River?

23

24 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I guess I don't want
25 them to fall by the wayside having sockeye and coho being
26 weighted so high above that they don't get considered.
27 In other words sockeye and coho are a primary species,
28 and we now have steelhead there, but I want to make sure
29 that hooligan, you know, that they're recognized as an
30 importance.

31

32 MS. GARZA: Are you moving?

33

34 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I am moving.

35

36 MS. GARZA: I will second it.

37

38 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and
39 seconded. Discussion.

40

41 MS. WILSON: Moved and seconded what? I
42 can't hear.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's up there.

45

46 MS. WILSON: I can't read it either.

47

48 MR. SCHROEDER: Could you read the motion
49 to the Council. Could you give me wording on it, please?

50

00267

1 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Do you want to
2 wordsmith it for us, so it's pretty?

3
4 MS. GARZA: That we prioritize Unuk River
5 hooligan.

6
7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Hooligans.

8
9 MS. GARZA: Which was already listed on
10 the first bulletin, so we're just basically saying you're
11 right.

12
13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I just want to make a
14 clarification, Marilyn's (indiscernible) by herself.
15 There's three of here. We'll not admit to anything. We
16 can't read, we can't hear, and so we're suffering here.
17 We're depending on you guys' interaction to keep us
18 straight. So our sound system leaves something to be
19 desired. The infrastructure isn't as suitable for
20 acoustics as we'd like it to be. Some of you
21 deliberately don't want to be heard, and this kind of
22 thing, so.....

23
24 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Speak for yourself, Mr.
25 Chairman.

26
27 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Oh, now I've got to
28 speak for myself, John. Anyway you guys are doing a good
29 job. We don't have the best of circumstances with the
30 sound system, so you guys are still doing fine, so I just
31 wanted to point that out, but it is difficult hearing.
32 Polly's easy to hear. You guys with the masculine voices
33 are too masculine. You've got to tighten it up a little
34 bit. Okay. Doug, I think you had your hand up.

35
36 MR. McBRIDE: Well, I guess just as a
37 suggestion, I think you made it clear you want to remove
38 regulation review, which was the fourth of the broad
39 categories, and what you might want to have as a motion
40 as a replacement for the fourth category would be other
41 species important to subsistence including Prince of
42 Wales steelhead and eulachon.

43
44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Are we good to go?

45
46 MR. LITTLEFIELD: We never voted for
47 regulatory review, so that sounds like a good idea to me.

48
49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It looks like we mutual
50 confidence established. No? Mike's looking at me a

00268

1 little bit of a skeptical focus. Next. Where does that
2 bring us to now?

3

4 MR. LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion.

5

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pardon me?

7

8 MR. LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion on the
9 floor.

10

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. We still....

12

13 MS. GARZA: Call for the question.

14

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
16 called for. All those in favor, say aye.

17

18 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Wait a minute, can you
19 read it or show it to us? Which one is it?

20

21 MS. GARZA: The Council identified
22 information needs to provide better data on subsistence
23 hooligan fisheries particularly on the Unuk and the
24 Chakaman (ph)?

25

26 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Chickamin.

27

28 MS. GARZA: Chickamin rivers.

29

30 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Good.

31

32 MS. GARZA: That's what John moved and I
33 seconded.

34

35 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Eventually when we
36 amended it to that so it's clear. Okay.

37

38 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
39 called for.

40

41 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Wait a minute.

42

43 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pardon?

44

45 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Wait a minute. We need
46 to add POW steelhead.

47

48 MS. GARZA: We already passed that.

49

50 MR. LITTLEFIELD: No, but isn't this

00269

1 replacing the regulatory review with.....

2

3 MS. GARZA: Well, that has to be a
4 separate. Okay. So we'll do it in a separate motion.

5

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: We'll make that a
7 separate motion.

8

9 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay.

10

11 MS. GARZA: Question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
14 called. All in favor say aye.

15

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

19

20 (No opposing votes.)

21

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.
23 John.

24

25 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'd like to on page 170
26 make a motion to replace the regulation review with the
27 previous two motions, to incorporate the previous two
28 motions, which was in particular the hooligan and
29 steelhead.

30

31 MR. DOUVILLE: Did you make a motion?

32

33 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I tried to. Nobody
34 seconded it.

35

36 MS. GARZA: Second.

37

38 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

39

40 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. It's been moved
41 and seconded.

42

43 MR. SCHROEDER: First if you can repeat
44 the motion?

45

46 MR. LITTLEFIELD: The motion is on page
47 170 to replace regulation review, and after TEK harvest
48 monitoring, salmon assessment for sockeye and coho, and
49 regulation review, I'd like to replace regulation review
50 to include the species identified in the previous two

00270

1 motions, which is particularly hooligan and steelhead,
2 POW steelhead. And if you want it, it's the Unuk and the
3 Chickamin hooligan, so we're not talking about hooligan
4 somewhere else.

5
6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Chickamin hooligan.
7 John.

8
9 MR. LITTLEFIELD: And a rationale, I
10 think regulatory review projects due to their probable
11 total lack of partnershiping would not be very highly
12 rated by this councilman, so that's why I'm proposing
13 this change.

14
15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Further discussion?
16 What's the wish of the Council?

17
18 MR. MARTIN: Question.

19
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
21 called. All those in favor say aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed, same
26 sign.

27
28 (No opposing votes.)

29
30 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.

31
32 MR. STOKES: Mr. Chair?

33
34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dick.

35
36 MR. STOKES: Since we're talking about
37 hooligan, I was just wondering, last spring I was in
38 Juneau, and a group there were going to deal with some
39 studying, and they told me that they were going to start
40 at Berner's Bay, and I requested that they look at the
41 Stikine. They said that they were going to start there
42 last spring, and I'm just wondering could you tell me
43 what happened to that?

44
45 MR. TUREK: Chairman Thomas, and Mr.
46 Stokes, I'm not sure how much research they did on
47 Berner's Bay. I know they started it, but I'm not sure,
48 you know, how far they got with that.

49
50 MR. STOKES: Well, maybe that was a

00271

1 federal project then. Is that what it was?

2

3 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
4 Mr. Stokes. Yes, you're right. Last spring some of our
5 fisheries biologists in the Forest Service were able to
6 get some funding from the National Marine Fisheries
7 Service to look at hooligan starting in the Berner's Bay,
8 and it's a long-term project, a long-term commitment that
9 NMFS has made to fund some work with hooligan in
10 Southeast Alaska. They started in Berner's and they're
11 going to expand as they get more money and they get the
12 techniques refined. But it's actually NMFS money that's
13 coming in for that.

14

15 MR. STOKES: I have another question for
16 you. This time for you. Right after the ice comes out
17 of the Stikine, the U.S. and Canadian starts a monitoring
18 program, and it's on this side of the border, and they
19 continue on from king salmon, sockeye, and then right now
20 they're on the coho. And the coho group were through day
21 before yesterday. And they have an ongoing program in
22 Canada where a friend of mine is up there doing some
23 monitoring on the silvers. And I was just wondering why
24 we can't get that information.

25

26 MR. TUREK: Chairman Thomas, Mr. Stokes.
27 You mean the information from the Canadian Government or?

28

29 MR. STOKES: I couldn't hear you.

30

31 MR. TUREK: Would you be talking about
32 information the Canadian Government has collected?

33

34 MR. STOKES: Yes.

35

36 MR. TUREK: Yeah, I think that we could
37 do that, contact DFO and find out what the status of it
38 is, and I'm sure they'd be willing to share it.

39

40 MR. STOKES: I'm just wondering why that
41 information that they're gathering is not made available
42 to us.

43

44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It probably would be
45 something Mike didn't want to share with us.

46

47 MR. TUREK: Yeah.

48

49 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Cal?

50

00272

1 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
2 Mr. Stokes, the information you're referring to I think
3 are the in-season assessments that are done cooperatively
4 between the Canadian Government and Alaska Department of
5 Fish and Game on these transboundary rivers, and, excuse
6 me, in the transboundary rivers, and that information is
7 commonly presented at the Transboundary River meetings,
8 so, Dick, if you come in December to the Transboundary
9 Panel meeting, you'll probably get exposed to a lot of
10 that information that they've been collecting.

11
12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Did everybody hear?

13
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.
15 (Affirmative)

16
17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I didn't, but that's
18 all right. Is there anything else on Stikine River?
19 Okay. Where does that bring us to now, guys?

20
21 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Wait a minute. Wait a
22 minute.

23
24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John?

25
26 MR. LITTLEFIELD: As a comment before
27 they leave, I'd like to once again state my concern with
28 not having a list of options that were presented to us to
29 pick from. We're really trying to struggle to do this,
30 and if again this comes up where a project that you
31 propose which we believe may or may not be appropriate,
32 we should be able to have something that we can choose
33 from instead of trying to, you know, really shoot from
34 the hip here and figure out a way to reallocate that
35 money. I hate to lose that money. I want to see it
36 allocated, and I think the way to do that is to make sure
37 that we have a grab bag that we can -- that could be the
38 second alternatives. So the list would be more inclusive
39 next time. Next year.

40
41 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. How long
42 break?

43
44 MR. STOKES: Five minutes.

45
46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Five-minute break.

47
48 (Off record)

49
50 (On record)

00273

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I sense an attempt at
2 mutiny here, and we're going to squelch it in its tracks.
3 Okay. We've got some scheduling concerns. And, you
4 know, it's ironic that the only time they bring these up
5 is at these RAC meetings. We must be miracle workers,
6 you know, to accommodate to where we're people for all
7 seasons for all reasons, and proud of it. Okay. Let me
8 hear from the people that have to leave? Sitka Tribe, do
9 you've got to leave? We've Sitka Tribe, we've got Forest
10 Service staff, we've got different people that need to
11 leave. Dan.

12
13 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman?

14
15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah?

16
17 MR. SCHROEDER: I think we have two sets
18 of people who need to leave. Fred Salinas has to be out
19 of here to do something else, and he won't be available
20 tomorrow, so he's going to assist with a presentation on
21 the wilderness EIS.

22
23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I understand that.
24 But I understand that there's also needs of a different
25 nature from other parties, and so they need to be
26 considered. Sitka Tribe didn't respond, so you guys are
27 okay?

28
29 MR. LORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, where are
30 you at on the agenda?

31
32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: We're trying to
33 determine who to have up here to accommodate them that
34 need to leave. We've got several parties that need to
35 leave for different reasons, and we're trying to
36 accommodate each of them the best we can.

37
38 MR. LORRIGAN: (Indiscernible - away from
39 microphone)

40
41 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have to.
42 (Indiscernible) tonight.

43
44 MR. LORRIGAN: Who has to leave?

45
46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Forest Service people,
47 OSM people.

48
49 MR. LORRIGAN: Okay. We're leaving
50 tomorrow at 11:00.

00274

1 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, at this
2 time to update, probably the one set of people who do
3 have to leave are some OSM people, the FIS folks have to
4 leave, and it would be real useful if they heard the TEK
5 presentation from the Southeast tribes. Other than that,
6 our schedule is at the Chair's discretion.

7

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It would be easier for
9 me if these updates were brought to me directly, because
10 I'm having a hell of a time hearing, I'm telling you. So
11 what's the status, you guys don't need to leave or what?

12

13 MS. GARZA: They need to leave tomorrow.

14

15 MR. LORRIGAN: Well, we're leaving
16 tomorrow at 11. We didn't know what time this was.....

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You're leaving
19 tomorrow?

20

21 MR. LORRIGAN: At 11.

22

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: At 11?

24

25 MR. LORRIGAN: Right. We didn't know
26 where we were on the schedule since we bounced around
27 today.

28

29 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: We'll get you on before
30 11.

31

32 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: In fact we'll have you
35 on at 5:30 a.m.

36

37 MR. LORRIGAN: Okay. Will you be here?

38

39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: No. Okay. Number 14.
40 Wilderness EIS. Front and center on the double. After
41 all the fuss, you better be here.

42

43 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, may I
44 introduce the topic?

45

46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Excuse me?

47

48 MR. SCHROEDER: May I introduce this
49 topic?

50

00275

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yes.

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: The Regional Advisory
4 Council has been interested in providing comments on the
5 wilderness EIS. The EIS wasn't out on the street at our
6 spring meeting, so the Council wasn't able to meet as a
7 Council and discuss the EIS at that time. Over the
8 summer a number of Council members approached me. I
9 contacted the Council and determined that the Council did
10 want to provide comments on the EIS. We held a
11 teleconference on July 24th. Seven Council members were
12 able to attend the teleconference, and the teleconference
13 resulted in a three-page preliminary comment sheet which
14 was forwarded to Tom Puchler (ph), the Forest Supervisor
15 who will be the decision-maker on this EIS. At this time
16 the Counsel wanted to the opportunity to look at this EIS
17 as a Counsel at a regular formally notified meeting, and
18 that's what we're doing today. The official comment
19 period for this EIS is closed. Mr. Puchler (ph) assured
20 us that he would consider the comments of the Council if
21 they were received shortly after this meeting. We have
22 Forest Service staff available to provide an overview and
23 guide through the EIS, and we have one person who wishes
24 to provide a public comment which could be taken at this
25 point, or we could wait until after Forest Service has
26 given an overview of this EIS.

27

28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, you don't have to
29 stall any more. He got here.

30

31 MR. SCHROEDER: I got your attention.

32

33 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, you've got his
34 ear now. Okay. Who's up? Who's on first? Who's on
35 deck?

36

37 MR. KANEN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and
38 Regional Council. My name's Dale Kanen. I am the
39 District Ranger with the Forest Service in Craig.

40

41 MS. GOULARTE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair
42 and Council. I'm Carol Goularte. I'm the District
43 Ranger for the Sitka Ranger District on the Tongass.

44

45 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Welcome to both of you.

46

47 MS. WILSON: What's your last name again,
48 Carol?

49

50 MS. GOULARTE: Carol Goularte.

00276

1 MS. WILSON: And how do you spell that?

2

3 MS. GOULARTE: G-O-U-L-A-R-T-E.

4

5 MS. WILSON: Thank you.

6

7 MR. KANEN: So before we begin with our
8 presentation, we were wondering how far the Council would
9 like to go? Would you like us to do a brief overview of
10 the alternatives and the process or do you want to go
11 straight to questions? On that regard, I'm perhaps able
12 to speak for perhaps five minutes with a broad overview.

13

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I told you, you didn't
15 have to stall no more. He's here.

16

17 MR. KANEN: I would like to yield my seat
18 to my distinguished colleague from Sitka.

19

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I must say you guys are
21 very tactful and professional at putting a devil club
22 leaf over a rose. They did a good job of protecting you.

23

24 MR. SALINAS: Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Tell us who you are,
27 what you're motives are and how you're interacting.

28

29 MR. SALINAS: Mr. Chairman Thomas, thank
30 you very much for giving us this opportunity to speak to
31 you about the supplemental EIS to the Tongass Land
32 Management Plan. We appreciate this opportunity, and we
33 do realize that this group of people, this Council is
34 very important and should be a part and should interact
35 with us relating to this process we're going through, and
36 particularly as it pertains to subsistence. So we do
37 agree with you that this is an important opportunity for
38 you and for all of us, and also an opportunity for us to
39 listen further to the comments and issues that you have.

40

41 We are prepared to give you a brief
42 overview of the supplemental EIS, this process and also
43 to, you know, interact with you on questions. We're not
44 fully prepared.....

45

46 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Let me interrupt you.
47 That young lady against the wall over there, if she
48 doesn't get your name, will be mad at you forever.

49

50 MR. SALINAS: Thank you very much. May

00277

1 name is Fred Salinas. I'm the Deputy Forest Supervisor
2 for the Tongass, and.....

3

4 MS. GOULARTE: We've already introduced.

5

6 MR. SALINAS: Okay. The other two are
7 set. So I think we're set now.

8

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Tank you very much.

10

11 MR. SALINAS: And thank you for pointing
12 that out. What I want to do is just begin by giving a
13 brief overview of the supplemental EIS, starting out by
14 just talking some things that you already know, but I do
15 want everybody to understand really what it is and what
16 we're doing. And I'll begin by saying that we have a
17 Tongass Land Management Plan and you're going to hear us
18 refer to the '97 plan, the '97 Tongass Land Management
19 Plan. That's the basis of all our work that's occurring
20 today. It's the basis of our implementation of the forest
21 plan.

22

23 Now, this hasn't been simple. Over the
24 last few years we have gone through several challenges to
25 the '97 plan, and there has been numerous what we would
26 call set backs and diversions in terms of implementing
27 this plan with what you might remember about the '99
28 record of decision and the lawsuits that have occurred
29 following that. And I'm only mentioning that to say that
30 as we implement this '97 plan, what occurred a little
31 more than a year ago was that the judge determined that
32 we had failed to include wilderness, a wilderness
33 alternative in our plan. And I want to establish that,
34 and not in defense of what occurred prior to the current
35 administration, but just to say that folks that developed
36 the '97 plan did believe sincerely that wilderness had
37 been considered over the development of that '97 plan.
38 It occurred over a number of years, and during that
39 period of time twice Congress had intervened to establish
40 wilderness during that process. At two different times.
41 And the total current amount of wilderness that's in the
42 current plan as well as that was in view at that time was
43 about six million acres of wilderness that was
44 established during those process and that we current have
45 to date.

46

47 I'm saying these things so that everybody
48 does understand that the folks that developed the plan
49 again sincerely believed that wilderness had been
50 considered. That had gone through all the steps in the

00278

1 processes in the analysis of the management situation to
2 look at all the roadless areas, and we're looking at 115
3 today. They looked at those and said -- and through the
4 process of looking at attribute that would apply to all
5 of these areas, they felt that based on what had occurred
6 in the recent history that the Tongass Land Management
7 Plan had considered wilderness, and so that's why it was
8 left out.

9

10 And so we have to think about that today
11 in light of what Judge Singleton, his decision. It was
12 primarily a technicality, and leaving that alternative
13 out, that he's focusing in on.

14

15 So our process as we talk about the
16 supplemental, it's a supplemental to the Tongass Land
17 Management Plan, that this process that we're referring
18 to and what we've been going through for a little over a
19 year. And the focus of this process that we're going
20 through was to evaluate roadless area for wilderness
21 recommendation, and that's what we'll do as we finish
22 this process and get ready to make recommendations to the
23 Regional Forester, who will then make a record of
24 decision that will be forwarded basically to our national
25 office, and then at that point in time Congress will make
26 the final determination on whether or not they want to
27 introduce legislation to establish wilderness based on
28 the recommendations.

29

30 So this draft EIS as I said is focused on
31 looking at 115 roadless areas that current exist on the
32 Tongass, and that 115 roadless areas represent about 9.5,
33 9.6 million acres of land. That's about 60 percent of
34 the Tongass National Forest is represented in what you
35 all are concerned about, and what your comments pertain
36 to.

37

38 As you know, the Forest Service when we
39 put our draft out, we identified a preferred alternative.
40 That was alternative 1, which is basically what we call
41 the no action alternative. We came out with that
42 preferred alternative because it did in fact we believe
43 represent, will represent the existing '97 plan. Now,
44 I'm going to repeat some things, but again I want
45 everybody to understand why we came out the way where did
46 at that point in time. We felt and believed that the '97
47 plan wasn't broken. We thought it was a good plan. We
48 thought it had a lot of good collaboration. We're not
49 saying it's perfect, because I'm not sure there's any of
50 those kind that exist. We did believe at that point in

00279

1 time it represented one of the best efforts to bring
2 science and management together in a land management
3 planning effort. We also thought that it believed that
4 it struck a very good balance for use and protection,
5 because that's really what this whole discussion is all
6 about. How much use do you allow and how much protection
7 and what kind of protection do you want? Wilderness in
8 fact does protect, but as you look at the Tongass Land
9 Management Plan as it currently exists, we also felt and
10 believed that it afforded a lot of protection just as it
11 stood. Again, not being perfect, but again it offered a
12 lot of good protection, a lot of good management that
13 addressed the issues such as subsistence. And every time
14 we proposed a timber sale or some other kind of project,
15 particularly a timber sale, those that we have agreed
16 that we would do, eight, 10 hearings on those that the
17 Forest Supervisor would sign. And that was just, you
18 know, recent work that we did, but again recognizing that
19 subsistence and maybe the basis, the criteria, the data
20 that we were using needed to have a harder look at that.
21 But again all of that work and interaction with this
22 Council and with individual tribes and with individual
23 communities was not detracted at all, or taken at all or
24 taken away from or diminished in any way by the '97 plan.
25 In fact, we thought all of those interactions, all of
26 those activities could take place and will represent the
27 issues.

28
29 Okay. I want to mention two things. As
30 we launch this process, we identify clearly that there
31 were two key issues, and the first issue is stated this
32 way: Is wilderness designation the most appropriate
33 level of protection for roadless lands in the Tongass
34 National Forest? I think that's very key, particularly
35 for your input, as a Council or individuals, and
36 particularly -- and in relation to all the Council and
37 all the comments that we've received to date. It's very
38 important for people to keep in mind that that's being
39 the key issue, and the questions that it raised, how do
40 you respond to them. Is wilderness designation the most
41 appropriate level of protection for roadless lands? And
42 again there's 115 roadless areas representing about 9.6
43 million acres.

44
45 The second issue states what would be the
46 social and economic effects of wilderness designation on
47 the 32 communities and the recreation and tourism, fish
48 and timber and mining industries in Southeast Alaska?
49 That's really important to us again, because we represent
50 all peoples in the entire national -- all of the

00280

1 resources of the national forest and how do you strike a
2 balance with the decisions you make right up to the level
3 of protection that you want on these lands. We make the
4 statement that the Tongass is roughly 17 million acres.
5 There's 19 wildernesses in the Tongass representing
6 almost six million acres. Again, the inventory of
7 roadless areas is 115 representing 9.6 million acres.

8

9 The roadless areas, the roadless acres,
10 wanting to focus in on that. We've got approximately 2.5
11 million acres or 15 percent of that's related to the land
12 that we're actually proposing within the plan that would
13 be affected, that we would have actual activities on it
14 that would change the stands of timber that currently
15 exist there.

16

17 Currently roadless, we talking about again
18 a fairly minimal amount of area that's proposed in the
19 current '97 plan, approximately four percent of the land
20 base on the Tongass being affected by the current land
21 management plan as we implement it.

22

23 Just a couple more things before we get
24 into some discussion of the various alternatives, and I
25 do want to know -- again, we're not prepared to get too
26 specific into those, but I do think that we can answer
27 some basic questions or general questions about each of
28 the alternatives. Here's a statement that I think is
29 very important, getting back to this '97 forest plan
30 revision. It did designate about 74 percent of the
31 inventory of roadless areas for non development. Again
32 it's a very important aspect to understand about the
33 current plan that we're implementing, in the process of
34 implementing, and the context of the roadless areas that
35 we're looking at for possible recommendations as
36 wilderness.

37

38 An important question, or important point
39 that we are at this point is, you know, what has changed
40 relative to the point in time when we started to
41 implement the '97 plan, and as we look at possibly
42 recommending additional wilderness within these 115
43 roadless areas. Important questions that I think must be
44 considered, and I'm saying this because as we look at all
45 the comments that we received, including yours, it's
46 going to be very important that as we look at those -- as
47 we look at those comments, it's important to understand
48 that the whole process of a supplemental EIS and taking
49 comments isn't a voting process. In other words,
50 everybody raising their right hand to indicate that

00281

1 they're in favor of this alternative or that alternative
2 isn't sufficient for us to be able to analyze the issues
3 and analyze whether or not we would recommend a portion
4 of an inventoried roadless area for wilderness. Here's
5 an example. If in fact you feel 10 of the inventoried
6 roadless areas should be made wilderness, and you -- and
7 that's your believe and recommendation, it's important to
8 back that up with some rationale, because as we look at
9 it, one of the first things we're going to do is run it
10 through what we all the WARS rating system, which is the
11 Wilderness Attribute Rating System. If it comes up
12 really high as something that really should, has really
13 high attributes for wilderness, it's going to come out
14 fairly high, but if you -- and if you add onto that
15 you've made comments how important that it is, or how it
16 relates to the importance of subsistence and subsistence
17 lifestyle and needs, again I think that adds cumulatively
18 to the support and the rationale for moving that forward
19 as a possible recommendation for wilderness. But if it
20 doesn't have -- if somebody just feels that wilderness is
21 the best way to protect development, that doesn't get us
22 as much basis and as much background and information to
23 make a recommendation there. I'm saying these things,
24 because they've been somewhat misunderstood as we've gone
25 through the process.

26

27 And I think at this point maybe if
28 there's some additional thoughts that either Dale or
29 Carol have, or if I've missed something, which is
30 certainly possible, we can see if they have anything to
31 add at this point.

32

33 MR. KANEN: Well, I think along with the
34 attributes that in your mind would make it a good
35 candidate for wilderness, I would also include from a
36 subsistence standpoint, at least if that's the primary
37 interest of this body, activities that you would like to
38 see permitted within that particular land use area. Make
39 sure that, you know, if you want to have certain
40 activities, certain accesses that you spell those out. I
41 don't know that we can know for sure what Congress will
42 prescribe in terms of whether we end up with a 64
43 wilderness prescription or an ANILCA wilderness which we
44 have here for the Tongass, or something else. So be
45 specific as you can. It just improves I think the
46 outcome you would like to see.

47

48 MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

49

50 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madame

00282

1 Chair. Could you explain the LUD 2 designation so that
2 everyone understands what that means?

3

4 MR. SALINAS: Okay. Just a general
5 comment about LUD 2. In general those are legislated
6 land use designations, and those were established in
7 order to, I guess, prevent and protect from development.
8 Particularly roads. The focus was on was on road and
9 road development. They continued to allow access and
10 they continued to allow activities, but it was, I think,
11 the focus that for those designations was on roads. Now,
12 some of the -- well, we'll read to you the goal here is
13 to manage recommended land use designated LUD 2 and
14 maintain the option for future designations as LUD 2 by
15 Congress. Am I reading that?

16

17 MR. KANEN: Yes.

18

19 MR. SALINAS: Okay. Some of the
20 objectives of the LUD 2 designation, well, the generally
21 apply direction from the '97 Tongass Land Management
22 Plan, and they were to prohibit commercial timber
23 harvest. They were to allow salvage logging only to
24 prevent significant damage to other resources. Certainly
25 permit boats, aircraft and snow machines, unless such
26 uses become excessive. And that's where maybe things
27 like the Shoreline EIS come into place where that process
28 in the capacity analysis that is an important component
29 of that would be used for something like this in
30 conjunction with giving us a better idea of what the
31 kinds of activities and the level of use that we would
32 like to see out there or permit out there. That's just
33 an idea without reading the whole thing. Does that help?

34

35 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair. I was
36 looking maybe for a listing or an example of some of the
37 activities that are allowed, you know, like can you use a
38 chainsaw, can you have camps, you know, and what is not
39 allowed. If you could list maybe those, just a general
40 categorization.

41

42 MR. SALINAS: Okay. LUD 2 designation,
43 they do allow personal use for wood for cabin logs, fuel
44 wood, float logs, trolling poles, and it says et cetera.
45 That gives you an idea though. Permit water and power
46 developments if designed to be compatible with the
47 primitive characteristics of the area. Permit roads only
48 for access to authorized uses, for transportation needs
49 identified by the State or for vital linkages. You know,
50 I'm not sure what that might be, but it may bring to mind

00283

1 something like the intertie, allow mineral development,
2 and I read this one before, permit boats, aircraft and
3 snow machines unless such uses become excessive. Permit
4 fish and wildlife habitat improvements, design structures
5 to minimize -- we would design structures to minimize the
6 effects to recreational resources, permit primitive
7 recreational facilities. Major concentrated recreational
8 facilities will generally be excluded it says. That's
9 the list that's here. Again, hopefully that will be
10 helpful to you.

11

12 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

13

14 MS. GARZA: So I have a point of
15 clarification, and this doesn't make me look good, but
16 I'm not sure where we're at, because I got up to try and
17 figure out what we're doing with agendas and you guys
18 started presenting. We had an audio conference on SEIS
19 because we missed the deadline to submit, and then I
20 heard Dale saying, well, we wanted comments on what kind
21 of activities you want on it, so I'm not sure of the
22 process we're following to provide input at this time.

23

24 MR. SALINAS: Yeah, we're not sure
25 either, other than I do know that on that teleconference
26 Forest Supervisor Tom Puchler (ph) did indicated that our
27 willingness to hear comments from you at this meetings,
28 and that you have a draft prepared letter to the Forest
29 Supervisor that we have briefly looked through, and it
30 certainly does accomplish those objectives, and if you
31 wanted to reference those and talk through those, we
32 would be glad to listen.

33

34 MS. GARZA: Okay. So let me start with
35 the Council. Some of you were not on that audio
36 conference. It was pulled basically ad hoc trying to get
37 together whoever we could to talk about the wilderness
38 EIS. Several people said these are the important points
39 to me, and they were put in here. And so it's my
40 understanding that this letter went forward, and that we
41 have at this time perhaps limited, but opportunity to
42 say, yeah, that letter was great, but I'd like to see
43 this added to it. Is that where we are right now?

44

45 MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, I think
46 that's substantially correct. Also at the teleconference
47 a number of Council members wanted the opportunity to act
48 as a Council, and felt that our ad hoc teleconference
49 didn't allow us that opportunity, so that's what we can
50 do here today, in whatever detail you might wish to do

00284

1 so.

2

3 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

4

5 MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: One of the points that
8 was made was we also wanted to allow a forum, which was
9 one of our charges, in Anilca, a forum for
10 (indiscernible) to testify before the Council before we
11 took any action. Secondly, I would hope that we could
12 formalize this letter as an official Council action, not
13 endorsing any one of these, any alternative, but just to
14 say that we held this, and it is a position that we've
15 looked at, and then later maybe take a position or not as
16 the Council wishes, but just to formalize that we did
17 have this talk which was an unofficial meeting, it was an
18 ad hoc meeting, but we should recognize that it was held,
19 that's all, formally. I'll have further questions later.

20

21 MS. GARZA: So then before this Council
22 would be a recommendation to affirm this letter as a
23 Council position or a Council document, not a Council
24 position?

25

26 MR. LITTLEFIELD: As a Council document.

27

28 MS. GARZA: Yeah.

29

30 MR. LITTLEFIELD: It's not to speak in
31 favor of one alternative or another, or anything like
32 that, just that it was an official document and we will
33 take further action today or maybe not. But I would like
34 to hear from the public if there's any prior to any Board
35 discussions or the State or anybody else that wants to
36 talk.

37

38 MS. WILSON: Madame Chair?

39

40 MS. GARZA: Marilyn.

41

42 MS. WILSON: I have a question on the
43 teleconference that seven of our Council members
44 attended. What is alternative six is what is said in
45 this letter, that you intended to support.

46

47 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Well, that's what I
48 didn't want to get into yet.

49

50 MS. GARZA: Except without getting into

00285

1 it, can we have public comment? Is there anybody in the
2 public that is here to testify to the Council regarding
3 SEIS?

4

5 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Excuse me, what was the
6 range of alternatives that were -- maybe a short summary
7 of the alternatives so that everyone knows what the
8 alternatives are?

9

10 MS. GARZA: Are you Matt Davidson?

11

12 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I think Mr. Schroeder
13 has all of them on disk here, could run through them
14 fairly quickly I would hope.

15

16 MS. GARZA: Okay. So in terms of the
17 process, we still want you here, but you might have to
18 sit there so we can have -- we have one request for
19 presentation to this process. We want you to hear it,
20 then we'll have further deliberations, and hopefully
21 accept some type of a document as our formal document.
22 Okay. Matt Davidson and Ji. You forgot part of your Y.
23 Okay.

24

25 MR. DAVIDSON: J-I.

26

27 MS. CAPELLA: J-I.

28

29 MS. GARZA: J, oh, okay. Okay. So we
30 have here Southeast Alaska Conservation Council. Restate
31 your names for the record, and make sure whoever speaks
32 is speaking into the mike.

33

34 MR. DAVIDSON: Okay. My name is Matthew
35 Davidson. I'm staff with the Southeast Alaska
36 Conservation Council.

37

38 MS. CAPELLA: I'm Ji Capella, and I am
39 staff on Southeast Alaska Conservation Council.

40

41 MR. DAVIDSON: And I really appreciate
42 the opportunity to come before you today and speak on the
43 wilderness SEIS. SEACC, the Southeast Alaska
44 Conservation Council is a coalition of 18 community
45 conservation groups across the reason. We have member
46 groups in many of you all's home communities, and some of
47 you may be familiar with them. And we will appreciate
48 the Council's interest in this issue, and efforts to
49 speak out.

50

00286

1 The Council has a long-standing
2 participation in the Tongass Land Management Plan
3 process, and I know it's tedious and this current
4 rendition is also a lot of energy, so I appreciate your
5 efforts. I appreciate Fred's overview of the T-1 (ph)
6 process and his overview of the 1997 Tongass Land
7 Management Plan. I think what he didn't mention is that
8 the 1997 Management Plan was appealed by 33 different
9 parties, including the timber industry. The 1999 record
10 of decision settled those appeals, but then the timber
11 industry lawsuit threw out that decision, and so we're
12 back with the '97 plan. The judge found that the forest
13 Service didn't follow their own rules by considering new
14 protected areas in the Tongass, and that this process is
15 our opportunity to speak out for those areas, and I
16 appreciate the Council's efforts to speak out for
17 important subsistence areas in the region.

18
19 During the comment period, the 90-day
20 comment period, that happened this summer, we had 17
21 hearings in communities in Southeast Alaska and in
22 Anchorage, and they were well-attended including some in
23 your home communities. At these hearings, 86 percent of
24 the people who testified supported new protected areas in
25 the Tongass, including also across the country. This was
26 a public process across the country, and we're looking at
27 over 170,000 people across the country who participated
28 in this process, and spoke in favor of new wilderness
29 and LUD 2 areas in the Tongass, so there's a lot of
30 public attention being paid to the Tongass as you know.
31 Also during this public process many of the tribal
32 entities in Southeast Alaska spoke out in favor of new
33 protected areas that are important subsistence lands to
34 be protected from logging and road building.

35
36 Interesting, the Forest Service mentioned
37 that this is only about wilderness. This is also about
38 LUD 2. The LUD 2, we have a description of the difference
39 between wilderness and LUD 2, would like the opportunity
40 to pass that out, if that's okay. Also in the packet is
41 the appendixes to the Department of Fish and Game's
42 comments on the SEIS, and they identify important areas
43 that they thought deserved more additional protections,
44 and some of those are in your letter. They correspond
45 with the areas that you mentions in your letter.

46
47 In terms of where we are in the process,
48 the public comment period ended the end of August and the
49 Forest service is currently reviewing those comments, and
50 then sometime this fall or winter we expect to have a

00287

1 final decision released. Interestingly enough, in the
2 last couple of weeks in Washington, D.C. our
3 Congressional delegation has been attempting to stop this
4 process by capping funding to complete the SEIS and to
5 exempt the Forest Service decision from any judicial and
6 appeal review. So we'll keep you posted on that, but at
7 this point the process is still moving forward as we
8 understand.

9

10 MS. GARZA: Mr. Davidson.

11

12 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes?

13

14 MS. GARZA: Did your organization submit
15 comments on a timely basis?

16

17 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, we did. We did, and
18 our comments in addition focused mostly on areas that
19 we've trying to protect for over 30 years, and in
20 addition to that, we reviewed the documents to look for
21 technical mistakes. One of the major glaring errors and
22 oversights we thought was the lack of real analysis of
23 the impacts of the different alternatives on subsistence.
24 In the document the subsistence section was very thin and
25 basically cursory, said that, you know, within the range
26 of alternatives the more land protections, the better
27 protection we have for subsistence, but they went into
28 great detail looking at what impacts there -- and using a
29 huge multiplier in terms of the impact on some other
30 entities or the timber industry. So I think that the
31 Council should be aware that in terms of looking at the
32 impacts of new protected lands in the Tongass, the Forest
33 Service believes that it would have impact on the
34 industries, the timber and mining industries, far
35 outweigh any impact of continued logging on subsistence,
36 and I think that's a mistake. And our comments are
37 available. I didn't bring copies of them, because they
38 were very lengthy, so I thought that the Forest Service's
39 -- we brought a couple copies of the Forest Service's
40 comments -- excuse me, the Department of Fish and Game's
41 comments which go into some of the really habitat issues
42 involved with the Tongass Land Management Plan, and we
43 have a few copies of those made for the record.

44

45 I'd like to say that, you know, a lot of
46 us have different opinions about wilderness areas and the
47 Tongass. You talk about it being a 17 million acre
48 forest and there being six million acres of wilderness
49 already. We know that the majority of those acres are
50 not wildlife habitat, not areas that are heavily used for

00288

1 subsistence. Some of them are along the edges of
2 subsistence areas, but a lot of that is rock and ice and
3 not areas that we use. In the '97 plan, of the acreage
4 that is currently in the timber base, the Forest Service
5 has indicated, the Deputy Regional Forester has indicated
6 that all those major watersheds that are in the timber
7 base they're planning to enter in the next 10 years, and
8 we've seen that with over 30 logging projects planned
9 right now in these large areas eligible for wilderness
10 and LUD 2 protections, and including two very
11 controversial timber sales, one at Gravina Island near
12 Ketchikan, and one right here outside of Hoonah at Neka
13 Bay where they're planning to put a timber sale in a
14 wilderness area that's heavily used for subsistence.
15 Especially here in Hoonah where there's been no
16 consideration of the impact of the private corporation
17 logging on subsistence, and the Forest Service's
18 responsibility to maintain subsistence in these areas, so
19 Neka Bay is highlighted by SEACC as an important area
20 that should be protected as wilderness or LUD 2, and it
21 would be great to see that on a list that this Board put
22 together to honor these folks in Hoonah who rely on the
23 subsistence.

24

25 Some of the other issues that I'd like to
26 address are the issue about whether wilderness is the
27 most appropriate. It may not be the most appropriate,
28 but I urge the council to recommend exactly what things
29 they'd like to see protected. LUD 2 is also an
30 opportunity. Alternative 6 of the SEIS includes some LUD
31 2 protections which is less stringent in terms of the
32 management guidelines that it has. And it also allows
33 for the same subsistence rights that all ANILCA
34 wilderness and LUD 2 do. And I think the question about
35 whether or not the wilderness would go back to the Lower
36 48 wilderness which does not allow hunting, is really a
37 scare tactic and is really not anything that I've ever
38 heard any conservation group or anyone else call for in
39 Alaska. We're about protecting fish and wildlife habitat
40 to be used by subsistence users and recreationalists and
41 tourism. This is not about locking up land from people.
42 This is about protecting wildlife habitat, fish and
43 wildlife habitat for our organization.

44

45 And the issue about being specific about
46 what areas and what your uses of those area, I think
47 that's very important, but the question of using the
48 Forest Service's rating system as the best measure, he
49 called it the WAR score, which is they said they plug
50 each of these areas into a formula and they come up with

00289

1 a number which, you know, I think 30 is the highest
2 number. But none of the others in the Tongass received a
3 30, or maybe one or two did, and they are very remote,
4 they're a lot of rock and ice. I think we need to tell
5 them that the areas that we want protected are the fish
6 and wildlife habitat areas, and we're not interested in
7 having mountain tops as wilderness. We want areas that
8 people can access and people that they go there and they
9 hunt and fish and they use the areas. We don't need more
10 wilderness necessarily, that's not the highest priority
11 is rock and ice. We want areas that are the low
12 elevation, big remaining stands of trees that, you know,
13 produce deer and fish in the region, and we can see the
14 effects, and we have, you know, a pending train wreck in
15 some of these area where they have been heavily logged,
16 and in the next 30 years, we're going to have deer
17 problems on places like Prince of Wales which this board
18 knows a lot about, so let's protect our remaining areas,
19 and I'll be hear t answer any questions if you have any.
20

21 MS. GARZA: And does your colleague have
22 any presentation?
23

24 MR. DAVIDSON: Ji, do you have anything
25 you want to say?
26

27 MS. CAPELLA: Actually, no. I'm just
28 making sure he didn't forget anything.
29

30 MR. DAVIDSON: (Indiscernible)
31

32 MS. GARZA: Mr. Thomas.
33

34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Madame
35 Chairman. Did you participate in the public hearings,
36 public comment period?
37

38 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. Yes, I did. I
39 attended I think at least seven hearings, and I
40 participated in one hearing. I testified in one hearing.
41

42 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Did you give this same
43 presentation at those hearings?
44

45 MR. DAVIDSON: Forest Service
46 presentation?
47

48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: These same comments,
49 did you -- yeah. Forest Service presentation?
50

00290

1 MR. DAVIDSON: The presentations were
2 very similar. The presentation about the need, whether
3 or not there was -- basically one of the presentations
4 said that they supported the '97 plan, they think the '97
5 plan was sufficient. And the response usually from the
6 audience was that the '97 plan was not sufficient, and
7 this is why, because you want to go log these areas that
8 we go and hunt and fish in. And so whether or not their
9 analysis was correct is really not the issue for a lot of
10 people. It's about the areas that they want to go to and
11 want their grandchildren to continue to go to and have
12 them be in their natural state.

13

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Was any there
15 any comments or questions from the council? Thank you
16 very much.

17

18 MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you. And I will be
19 available if you have other questions.

20

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

22

23 MS. GARZA: Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mr. Woodmark. Oh,
26 Madame Chair, Mr. Widmark.

27

28 MS. GARZA: So while he's coming up, I
29 guess we want to hear informally from Hoonah if they
30 agreed with the one statement from these last presenters
31 on the Neka logging. I don't know anything about it, so
32 if you guys have a one liner of support or not support,
33 so we don't forget it. You guys can talk, and then just
34 let us know. Mr. Widmark.

35

36 MR. WIDMARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
37 Council members, Woody Widmark, Sitka Tribe of Alaska,
38 tribal chair. Just to preface my remarks, that Sitka
39 Tribe of Alaska did make its comments, consultation with
40 the Forest Service with the Sitka Ranger District, just
41 Shuk-a-kwon (ph) area. And do have respect for the other
42 tribal governments within the Tongass. Our letter dated
43 August 16, 2002 regarding the SEIS, to preface, on a
44 government-to-government on the SEIS that the Sitka Tribe
45 and the Forest Service from the Sitka Ranger District
46 have met on numerous occasions on that, and had a pretty
47 favorable consultation regarding the territory of Sitka
48 Tribe, and I wanted to make that -- not just once, not
49 just a couple times, but three or four times, meeting
50 with the Tribal Council, the staff, and our comments from

00291

1 our elders as well, too.

2

3 I guess in a nutshell that Sitka Tribe
4 did support alternative 3. To remark on this, or to
5 expand on this, that alternative 3 may or may not have
6 been our best one, but that was the one that Sitka Tribe
7 did come make its remarks on. We could have gone either
8 way though, but we do have concern on the Poison Cove and
9 Ush Bay that that's been historical I think for the past
10 10 years on that, where the tribe had concerns on
11 logging, subsistence, habitat and historic cultural stuff
12 that Sitka Tribe was concerned about.

13

14 Things that we're worried about or at
15 least made comments on was archaeological protection. To
16 paraphrase, we support the wilderness because these
17 important sites will become protected. However, Sitka
18 Tribe would like all archaeological sites to be protected
19 and given a buffer zone similar to anadromous streams.
20 In the future, Sitka Tribe would likely achieve most of
21 this work by establishing a tribal historic preservation
22 officer, TIPO if you will, as provided in section blah-
23 blah-blah of the National Historic preservation Act.

24

25 To summarize I guess and make it briefly,
26 a couple things in our letter and Carol Goularte, the
27 Sitka District Ranger, did receive this, and I'm sorry
28 that we didn't make copies for the Council members here,
29 but some of the things that the Sitka Tribe looked at was
30 protecting our native allotments which is in this area
31 where the Sitka Tribe picked alternative 3. We do have
32 numerous allotments in that area where it's pretty
33 important that the past 10 years, at least the 10 plus
34 years that I've been with the council that they're very,
35 if you will, protective on this area. Protecting our
36 customary and traditional resources, protecting all
37 archaeological sites, documented and undocumented from
38 disturbance, finalizing the special forest products
39 policy, and protecting all of our traditional monument
40 sites from disturbance. Also, Mr. Chairman, Council
41 members, we did have some concern about some of the laws
42 that are interpretational laws on subsistence, permits,
43 et cetera, so we did have some lengthy discussion on
44 that, in trying to figure out the different laws,
45 Federal, State, ANILCA, subsistence, et cetera, so we're
46 still working on that as well with the tribe and the
47 district. One of the concerns may be looking down the
48 line if implemented was the concerns and understanding
49 the roles and responsibilities and how they're going to
50 be regulated and enforced, so in a nutshell that's -- the

00292

1 tribe did send its comments regarding alternative 3,
2 which is the best, or not the best, that the tribes took
3 action on.

4

5 Thank you, Mrs. Chairman.

6

7 MS. GARZA: Are there any questions for
8 the Sitka tribe. Mr. Littlefield.

9

10 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madame
11 Chair. Mr. Woodmark, alternative 3, when the STA
12 considered that, they were looking at the economic value
13 and benefit as well as subsistence priorities, right?
14 Which our charge is only subsistence priority. In other
15 words, we know this has economic consequences one way or
16 another to communities, but, you know, our basic charge
17 is only subsistence, and you looked at this more in a
18 broad picture, right? Is that correct?

19

20 MR. WIDMARK: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
21 Littlefield, that is correct. I forgot to allude that,
22 but the Council is very aware of the concern about
23 subsistence, also the economic factor, so they took that
24 into concern. Than you for bringing it up.

25

26 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Woodmark.
27 Chairman Woodmark. Are there any other requests for
28 public testimony? And after your public testimony, if
29 you could fill out these green forms, that we can keep it
30 on record.

31

32 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You guys know the
33 drill.

34

35 MS. CULP: WE got too excited with all
36 the SEACC support here. We just don't know how to take
37 this. We hardly ever get to see this type of support.

38

39 MS. GARZA: Your names for the record?

40

41 MR. BELTON: My name is David Belton, and
42 I'm the director of Cultural and Natural Resources with
43 the Hoonah Indian Association.

44

45 MS. HANLON: Ernestine Hanlon.

46

47 MS. CULP: Wanda Culp. I also sit on the
48 subsistence committee for the Hoonah Indian Association.

49 And I can't help but feel a little embarrassed that we

50 don't have any of our tribal leaders here to fill us in

00293

1 on specifically what is going on with the SEIS, but I
2 have to compliment the Forest Service on their talking
3 about 2.5 million acres with activities to change timber
4 stands. That's the nicest way I've ever heard of logging
5 called yet. But it was mentioned that Neka Bay is on the
6 hatches table there for some more logging in a very
7 important area to us, and, of course, we oppose this.
8 And there has been a letter that Dave will talk about
9 from the current Hoonah Indian Association president who
10 calls for extra protections of Neka Bay because of the
11 heavy logging that has happened around there both by the
12 forest Service and Hoonah Totem and SEAlaska. These
13 impacts have been devastating to our area, and yet
14 they're not included on things like this planning with
15 the Forest Service.

16

17 The archaeological protections, we need
18 that in this Icy Straits area and our surrounding
19 forests. We have certain areas that were used for seal
20 hunting for instance in Neka Bay where the hunters
21 generations ago I believe have built this -- I can't
22 remember what it's called, but it's like a wall where the
23 hunters hide and they built a.....

24

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Blind?

26

27 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Porches?

28

29 MS. CULP: The blind, but then the
30 process is to build a fire on the beach and draw the
31 seals.

32

33 MS. HANLON: It's about a couple thousand
34 years old.

35

36 MS. CULP: They're ancient. And we also
37 have burial sites within Port Frederick that are Chu-ka-
38 nadi (ph) burial sites that need protecting as well. I
39 was struck with the idea that under wilderness that there
40 could be Title VIII wilderness opportunity. I think that
41 slipped our minds throughout time, because with Glacier
42 Bay when the wilderness was established, it literally
43 took away every bit of our traditional winter salmon
44 fishery just by a hatchet mark on the books. They didn't
45 -- they came in and got information on where we fished in
46 the winter, and the next time they came in again they
47 have brought this colored map showing as wilderness
48 areas, and that's how Hoonah people lost their winter
49 fishing. So we've been kind of afraid of the wilderness
50 designations. But then realizing again that we do have

00294

1 this opportunity under Title VIII of ANILCA, I would
2 request and also of the Hoonah Indian Association that a
3 government-to-government relationship be established with
4 the Forest Service here in our own midst. That will
5 enable us to explore the Title VIII wilderness
6 opportunities that we could establish for our benefit
7 finally.

8

9 MR. BELTON: Once again, I'm David
10 Belton. I would like to say one positive note on behalf
11 of our local district ranger, Paul Matter and his crew,
12 who have been very consistent and thorough about
13 consulting with tribe, at least giving ample opportunity
14 to consult with the tribe on various timber sales and
15 different opportunities that we have to offer comments
16 and input into the process. And that consultation is
17 offered above and beyond any public hearings that are
18 offered into the community. So I would like to give them
19 that credit. I think the best way to present at this
20 time the Hoonah Indian Association feeling is by reading
21 a very short letter that was submitted to the Content
22 Analysis Team on the Tongass Forest Plan Revision Draft
23 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, SEIS,
24 Roadless Area Evaluation for Wilderness Recommendations.
25 This letter is signed by our present, Frank Wright, Jr.,
26 and is addressed as I said to the members of the Content
27 Analysis Team.

28

29 The Hoonah Indian Association is the duly
30 constituted Indian tribe organized pursuant to the
31 authority of the Federal Indian Reorganization Acts of
32 1934 and 1936. As president of the Hoonah Indian
33 Association, I appreciate the opportunity to submit
34 comments regarding the roadless area evaluation for
35 wilderness recommendations. Hoonah is situated on Port
36 Frederick in the northeast section of Chichagof Island in
37 the northern part of Southeast Alaska, also known as the
38 Icy Strait region. The lands and waters of this area are
39 the customary and traditional use areas of the Hoonah
40 Tlingit people and therefore hold a high level of
41 importance and significance for the continuation of our
42 traditional lifeways and culture. The Hoonah people are
43 descended from the original clans that occupied the Icy
44 Strait region, including Glacier Bay for many generations
45 prior to European contact. We continue to express an
46 historic and cultural connection with this land and the
47 resources it provides. Obviously with the establishment
48 of the Glacier Bay National Monument and related park and
49 preserve, much of our traditional subsistence territory
50 is no longer available to us for traditional use. For

00295

1 this reason the remaining areas are vitally important to
2 us for our future.

3

4 There are several individual roadless
5 areas described in appendix C of the draft SEIS of
6 special interest to the Hoonah people. It is these areas
7 that we feel it is appropriate for us to comment on, as
8 they are historically within the traditional tribal
9 subsistence territory of the Hoonah people, and as such
10 are the customary places that our people rely on for
11 their subsistence resource needs. They not only provide
12 our people with the fish, wildlife and forest resources
13 they depend on for their food, but essentially define who
14 we are and where we come from. It is the protection,
15 conservation, and responsible management of these lands
16 that we are committed to assuring. They include
17 Chichagof, Point Augusta, Pavlof East Point, Tenakee
18 Ridge, Gary Creek, Freshwater Bay, Neka Mountain, Neka
19 Bay. Having had the opportunity to consult with the
20 Hoonah Ranger District's district ranger, Paul Matter, we
21 realize that the decisions to be made regarding future
22 use of the Tongass National Forest are complex and
23 challenging. We understand that a balance must be sought
24 between commercial timber harvest, recreational
25 opportunity, customary and traditional subsistence
26 resource use and long term protection for wild and
27 natural places. It with this in mind that these comments
28 are offered.

29

30 The Village of Hoonah as mentioned is
31 situated on Port Frederick and is surrounding by
32 privately owned land which has already been heavily
33 clear-cut over the past 30 years. There is concern that
34 a significant portion of protective fish and wildlife
35 habitat has already been negatively impacted and even
36 eliminated by this effort, and that the cumulative
37 effects of future clear-cut timber harvests on adjacent
38 Federal lands may well threaten some of the last
39 remaining old growth protective reserves which lie along
40 critical fish streams and wildlife corridors. This is
41 certainly the case in the Neka Mountain and Neka Bay
42 area. In addition to being one of our last pristine
43 locations reasonably accessible by traditional users in
44 small skiffs, the area continues to attract more and more
45 light recreational users from outside the area. We would
46 ask for additional long-term protective measures that
47 would prevent any further road-building or clear-cut
48 logging above and around Neka Bay, including measures
49 that would prevent the proposed Otter Lake timber sale.
50 Additional logging of this area would require the

00296

1 reconstruction of the eight fathom log transfer facility,
2 a salt water log dump that we feel would be detrimental
3 to shell and ground fish resources, including king and
4 dungeness crab. Establishing additional predictions for
5 this area would maximize benefits of the remaining
6 protected habitat for deer, a primary food resource, as
7 well as brown bear, several varieties of salmon, halibut,
8 and countless other plant and wildlife species.
9

10 In addition to ensuring a continued
11 reasonable C&T subsistence opportunity, we feel that the
12 economic benefits for our community from tourism and
13 recreational use by protecting these natural areas will
14 be far superior to the economic benefits of continued
15 road building and more logging in the long term.
16 Visitors to our area come to experience natural places
17 and to enjoy the solitude and scenic rewards the area has
18 to offer. This is a trend that we anticipate will not
19 only continue, but will increase. Visitors are often
20 baffled and confused by the extent of the highly visible
21 clear-cut harvest which has and continues to occur around
22 Port Frederick. Protection of the Neka Bay and Neka
23 Mountain area would to some extent mitigate the
24 cumulative effects of the egregious clear cutting that
25 has occurred on adjacent lands.

26
27 The above reasoning would also be
28 applicable for other areas that are of interest to the
29 Hoonah people. Some of these areas have also experienced
30 very heavy clear cutting in the past, and it would be our
31 desire to see future management decisions that seriously
32 considered protecting remaining areas for their value as
33 customary and traditional harvest areas, as well as
34 irreplaceable destinations for light recreational use.

35
36 He thanks them for the opportunity to
37 submit these comments and for their consideration.

38

39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

40

41 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman, thank
42 you. Dave, is it possible to get a copy of that letter
43 so that I can -- each of those has a number associated
44 with it, like Neka Mountains, 342.

45

46 MR. BELTON: That is correct.

47

48 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'd like to get a list
49 of those designation units.

50

00297

1 MR. BELTON: I will provide you with
2 that.

3
4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Ernestine, do you
5 have.....

6
7 MS. HANLON: I think you're all familiar
8 with Hanlon versus Barton. And I got away from the
9 logging issue for a while, because I came to a burn out,
10 realizing as we'd been to court for 10 years fighting on
11 subsistence, and to find out that ANILCA says priority,
12 subsistence is not a priority. We're way in the back
13 burner. And I'd just like to bring out that point that
14 somewhere along the line priority needs to be priority,
15 and I support what SEACC had brought out about Neka Bay,
16 and I support the Hoonah Indian Association's stand. I'm
17 very opposed to logging, and we've got to have something.
18 And I think it's very important to that, and I see that
19 both entities brought out that there's other logging
20 besides the Forest Service, and that has not been
21 addressed and it's serious. We've got to have one place
22 that we can go and fish and hunt. Like, you know, when
23 we go pick berries, you can't walk without falling in a
24 hole. Imagine how the hunters feel. So, you know, we
25 need one area that we could continue, you know, like for
26 people like my grandson. I feel it's very important.
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

30
31 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, thank you.
32 One other question would be that in addition to the list
33 of these units, did you take a position on any particular
34 alternative, or was your focus more on unit protection by
35 identification?

36
37 MR. BELTON: No, it was decided not to
38 select in behalf of one of the alternative, realizing in
39 discussions with the District Ranger and others that the
40 process will not come down to deciding on one alternative
41 over another, but will be a process which takes maybe
42 some of the best things from all the alternatives, and
43 will be -- so realizing that reality, we felt that it
44 wasn't time to speak in behalf of just one alternative.

45
46 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Questions? Comments?
49 Thank you very much.

50

00298

1 MS. HANLON: Personally I don't know if
2 the alternative for no action, no logging, that's what
3 I'm in favor of.

4
5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

6
7 MR. BELTON: And I would have to add that
8 -- say that I do know that it is a position of the Hoonah
9 Indian Association not to call for a total ending of all
10 logging in this area, because of the economic realities
11 of that industry to our community. However, special
12 consideration is requested for some of those special
13 areas.

14
15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.j

16
17 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman?

18
19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

20
21 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Just a point of
22 clarification, I believe that the no action alternative
23 leaves it as it is right now. In other words the T-LUMP
24 (ph) will continue as it is, so that doesn't correspond
25 with no logging. Just to clarify that.

26
27 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Any further public
28 comments with regard to the Southeast Environmental
29 Impact Statement? What's the wish of the Council?

30
31 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman,
32 (indiscernible).

33
34 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: What? You want the
35 Forest Service back at the table?

36
37 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Please.

38
39 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: We need somebody at the
40 hot seat.

41
42 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman?

43
44 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

45
46 MS. GARZA: I have four copies of the map
47 that we had one copy of at Juneau and that was the areas
48 that have been logged. I got this from Eco Trust, so I'm
49 glad to share these just to look at.

50

00299

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

2

3 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman. One of the things I requested during this
5 teleconference was a map of all of Southeast Alaska that
6 showed the logging and developed areas. In other words,
7 if you look at alternative 6 or 8, they were listed in
8 yellow, or any of those that showed yellow, but there is
9 not one that showed a composite of Southeast Alaska of
10 all of the developed areas to date, and that's what I was
11 looking for. I was trying to get the non-Forest Service
12 lands, private lands, as well as the Forest Service lands
13 that have been logged to date so that the Council could
14 look at the areas that have been logged to date and see
15 what's left. And I don't know if we have a copy of that,
16 but I think it's important, and a question for Mr.
17 Salinas would be to -- we heard about selecting certain
18 areas. Is that true that that -- is that a true
19 representation that some areas if they are identified for
20 special status protection, such as Neka Bay, Neka
21 Mountain, or Hoonah Indian Association 330, the north
22 Baranof, some of the areas that the Governor's list, that
23 we do not have to pick any one of alternatives, that it
24 could be a meshing of these?

25

26 MR. SALINAS: Mr. Chairman, let me
27 address the first part of the question which was a map
28 that showed comprehensively how much of the Tongass has
29 been developed, or been affected by roads and timber
30 harvest, I do believe that we have such a map. I'm not
31 sure we have one here with us, but I know that question
32 has come up even for us, the idea that we felt we needed
33 a way to show how much of the Tongass has been developed,
34 particularly when we make a statement that only four
35 percent of the tongass has ever been and ever will be
36 affected by activities such as logging. That's a pretty
37 strong statement, and to back it up, you know, we did --
38 do believe that a map would show that very well, but I
39 know the first run at that, you know, everything was --
40 the scale of the map, we needed one probably the size of
41 this wall over here in order to show so that you could
42 see the detail well enough. And I do know that our
43 planning folks were working on developing a map that
44 could demonstrate and distinguish those things much
45 better.

46

47 Let me just turn back and see the
48 rangers, if they know if we've got that map produced, or
49 if we're still working on it. It doesn't look like we
50 know for sure on that, but I can follow up on that. I do

00300

1 know that's an important -- a good question, John, and
2 that I think that would show a lot.

3

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly might be able to
5 help you out.

6

7 MS. GARZA: From the Forest Service's
8 assets (ph), Mr. Chair, this map came from Eco Trust. I
9 talked to Ed Baccus or whatever his name is, and they are
10 updating this, and it should be out like any month. It
11 would show all of the logging in Southeast, private and
12 Forest Service. The other alternative is to take a five-
13 minute break and everybody look at and mark up on one map
14 where they know it has been logged.

15

16 MR. LITTLEFIELD: If I could get the
17 maps? It was my understanding that this was going to
18 take place tomorrow. The expert was coming in tomorrow,
19 and I have the maps from the other, all of the
20 alternative maps which are large scale that you could
21 look at. Maybe if you could throw alternative 6 up on
22 there, or 8 or any -- 6 would be fine. I think that one
23 was in yellow, to give you some idea of what I thought we
24 needed to look at.

25

26 MR. SALINAS: Mr. Chairman, we could
27 offer to put up the hard maps, you know, during the
28 break, put them up on the wall.

29

30 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Sure, that would be
31 great. Yeah. And then there was a second part of my
32 question that you didn't address, and that was what was
33 brought up by the Hoonah Indian Association of whether we
34 could consider just say one unit, Neka Bay, Neka Mountain
35 out of all of these alternatives, or one of these
36 alternatives, the no alternative is what your preferred
37 choice is right now, no action. Does it have to be one
38 of these alternatives or could it be a combination of
39 some units? I'm just wondering how much latitude that is
40 going to be allowed.

41

42 MR. SALINAS: Right. I'll address this
43 in general. It is true that ultimately when we get to
44 the point where we make recommendations to the Regional
45 Forester and basically to Congress on what we see comes
46 out of this process as roadless lands that we would
47 recommend for wilderness, it is possible, and it is true
48 that we would look across the board at all of those
49 alternatives, and what may come out from those,
50 particularly if it's strongly supported. Maybe the best

00301

1 way for me to say what I'm trying to say is that the
2 Hoonah Indian Association letter that was sent to the
3 Content Analysis Team I think is a very good example of a
4 substantive letter that we can take and work with,
5 because it does get specific, it does address specific
6 issues related to the lands of their interests and their
7 concerns and issues. So I think when you see the Content
8 Analysis Team, and incidently, we will be reviewing their
9 report here in a couple weeks I believe, the entire
10 Tongass Leadership Team will be getting together to
11 listen to that report by the contractor, and the content
12 analysis team, and we'll be reviewing and considering
13 what that means relative to, again, making
14 recommendations for that final record of decision. And,
15 yes, we can bring together across the board several
16 alternatives and pick those things that make the most
17 sense, that are supported and substantive in terms of
18 recommending wilderness.

19
20 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Or other designation
21 other than wilderness?

22
23 MR. SALINAS: Dale also indicated that,
24 you know, you're right. The first part of that is that
25 other recommendations that might come out of that. And
26 in addition to that, if there's a need to amend the
27 forest plan due to whatever recommendation might come out
28 of that.

29
30 Again, you know, I wanted to point out,
31 if I may, that, and this is something I missed a little
32 bit when I was commenting on the current supplemental EIS
33 process. It has been very good on many accounts. It has
34 caused us to go back and look at all of our inventory of
35 roadless areas and these maps and clean them up and
36 verify what's actually out on the ground. And in that
37 respect, it's been very good. And it's also caused us to
38 sit down with all of the local tribes and interests and
39 subsistence, whether it is subsistence issues or any
40 other issue. And one of the things that I think has been
41 particularly useful is I did sit in on the meeting, that
42 government-to-government meeting that was mentioned with
43 Sitka Tribes, and to hear the District Ranger and Sitka
44 Tribes begin to take out of that meeting something like
45 customary and traditional use areas, because that being
46 really the issue, and the underlying principle and basis
47 of why we were at that table, and what can be represented
48 and come out of a process like the supplemental EIS. It
49 caused those folks to look at really what was the
50 underlying interest, and it caused them to focus on that.

00302

1 And I just want to mention that that process in itself is
2 causing those people to look at those issues and those
3 things can be addressed. I want you to know that they
4 can be addressed as we currently stand, under the current
5 plan, under the current process that we have available to
6 us. They didn't need a supplemental EIS. What they did
7 need though was the government-to-government work
8 together to recognize the true sense and issues of
9 customary and traditional uses, and for us to really
10 start to pay attention to what that means to you, and how
11 we should address that, whether it's in a timber sale
12 proposal, or even a shoreline EIS, recreation outfitter
13 and guide thing, so I just wanted to make that point.
14 Thank you very much.

15

16 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Ready for a break?

19 Five minutes.

20

21 (Off record)

22

23 (On record)

24

25 MS. GARZA:take some action and
26 move along.

27

28 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Chop chop. Okay. Who
29 are you ready for now?

30

31 MS. GARZA: We're ready for Council
32 discussion and action. So we had a letter that the
33 Council drafted from the audio conference. It's my
34 understanding it was submitted. We wanted to affirm that
35 it is a Council letter, to make changes to it, whatever.

36

37 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair.

38

39 MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

40

41 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

42

43 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, I move to
44 adopt the letter of August 14th to the Forest Service an
45 official record of an ad hoc meeting.

46

47 MR. MARTIN: Second that motion. Second.

48

49 MS. GARZA: It's been moved and seconded
50 to adopt the letter of August 14th as official Council

00303

1 through an ad hoc meeting.

2

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Discussion?

4

5 MS. GARZA: Discussion.

6

7 MR. KOOKESH: Under discussion, Council
8 members that supported alternative 6 were representing
9 their communities? Home?

10

11 MR. LITTLEFIELD: No.

12

13 MR. DOUVILLE: May I make a comment?

14

15 MS. GARZA: Mr. Douville?

16

17 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
18 Sitting on this RAC Council, we are charged to providing
19 the best avenue for subsistence, and alternative 6 does
20 that, and that was the reason for that stance on it.

21

22 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, this looks like a
23 vote -- six looks like (indiscernible) of voting members.

24

25 MS. GARZA: In the letter it said the
26 majority of the Council members on the audio conference
27 favored six. It does not say the Council endorses six.

28

29 MR. LITTLEFIELD: That's correct.

30

31 MS. GARZA: And so we may want to clarify
32 that in the letter, that in parentheses the Council does
33 not endorse six.

34

35 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

36

37 MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield?

38

39 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I concur. At that
40 Council I was speaking as a regional member. My motion
41 was not made with any intent of assuming that alternative
42 6 was the preferred alternative of this Council. I just
43 want it as a record, that's all, of some action that we
44 took and it was an official record. It's like approving
45 the minutes to me is how I would look at this. If you
46 see something wrong with the minutes of this, then I
47 would say so, but this is just what took place. It's an
48 official report to you that if you were not there, then
49 I'm saying that I believe this is a true representation
50 of what took place at that teleconference.

00304

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair?

2

3 MS. GARZA: Patricia?

4

5 MS. PHILLIPS: Is there a motion?

6

7 MS. GARZA: Yes.

8

9 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes, there is.

10

11 MS. GARZA: The motion before us is to
12 accept the August 14th letter as Council, what,
13 correspondence? What did you say?

14

15 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes. Madame Chair, the
16 intent of that was to accept this as if it was the
17 minutes of the Council meeting, because this is basically
18 a summary of a several hour long meeting, and if I had
19 objections with it, or wanted to include something with
20 it as one of the Council members, I would. It is not at
21 all meant to say that we endorse alternative 6 or
22 alternative 1 or any alternative. Just a record of what
23 we discussed. That's all it was meant to be.

24

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair?

26

27 MS. GARZA: Patricia.

28

29 MS. PHILLIPS: I would have commented
30 with more extensive comments in other areas had I
31 participated, but I was unable to be a participant in the
32 teleconference. I sent an e-mail correspondence to those
33 who have e-mail concerning the comments that I made
34 concerning the SEIS, and those that don't have e-mail did
35 not get a copy of my letter, so I'm wondering if I'd been
36 a participant, if my comments would have been reflected
37 in this letter.

38

39 MS. GARZA: So as a protocol, in
40 accepting this letter it's my understanding that we went
41 through that process at that time in order to meet
42 certain date requirements. I'm looking at you. If we
43 modify this letter because Pelican wants to add sections
44 of protection or list their concerns, can we add that to
45 this letter as an amendment at this time, and the letter
46 still goes forward? Yes. So if you wanted to say, okay,
47 please include blah-blah-blah-blah-blah to this letter,
48 this is the time.

49

50 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair?

00305

1 MS. GARZA: Patricia.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: From a community that was
4 not able to participate in the teleconference, I would
5 like to read my comments. First I want to say that.....

6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Point of order, Madame
8 Chair.

9

10 MS. PHILLIPS: Huh?

11

12 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Point of order. We are
13 discussing only approval of this as a record of what took
14 place. The comments would be appropriate as soon as we
15 have approved this.

16

17 MS. GARZA: I'm not sure that's correct,
18 Mr. Littlefield. If she wants to include it in this
19 letter, they just said we could. So she would have to
20 read it into the record now and say that is now part of
21 this official Council correspondence.

22

23 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I object to your
24 ruling, Madame Chair. No second, it dies.

25

26 MS. GARZA: Keep going.

27

28 MS. PHILLIPS: I want to say that I
29 support LUD 2 designation rather than wilderness
30 designation. Most of the homes in the Pelican area are
31 -- I'm sorry. Most of the homes in our area have wood
32 from free-use timber permits. Free-use timber permits
33 are unique to Alaska. The U.S. Forest Service public
34 SEIS comment period regrettably closes before there was
35 an organized comment by the FACA Southeast Regional
36 Advisory Council to the Federal Subsistence Board. I am
37 a SEARAC member. However, the following remarks are my
38 own.

39

40 SEARAC has not convened to provide a
41 recommendation concerning the Tongass SEIS alternatives.
42 ANILCA 801 states subsistence uses of fish and wildlife
43 and other renewable resources shall be the priority
44 consumptive uses of all such resources on the public
45 lands of Alaska, and the use of the public lands in
46 Alaska is to cause the least adverse impact possible on
47 rural residents who depend upon subsistence uses of the
48 resources of such land.

49

50 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, there is

00306

1 a motion on the floor, and we need to speak to the
2 motion, and that's all that is in order at this time.

3

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, I asked as a
5 community who was not able to participate in that
6 teleconference, had I participated, would my comments be
7 in the letter?

8

9 MR. LITTLEFIELD: If you had been there,
10 yes. Your comments are appropriate as soon as we vote on
11 this motion. You can continue right where you were as
12 soon as we vote on whether to approve this as a record of
13 what happened. We can't say what you would have done.
14 You weren't there.

15

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, I don't care what
17 you do, but I don't want it to be -- it is reflective of
18 those that were there, but it reflects the seven members
19 that were there.

20

21 MS. WILSON: Madame Chair?

22

23 MS. GARZA: Marilyn?

24

25 MS. WILSON: I move we amend her letter
26 to add to this motion that's on the floor to accept this
27 letter.

28

29 MR. KOOKESH: Can we remark?

30

31 MS. GARZA: Floyd?

32

33 MR. KOOKESH: I'd like to believe that an
34 opportunity should be provided to allow for those
35 communities that did not partic -- those members that did
36 not participate to be allowed to comment. It was not an
37 official meeting.

38

39 MS. GARZA: So, John, I guess what I
40 don't understand is why this letter can't be amended by
41 the comments from the other council members who were not
42 there. It would simply be amending, if this were a
43 motion or a resolution, you would amend it prior to
44 voting on that full motion or full resolution, so I'm not
45 sure why you think it's out of order.

46

47 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, my motion
48 was to approve the letter of August 14th basically as a
49 record of the minutes of what took place at that meeting.
50 It's not what could be added later, which can be added as

00307

1 soon as we approve this motion, you can go on, the Chair
2 could let you talk about this, and I encourage that,
3 approve it, support it. But it is not germane to the
4 motion. The motion was to approve this letter as written
5 a true representation of what took place that day. And
6 if you were not there, then it is not a true
7 representation of what took place that day. Your
8 concerns can be addressed immediately after we approve or
9 not approve this. It's just not to the motion. It's not
10 speaking to the motion at all, and we have to speak to
11 the motion that's on the table.

12

13 MS. PHILLIPS: I have concerns about how
14 you're saying that, because it was not a posted public
15 meeting. It is a record of the teleconference, which was
16 an informational teleconference.

17

18 MR. LITTLEFIELD: And that's all the
19 motion asks for is to approve it as what happened at that
20 teleconference. Nothing more. And all of your comments
21 are still in order, but not right -- they do not speak to
22 the motion that's on the floor right now.

23

24 MS. GARZA: Okay. So the process would
25 be we would vote on the motion to accept this as
26 correspondence, as official Council correspondence of
27 record as an ad hoc committee. Then Council members who
28 were not there or even council members who were there who
29 thought of additional areas may say I wish to add to the
30 list of concerns these things.

31

32 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes. That's my
33 interpretation, Madame Chair.

34

35 MS. GARZA: So what he's saying is you
36 can't add to a meeting that you weren't at as official
37 correspondence, but you can still add as the concerns as
38 a Council member.

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: I just want it on the
41 record that it wasn't a posted public meeting.

42

43 MS. GARZA: Right.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

46

47 MS. GARZA: And it is listed as an ad hoc
48 Council meeting. Okay. So the motion is to accept the
49 letter as is as official.....

50

00308

1 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Call the question.

2

3 MS. GARZA:correspondence of the
4 Regional Advisory Council at an ad hoc Council meeting by
5 audio conference. All in favor signify by saying aye.

6

7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8

9 MS. GARZA: Opposed.

10

11 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

12

13 MS. GARZA: Okay. Patricia.

14

15 MS. PHILLIPS: I'm going to consolidate
16 my statements, because I already submitted them to the
17 process. Where was I?

18

19 Furthermore, it states each RAC shall
20 have the following authority, ANILCA 805(a)(3)(B)(iv).
21 Recommendations concerning policy standards and
22 guidelines and regulations to implement the strategy. In
23 approved timber harvest sales, I support alternative
24 measures and timber harvest methods. these alternatives
25 would combine ecosystem management with acceptable
26 practices given the social and environmental objectives
27 of subsistence uses, view (ph), watershed protection,
28 wildlife corridors and habitat conservation plans.
29 Alternatives will include select tree logging, filter
30 (ph) wood, a method that leaves 30 percent of the trees
31 unharvested, variable retention, patch cut, longer
32 rotation time of timber harvested.

33

34 Several isolated communities are
35 dependent on subsistence resources of the surrounding
36 area in close proximity. It is important to maintain
37 buffer zones to protect the diversity of wildlife.

38

39 Forest management plans require more in-
40 depth analysis to minimize and mitigate affected forest
41 logging practices. It is important that logging be
42 reasonably controlled to lessen the impacts to
43 communities and local resources.

44

45 In 1996 or 1995 each member of the
46 Council was given a report to Congress, anadromous fish
47 habitat assessment, and I would like to see the Forest
48 Service adhere to the best management practices and all
49 the recommendations and findings that this report
50 delivers. And I'm going to cut it off there.

00309

1 MS. GARZA: Okay. One of the things that
2 we did at the audio conference was to highlight areas
3 that we felt needed further protection. Were there any
4 areas that you felt that you could put in as a bullet,
5 such as for Hoonah protecting the, is it Neka?
6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Neka Bay and Neka
8 Mountain.
9

10 MS. GARZA: Neka Bay and Neka Mountain.
11

12 MR. LITTLEFIELD: 342 and 343.
13

14 MS. PHILLIPS: I would support LUD 2
15 designation of Neka Bay.
16

17 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Neka Bay? Bay or
18 Mountain?
19

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Neka Bay, Neka Mountain.
21

22 MS. GARZA: So what I would suggest is
23 that we take a break now, and Council members who were
24 not at that audio conference, if they would wish to add
25 areas of concern that they write them down so when we
26 come back, we can bring them up. The ones that we listed
27 were listed by the 134, whatever designated they
28 received. That would be the easiest, but if you just
29 come up with bays or areas, et cetera, then we can work
30 with that, too. We'd like LUD 2 for Neka Bay and
31 Mountain. So we'll recess until 7:00 o'clock. Come back
32 with any ideas that you think we need to continue to take
33 forward on SEIS.
34

35 (Off record)
36

37 (On record)
38

39 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: I know that Bill
40 Thomas will not be coming back, and Richard Stokes will
41 not be coming back, so I think we have the rest of the
42 Council, except I haven't seen Floyd.
43

44 (General conversation)
45

46 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. I'll call the
47 meeting back to order. When we had recessed at 5:00 p.m.
48 for dinner, we had approved the August 14th letter as
49 official correspondence from the Council. We then talked
50 about the opportunity for Council members who were not on

00310

1 that audioconference to list their concerns as the
2 Council members who were on the audioconference to modify
3 or add to their concerns. Do I hear any of those
4 concerns at this time?

5

6 MS. WILSON: Madame Chair?

7

8 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Marilyn?

9

10 MS. WILSON: I would like to know what
11 the situation if we pick an alternative like for
12 wilderness, what is the stipulation on the land then? I
13 forget, but you can't use it I know. Could we have a
14 real quick run through on the wilderness?

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Carol?

17

18 MS. GOULARTE: Thank you, Madame
19 Chairman. Marilyn your question was, you said that
20 alternative, what would be the stipulation?

21

22 MS. WILSON: What happens to the land if
23 it's under wilderness.....

24

25 MS. GOULARTE: Designation?

26

27 MS. WILSON: Designation, yes.

28

29 MR. KANEN: Okay. In the SEIS under
30 goals, it's to manage all recommended wilderness to
31 maintain wilderness resources while providing for public
32 access and uses consistent with maintenance of the
33 presently existing wilderness characteristics of the
34 area. Objectives, maintain recreational activities. I'm
35 skimming here a little bit. Provide for public.....

36

37 REPORTER: Move the microphone a little
38 further away from your mouth. Thanks.

39

40 MR. KANEN: Okay. Excuse me. Provide
41 for public use of the recommended wildernesses in
42 accordance with ANILCA provisions for motorized and non-
43 motorized access, and travel, including reasonable
44 traditional subsistence uses by rural residents. Provide
45 trails and primitive facilities that are in harmony with
46 the natural environment, and then promote primitive and
47 semi-primitive recreation experiences. And then let me
48 turn to some of the activities. Wilderness is not open
49 to any new mineral entry. Prior existing rights are
50 valid. Let's see, under recreation and tourism, maintain

00311

1 existing public use cabins and shelters at present or
2 improved condition. Consider additional public use
3 cabins and other shelters consistent with the need for
4 health and safety purposes. Base new cabin or shelter
5 locations on analysis of public health and safety needs.
6 Under (f) it's got, with the help of user groups to
7 develop leave no trace camping and use programs that
8 encourage dispersal and use of durable campsites. Where
9 dispersal is not feasible, develop designated campsites
10 and encourage their use. Subsistence. Rural residents
11 engaged in subsistence uses shall have reasonable access
12 to subsistence resources, appropriate use of snow
13 machines, motor boats and other means of surface
14 transportation traditionally employed for such purposes
15 by local residents shall be permitted subject to
16 reasonable regulation to protect wilderness resource
17 values. And this is assuming that it's an ANILCA flavor
18 of wilderness. Trails. Provide for a diversity of
19 outdoor recreation trail and waterway opportunities.
20 Transportation. Allow use of snow machines, motor boats,
21 fixed-wing airplanes and non-motorized methods of surface
22 transportation for traditional activities that are legal
23 and for transportation to and from villages and
24 homesites. And, Marilyn, I can give you this if you want
25 to read through all of it, but those are some of the
26 things that jumped out at me that I would think would be
27 important to the villages.

28

29 MS. WILSON: Can a road be built on a
30 wilderness area, or do they just use the existing road
31 system if there's one on there, and it's designated as
32 wilderness?

33

34 MR. KANEN: I was looking for roads.
35 Transportation. Okay. New roads and new airstrips are
36 not permitted except to access surrounding state and
37 private land and valid mining claims, subject to
38 stipulations to protect the natural and other values of
39 such lands. Any transportation developed in association
40 with mineral exploration and extraction will be in
41 accordance with approved plan of operations and
42 subsequent annual work plans. Any existing roads in the
43 recommended wildernesses are closed to motorized use
44 unless needed for valid existing rights or consistent
45 with the objectives of ANILCA.

46

47 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

48

49 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madame
50 Chair. Dale, could you summarize the subsistence section

00312

1 of the wilderness, please? This is a subsistence board.

2 Can you summarize the subsistence portion?

3

4 MR. KANEN: Why don't I read it, it's
5 only about five lines. Under subsistence it says rural
6 residents engaged in subsistence uses shall have
7 reasonable access to subsistence resources. Appropriate
8 use of snow machines, motor boats and other means of
9 surface transportation traditionally employed for such
10 purposes by local residents shall be permitted subject to
11 reasonable regulation to protect wilderness resource
12 values.

13

14 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

17

18 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Could we have the same
19 for LUD 2 designations? That was for wilderness, and I
20 would like the same for LUD 2.

21

22 MR. KANEN: I don't see a subsistence
23 category. I don't see a subsistence category. You know,
24 from the other activities that are permitted, I would
25 guess that it would be, if anything, a little bit less
26 restrictive. Under transportation as far as your
27 question on roads, existing roads are generally closed to
28 highway vehicular use. Any proposed roads will use the
29 following guidelines. Allow vital force transportation
30 system linkages, including roads and transfer facilities.
31 Roads other than vital transportation linkages will not
32 be built except to serve authorized activities such as
33 mining, power and water developments, aquaculture
34 developments, or transportation needs determined by the
35 State of Alaska. Generally in LUD 2 you would not, you
36 know, have a timber-related road, timber-harvest related
37 road. Under recreation, primitive recreation facilities
38 such as recreation cabins, boat docks, moorings and
39 trails may be constructed and maintained. Under
40 minerals, forest lands within this land use designation
41 are open to mineral exploration and development.

42

43 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Thank you, Dale. Mr.

44 Littlefield.

45

46 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, I just
47 want to clarify for the record if Dale or Goularte would
48 clarify that with a LED 2 designation, the existing
49 activities, subsistence activities would be able to
50 continue in their customary and traditional manner

00313

1 unabated, is that correct?

2

3 MR. KANEN: Yeah, I don't see a real
4 conflict with the subsistence activities that I'm
5 familiar with and ANILCA wilderness.

6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Either one of them,
8 subsistence?

9

10 MR. KANEN: Well, and even less so I
11 guess with the LUD 2. I guess, and I'm thinking more to
12 some wilderness training that I took in the Lower 48, and
13 it generally had more to do with the '64 wilderness
14 flavor. They began to worry quite a bit about leave no
15 trace, so whether or not, you know, your fish camp's
16 going to have to disappear at the end of the season,
17 whether or not you're going to you're going to --
18 density, how many people are allowed into an area at a
19 time. Wilderness activities I guess tend to be more
20 closely regulated. You know, and so what, it's going to
21 be 50 years out. That's why I'm telling the Council that
22 I think that not only in saying if you decide you want to
23 recommend areas for wilderness, you also include the
24 activities that, you know, you would like to see it open
25 for, as well as activities you don't want to see in
26 there. If you wanted to see a trail built into a use
27 area, for example, in '64 wilderness, may not be able to
28 use motorized, mechanized machinery to build access, may
29 not be able to use motorized equipment other than your
30 snow machines and your traditional access, your skiff,
31 your snow machine. You might not be able to use a power
32 generator, power saw, those types of things on the beach
33 for your bonfire.

34

35 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Bert.

36

37 MR. ADAMS: Dale, would you help me out
38 here a little bit. You know, you've got, you know,
39 conditions for snowmobiles, motor boats, and, you know,
40 other means of surface transportation. Would you be
41 willing to see where ATVs fit into this category? That
42 has been a discussion in Yakutat and in our Subsistence
43 Resource Commission meeting we had just recently, and so,
44 you know, I'd kind of like to get a little bit more
45 clarification on that. Could that be included, do you
46 know, as a means of transportation?

47

48 MR. KANEN: If it's okay, let me pass
49 that to Carol. She has had more of those issues on her
50 district than I've had on mine.

00314

1 MS. GOULARTE: Thanks, Madame Chairman.
2 ATVs are not mentioned in any of the standards and
3 guidelines. I do believe that you probably could use
4 ATVs in the winter just like snowmobiles; however, there
5 would be concern for damage, you know, on the land in
6 sensitive area. That's something that we have not
7 addressed, and at this time they're probably not allowed,
8 but that would be something we would need to discuss.
9

10 MR. ADAMS: Thank you. I know the Forest
11 Service in Yakutat did a review on ATV use, you know, on
12 Yakutat Forelands, and it has shown that they are very
13 detrimental, you know, to the environment, because the
14 Yakutat Forelands, you know, is just one real big
15 spawning bed for salmon, and kids go out moose hunting,
16 they use these ATVs and they'll just go out, you know,
17 and no trail, so they make their own trails, you know,
18 and we could see evidence, you know, of damage in, you
19 know, the salmon, the small fry salmon. So what they're
20 doing now is they're making designated trails for the
21 easement (ph). You can use those trails in order to use
22 your ATVs on, but if you see a moose, you know, two miles
23 away from your trail, you have to go down there by foot
24 and make your kill, and then drag it all the way back,
25 you know, but, you know, I think that's something that
26 what I'd like to be able to come from this meeting in
27 regards, you know, to the use of ATVs, because we would
28 be considering this with our subsistence resource
29 commission, for the last couple years we keep on tabling
30 it, because we don't have enough information.

31
32 MR. KANEN: Yeah. I think as you know in
33 Yakutat, there are quite a few areas that I think are
34 closed by administrative order, and those administrative
35 orders can be applied to any land status, even a timber
36 LUD or a development LUD can have portions of it closed
37 to ATVs by administrative order if there's a need to
38 protect the resource. It might be good to express that
39 concern. I don't know if this is the best vehicle for
40 working that out in your local area. It's probably
41 within the scope of your ranger to negotiate those.

42
43 MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. Seeing no
46 action, we can move on to TEK. I'm sitting here waiting.
47 Mr. Littlefield.

48
49 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'll try and -- I would
50 like to make a motion that the SEARAC go on record and

00315

1 notify the Forest Service that they, or request the
2 Forest Service to consider those units, value comparison
3 units identified by the August 14th SEARAC letter,
4 identified by the tribal governments of Southeast Alaska,
5 identified by the local government and state government
6 as areas of possible consideration for higher protection
7 than is currently given.

8

9 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Is there a second?

10

11 MR. MARTIN: Second that motion.

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So the intent of the
14 motion is to have the Forest Service consider what we
15 listed in the August 14th meeting -- go ahead.

16

17 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Speaking to my motion,
18 this backs off from alternative 6, but it includes those
19 areas that have been identified by the local governments,
20 the tribal governments who have a government-to-
21 government relationship with the Forest Service, those
22 things should be considered very high on the list I
23 believe. The Governor has identified four specific areas
24 that deserve some protection. I deliberately did not say
25 whether that is LUD 2, whether that is wilderness. I'm
26 just saying it deserves some order of higher protection
27 than is currently offered. So if you look at the SEARAC
28 letter, I think I can let Mike talk to that, that is
29 currently designated, there are some lands that we've
30 identified by numbers that are currently designated LUD
31 2. They would be considered for some other alternate
32 form of ANILCA type legislation. And I want to make
33 clear that I'm looking at ANILCA type legislation, not
34 pre-snow machine, before they even had generators, '64.
35 So if it was not protected at all, and was listed as a
36 wilderness area, or inventoried area, then it could be
37 considered for a remote recreational site or LUD 2 in
38 consultation with the people who are affected. That's
39 what I'm hoping will come out of this, that they will get
40 with the people who are affected in the Hoonah area for
41 Neka Bay, or the Ash Bay area in Sitka, the islands in
42 Craig, and so on, and consult with the local people and
43 consider giving those areas special protection. That was
44 the intent of my motion.

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr.
47 Littlefield. Is there any other discussion on motion.

48

49 MR. ADAMS: Call the question.

50

00316

1 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: The question has been
2 called for. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
3 aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Apposed?

8
9 (No opposing votes.)

10
11 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Motion passes.

12
13 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Littlefield, does the
14 text on the screen adequately capture.....

15
16 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Can't hear you.

17
18 MR. SCHROEDER: Does the text on the
19 screen adequately capture the intent of your motion?

20
21 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: You need to make the
22 font bigger.

23
24 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Make it bigger. I
25 can't see and I can't hear at this time of night. I
26 believe I said a higher level of protection, I did not
27 say LUD 2 or wilderness, because there are some other --
28 in other words, you could have a remote recreation area.
29 That's a different area. Those were given in my --
30 afterwards, but that was not part of the motion. Higher
31 level of protection is I think what I said. And some
32 would fall in LUD 2, some would fall in wilderness, but
33 remote recreation may be acceptable to the local
34 government or the tribal government. I think that pretty
35 well captures it otherwise.

36
37 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. Good. Okay.
40 We're moving on from SEIS. We have TEK. I can't read
41 this any more. Which will include several presentations
42 by STA in combination with Hoonah I think and then
43 followed by Mike Turek for some TEK projects, followed by
44 Meg Cartwright on the stock projects for Craig, Sitka and
45 somewhere else. Kake. So these are basically the
46 projects that have been funded through the fishery
47 information systems. These are the projects that involve
48 our community members, our tribal members, and I'm just
49 excited to see what they're doing. Although it looks
50 like we have dueling computers up there.

00317

1 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Competing power plants.

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, I'd like to
4 introduce the subject while they're getting set up.

5

6 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Schroeder.

7

8 MR. SCHROEDER: Meredith, can you --
9 okay, there we go. I'd just like to provide a very brief
10 background on how these projects come to be before you,
11 because I think it's something of a success for Council
12 action and Council interest in supporting TEK work.
13 Going back to the Federal assumption of jurisdiction over
14 fisheries in Federal waters a few years ago, the tribes
15 in Southeast went through a planning process of trying to
16 identify projects that would provide information useful
17 to the Council and to the Federal Subsistence Program.
18 The tribes met with the Regional Advisory Council at your
19 Douglas meeting, and I think that was probably in spring
20 of the year 2000. Someone could correct me. And the
21 Council spent a good deal of time and energy hearing,
22 reviewing possible projects that might take place to
23 provide information that would be useful for future
24 decisions. At that time the Council supported launching
25 TEK projects that would document traditional use areas,
26 traditional territories in Southeast Alaska communities
27 and suggested that these be tribal projects such that
28 each tribe would work on documentation of the tribal
29 territories that they used.

30

31 In the first year, three contracts were
32 given out, one to Angoon, one to Kake, and one to Hoonah
33 to do this work. And last year three more contracts were
34 given out to, this is going to be difficult, Sitka,
35 Yakutat, and Craig. What you have before you here are
36 some of the participants that were tribal
37 representatives, the tribal staff who have been working
38 on projects and through the communities in Hoonah, in
39 Sitka and in Angoon. So what I've asked the tribes to do
40 is to fill in the Council on the direction of these
41 projects and to pull out some indication of the progress
42 that's being made in reaching the goals on these
43 projects.

44

45 I will mention that the intent of the
46 Council two and a half years ago was that these projects
47 would be undertaken in each tribal community in Southeast
48 Alaska. Six of these are underway. Because of staffing
49 problems this last year, we did not launch a further set
50 of three communities. We felt that we needed to have a

00318

1 little bit more completion on the existing six
2 communities before launching three more communities as
3 being part of this larger study.

4

5 This study proceeds under a generalized
6 research design that you reviewed back in Douglas, and
7 it's been before you a number of times. So with that
8 I'll let our TEK panel introduce themselves and take it
9 from there. Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. I'm not sure
12 who will start, but I would first like to start by
13 apologizing to you for having you at night. It seems
14 like a number of things just happened today that kept
15 postponing these projects, and to me they are some of the
16 most important work that is being done through the
17 Federal Subsistence Board, OSM process. And as an
18 Advisory Council member, I'm just elated to have you
19 before me. Although I sound tired, I am elated. Thank
20 you. So who's going to do the introductions?

21

22 MS. CRAIG: I'd like to thank the Council
23 for having us here tonight. I'll start by introducing
24 myself as we try to figure out the computer. My name is
25 Robi Craig and I work for the Sitka Tribe of Alaska.
26 I've had the pleasure of working at STA for the past
27 seven years, and the more recent pleasure of assisting
28 Angoon Community Association on their TEK project.

29

30 MR. FRANK: Madame Chairman, my name is
31 Donald Frank. I was recently hired by the Forest Service
32 as an Angoon Tribal Liaison/TEK Coordinator for ACA, and
33 have been gathering information through interviewing, and
34 with the help of Robi Craig putting some of these
35 interviews together.

36

37 MS. DANGEL: I'm Helen Dangel, and I work
38 for Sitka Tribe of Alaska, and I'm the Coastal Resources
39 Coordinator and I've recently been working on the
40 traditional ecological knowledge project doing research
41 and interviews.

42

43 MR. BELTON: And my name is David Belton.
44 I'm the director of Cultural and Natural Resources for
45 the Hoonah Indian Association, and I was hired by the
46 Hoonah Indian Association the first of March in 2001, and
47 was introduced to this project soon after arriving, and
48 have been working on it now about a year. And also we
49 working with us at the Hoonah Indian Association Angela
50 Sharclaine (ph). She's a young lady that is near

00319

1 completion of her college work. She's been attending
2 school down in California and working with the Hoonah
3 Indian Association during the summers, and now she's on
4 staff, went full time, and is working on the TEK
5 projects. I've been working on some of the GIS and
6 annotated bibliography aspects of the project, and Angela
7 has been doing most of her work with the interview
8 material. Angela is not here today because she's ill
9 unfortunately.

10

11 MS. CRAIG: We have a lot of
12 technological difficulties tonight. It isn't going to
13 get much closer. Okay. I was going to start a little
14 bit on the ACA project presentation, and then Donald will
15 take over when we get to the interviews, which he's been
16 conducting. And Mr. Schroeder was kind enough to take us
17 through a lot of the beginning portion already, and what
18 we did was just go ahead and put a little summary for you
19 from the original TEK project abstract, talking about the
20 identification of the need for these TEK projects. And
21 you'll see, and I'm sure you all remember, and as Bob
22 summarized, there's a need to document subsistence
23 hunting and fishing areas to pay special attention to
24 fishing camps.

25

26 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Robi?

27

28 MS. CRAIG: Yeah.

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Please speak up a
31 little bit.

32

33 MS. CRAIG: Oh, sure. To pay special
34 attention to fishing camps

35

36 REPORTER: Ma'am, if you pull it a little
37 further away from your mouth, then I can turn it up
38 higher.

39

40 MS. CRAIG: Sure. Okay. And then just
41 to continue to look at TEK. This again is something that
42 Bob summarized, it was the RAC's decision to go ahead and
43 make an action item to have these TEK projects, and this
44 portion talks about your work, consulting with the tribal
45 RAs to go ahead and start these projects.

46

47 The projects are composed of four
48 different elements. The first is the annotated
49 bibliography that David spoke about. That's to try to on
50 a community level to look at all the information that's

00320

1 maybe in the tribal archives that perhaps like the Sitka
2 Native Education Program, other unidentified perhaps
3 sources of traditional ecological knowledge as well as
4 the more recognized Delaguna, Goldschmitt and Hawes.
5 Then the second would be the taped interviews which
6 Donald, Helen and David have all been working on, and
7 that's talking to elders as well as present day
8 subsistence harvesters. The maps, that's looking at both
9 historical, like you'll hear when Donald speaks that he's
10 been taking out Goldschmitt and Hawes for Angoon's
11 traditional territory, and talking to elders, are these
12 the clan territories that you remember. And then also
13 we're going to start working with present day harvesters
14 to say, are these the areas that you continue to use.
15 And then we'll file a report which will bring together
16 these elements.

17

18 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: If anyone over there
19 can't see, you're welcome to walk about back here if you
20 need a better view of what's going on here.

21

22 MS. CRAIG: And then here we have a slide
23 that just gives you a brief update of what's going on
24 with the Angoon Community Association project. We've
25 been working on the bibliography. You'll see in Helen's
26 presentation a slide that shows the form that we're using
27 to input this information into what's going to be an Axis
28 data base. She'll be able to hit a key word for Angoon,
29 sockeye, and up will come the resources that we found
30 that identify traditional ecological use of sockeye. And
31 also it could be by place, and we could break out the key
32 words for those.

33

34 To date Donald has conducted 10
35 interviews with eight elders and two active harvesters.
36 We've transcribed seven of these. You'll see some clips
37 here later on in the presentation. Like I mentioned
38 earlier, Donald's been working with elders to look at the
39 old Goldschmitt and Hawes' maps and then we have a
40 planned meeting to use mylar to go into mapped areas as
41 people want to share that they're using for this
42 fisheries and harvesting areas today.

43

44 And then we expect the final report to be
45 out for participant, Council and community review by
46 January of 2003. And going down a little bit further if
47 I can on this, basically that we expect to have the final
48 report to the printer by February of 2003.

49

50 And here we just wanted to share just a

00321

1 couple of the excerpts of the sorts of information that
2 we're finding, and both of these come from published
3 sources. That one is a Delaguna who did a lot of in
4 Angoon, and it talks about four sites, and it's an
5 interesting article. And then the second example that we
6 have for you is a work by Harold Jacobs, and it's
7 published in the volume Rubiton (ph) Overcome from the
8 Clan Connection. I think it was in 1993. And he talks
9 about some of the information that he's gathered from his
10 father and his grandfather and working in Angoon.

11

12 And another aspect of this work is that
13 some of these published documents that might not have
14 returned to the community, not Mr. Jacobs, but other
15 studies that have been done using and documenting
16 traditional ecological knowledge actually get repatriated
17 back to the community, and people can decide if they're
18 correct or not and decide if they want to use them or not
19 or do more research.

20

21 And then I'll go ahead and turn it over
22 to Donald to talk about the interview process, and I'll
23 just flick through some of these as he talks about his
24 experiences.

25

26 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Please state your name
27 again.

28

29 MR. FRANK: Okay. My name is Donald
30 Frank. If I mean, I'd like to introduce who I am. I'm a
31 grandson of Daisy Tong. I was adopted by the Kar-wan-ton
32 (ph) Eagle Roof from the Jump House in Klukwan. As I
33 mentioned earlier, I was recently hired as Angoon Tribal
34 Liaison/TEK Coordinator, and with the help of the tribal
35 council I've been focusing on some of our tribal elders,
36 interviewing and documenting some of the traditional
37 lands that have been used for harvesting, and I can say
38 that I've had a lot of cooperation, although there's a
39 few that I could say that they were insulted more or less
40 because this was done before by elders that precede us
41 that knew a lot more, and you could say that they were
42 true elders. But they were able to give me what
43 information that they had. And I was able to interview
44 some harvester that could say growing up that subsistence
45 was their way of life, and without subsistence they would
46 have had a hard time with feeding their family. Hope to
47 have more work done for this project, but due to problems
48 that came up in a month's time, the work came to a halt.
49 But I continue to interview some people, and hope to get
50 three more elders interviewed and some more harvesters to

00322

1 finish up the interviews with customary and traditional
2 use areas. Thank you.

3

4 MS. CRAIG: If the Council had any
5 questions about the AC project, you're welcome to ask
6 those now before we go onto the Sitka TEK. And I'll just
7 continue to sort of go through these excerpts.

8

9 (Pause)

10

11 MS. CRAIG: So we envision a final report
12 coming out that will provide some of the summarized
13 information from the published and unpublished sources
14 that have already been documented. Like Donald
15 mentioned, there's a lot of work that's already been
16 done. There's a lot of work that's been done in
17 communities that needs to be returned back to the
18 communities to be read, to be looked at, to decide
19 whether it's truthful or not, and then also to contain
20 excerpts from the interviews, as well as for other people
21 who wish to, to have their entire interview in the back
22 in sort of an appendix. And then it will also have
23 project maps, and the CD Rom that were talking about is
24 sort of an insert in the pocket so that you can, and the
25 community can go ahead and use that to go ahead and
26 search the bibliographies. And there are phone numbers
27 if you have any questions.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Maybe we'll hold our
30 questions until we finish the panel.

31

32 MS. CRAIG: Sounds good.

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Unless there are any
35 right now?

36

37 MS. DANGEL: Hello, my name is Helen
38 Dangel, I'm with Sitka Tribe of Alaska again, and let me
39 find our presentation. Okay. Okay. So this is my title
40 slide. This is, of course a joint project between Sitka
41 Tribes of Alaska and the Forest Service, Bob Schroeder.
42 This is just a general overview which we've kind of
43 already gone over. It's supposed to document traditional
44 ecological knowledge and traditional clan territories or
45 work plan territories, and to find out how these
46 territories are important today. The whole
47 presentation's geared towards about what this project is
48 actually trying to accomplish, and I think that's -- at
49 least my vision is how territories are used today so that
50 we know what the subsistence resources, how they're being

00323

1 used. And this is the current map of the Sitka
2 traditional territory that Sitka Tribe of Alaska uses for
3 project proposals, et cetera, so it goes from the base of
4 Baranof Island at Cape Ommaney up probably into Hoonah
5 territory, Yakobi Island, et cetera. And the first
6 program they kind of did is the bibliographic research to
7 research books and find out what information already was
8 out there on traditional territories, and to put this
9 into an annotated bibliography. And for the most part
10 what I found for the Sitka area is that most of the
11 historical documentation done by an anthropologist does
12 not have very much on traditional territories at all, so
13 it just hasn't been a very good source, and the STA has a
14 lot of previous interviews from previous projects that
15 contained a lot more information, so that's what most of
16 the bibliography has. And Robi Craig and I developed a
17 data base that Robi mentioned previously to put this
18 information in rather than just doing it in a word
19 processor, and it can be searched this way with key
20 words, and Robi did a lot of the technical writing for
21 that. And it can also be exported to Word documents so
22 it can just be a regular annotated bibliography.

23

24 And this is some forms on the -- just
25 enter all the information and the key words, so you can
26 search for stuff. It has a place for place names and
27 clan territories, et cetera.

28

29 And then for the interview part of it
30 we've used marine charts that Sitka Tribe already has,
31 because most of the elders and subsistence users are
32 familiar with using those and prefer to use them, and so
33 that's what was used. And we put transparencies, just
34 clear plastic over them to mark down the clan territories
35 and other traditional ecological knowledge. A lot of
36 that just kind of comes with the territory. People start
37 talking about where they get stuff and stories, cultural
38 sites, et cetera. And we videotaped these and I'm in the
39 process of transcribing the interviews we've done so far.
40 And so I've done several, and I'll continue doing them
41 through October, and hopefully mostly finish up.

42

43 And the next part of this project is
44 mapping which I've had some training on, and I'll be
45 doing with the assistance of Dave Aubert who works in
46 Juneau with Eco Trust. He's providing the GS support for
47 this project, so we're going to make -- with GS you have
48 a different layer over the base map and we'll have a
49 different layer for each interview. And we'll make this
50 in the composite for different clans. Hopefully that

00324

1 will work out.

2

3 So this is one I've kind of made it as a
4 learning project from Hauten, Begich and Hawes. It just
5 has a couple people who were interviewed and the
6 territories they provided. Looked for the
7 (indiscernible).

8

9 And so just to make a couple comments
10 about my initial findings, I'd just like to say that
11 traditional territories are hard to define. There's no
12 distinct boundaries necessarily. It depends on who you
13 talk to also, but it's not necessary or the house but
14 some others think traditional territories pass back and
15 forth between your family, and it's like from father to
16 soon. It goes to the opposite clan. At least that's
17 what some people are saying. And then others are, you
18 know, well, this is definitely Tiksadi (ph), et cetera.
19 Traditional territories are found from going through past
20 interviews and also doing the interviews for the current
21 project are not being used the same way. People don't
22 necessarily go back to their clan, like with Kagwantaan
23 don't necessarily go back to Kagwantaan because of a
24 variety of factors, and some of these factors are -- I
25 definitely heard less resources due to increased
26 populations. Sitka's gotten a lot bigger, a lot of non
27 native and lots of other people have moved in. And
28 there's also pollution, degraded habitat I especially
29 heard due to logging that, you know, the family's bay
30 they can no longer because it's been ruined. And also
31 changes in traditional ownership of the allotments.
32 Again that's kind of it goes from father to son and then
33 it goes, you know, it's split off into a bunch of
34 different owners, so that really affects ownership.
35 Sitka has Sheldon Jackson and Mt. Edgecumbe, a lot of
36 people from other clans and from other communities and
37 even, you know Eskimo, Inupiat, Aleut have moved in to go
38 to school and stayed. And also with factors, modern life
39 style, have full time jobs, and they just don't have time
40 to go out and collect subsistence every day, so they're
41 weekend warriors. And so that's all in how traditional
42 territories are used today.

43

44 And this is a quote from an interview.
45 It's just an anonymous elder, don't take anything from
46 the picture. I asked, do you still use traditional
47 territories for subsistence gathering, and the elder
48 said, well, the answer would be no. The reason being
49 Western culture has forced us into a pocket where we have
50 to share what little we have left. You can't go against

00325

1 another family and you ask permission. Now it's at the
2 point where you help yourself, you take it for granted
3 that we're all brothers and sisters. It's no longer a
4 Kiksadi (ph) and Kagwantaan it's the people. What we
5 have left, where we do the harvest, regardless of clan,
6 because we're being pushed into a smaller pocket for our
7 subsistence. And that's it.

8

9 MR. KOOKESH: Question. What
10 (indiscernible - away from microphone) anonymous elder?

11

12 MS. DANGEL: I just didn't want to
13 without going back to him first to say his name right
14 now. That's all. I'm sure it will probably be in the
15 final report, but.....

16

17 MR. KOOKESH: This is a draft?

18

19 MS. DANGEL: It's a draft.

20

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Have you got some place
22 names?

23

24 MS. DANGEL: Well, actually Sitka Tribe
25 has done a big place name project already which we helped
26 produce some very beautiful maps that Robi Craig has
27 looked very hard at. So we do get some place name data,
28 but it's mostly already been documented. So, yeah,
29 there's some, you know. Some value (ph) names and stuff
30 like that. Anyone else?

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Marilyn?

33

34 MS. WILSON: I was just wondering where
35 all this information is going to be stored, who can use
36 it or what's going to happen to the information that you
37 are gathering?

38

39 MS. DANGEL: Well, I'm not positive but I
40 know we're supposed to complete a final report, and I
41 think Bob Schroeder might be better able to answer that.
42 I mean, we definitely would send one to him, and I would
43 -- I'm guessing that we would provide copies to all of
44 the RAC, and probably Sitka Tribe. I'm not sure if it's
45 in our proposal where it's all supposed to be sent. Bob?

46

47 MR. SCHROEDER: Marilyn, the intention of
48 this project was that it would come up with a good
49 published documentation of subsistence territories,
50 mainly because that provides a real strong basis for

00326

1 subsistence protection. So balanced against that is the
2 interest of the tribes to keep things private that need
3 to be kept private. So the project envisioned that the
4 tribe would maintain privacy where needed, but publish a
5 good documentation of traditional territories.

6

7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair.

8

9 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: John.

10

11 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have a question.

12

13 REPORTER: John, you'll have to get close
14 to a microphone.

15

16 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I have a
17 question on the map, the GIS map that was prepared by Art
18 View (ph), is it the intent to publish on the complete
19 layered map so that you don't identify special areas? Is
20 that the only thing that would be given out to the public

21

22 MS. DANGEL: Yeah, I think we are
23 planning on composing, compositing the different clans,
24 layers by clans, so it's not necessarily even by
25 interview, because people have different variations, too.
26 So there wouldn't really be any special areas that are
27 documented.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Harold?

30

31 MR. MARTIN: Some years ago we presented
32 a map with Tlingit place names to the Angoon Community
33 Association. That might be helpful to your project. See
34 Walter Frank or Ed Ganda (ph), Walter Jack. These guys
35 were on the community council at the time.

36

37 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: David.

38

39 MR. BELTON: I'm David Belton with the
40 Hoonah Indian Association. I work in Cultural and
41 Natural Resources, and I've been involved in this project
42 since the spring of 2001. Working with me on this
43 project as I said earlier is Angela Sharclaine (ph). In
44 addition to leadership and support that we get from Dr.
45 Schroeder. It would be redundant for me to repeat the
46 purpose and method of this, because it's kind of the same
47 thing that was just described to you that they're doing
48 in Angoon and Sitka is what we're also doing here in
49 Hoonah.

50

00327

1 Two summers ago, the summer before last,
2 we were able to complete 18 interviews. Initially we
3 targeted 20, and we may be able to get two more, but we
4 have 18 that have been completed. Those initial
5 interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and Angela
6 has just completed going back to the original
7 interviewees with the transcriptions and making the
8 corrections, which is kind of a standard process with
9 interviewing.

10

11 We also have been working with other
12 agencies that have helped us. Primarily I'd like to make
13 note of the National Park at Glacier Bay. One of
14 advantage that we have here in Hoonah is that there's
15 been so much research done on our area, and one of those
16 reasons is because one of our traditional areas and very
17 significant areas, of course, is Glacier Bay, and, of
18 course, the National Park and Preserve and their staff
19 have done an incredible amount of research over the
20 years, and there's an incredible volume of work that has
21 been done. So that has made this work much easier for
22 us.

23

24 Initially we made a trip to Glacier Bay
25 and were given access to many of the files that were
26 there that contained material about Glacier and Hoonah
27 territory. In particular we came across a piece of
28 research that was done by Dottie Theateratis (ph) with
29 contributions by Jennifer Sepez (ph) that was part of a
30 cooperative agreement between the National Park and the
31 University of Washington. Part of that work consisted of
32 an annotated bibliography that was quite extensive, some
33 70 pages I believe. And from that we've been able to
34 make additions.

35

36 One of the objectives of the annotated
37 bibliography is not only to incorporate easy to find
38 books, standard books, the Goldschmitt and Hawes report
39 and other things that everyone is familiar with, but a
40 special effort has been made to find unpublished
41 materials, hard to find books, resource studies, things
42 such as the shoreline EIS's that have been conducted over
43 the years, various community development plans, early
44 work with the Department of Fish and Game. You might
45 remember the TRUAC study that's often referred to, the
46 Traditional Use Area Cooperative Study that was done with
47 ADF&G, and all these different sources provide us
48 information that at some point or some place in there
49 talk about traditional use. So we're trying to add those
50 to other bibliographies that we've been able to find

00328

1 associated with other works. We're developing actually
2 quite an extensive volume of citations. It could be a
3 life's work to do this, but fortunately we have the help
4 of many researchers that have done this type of work over
5 the years, and we're kind of trying to bring that all
6 together into one place. So on one hand we have -- and
7 if any of you would like to look through this
8 preliminary, it's very much a draft, very much a work in
9 progress, and I would imagine it will continue to be so.
10 New things pop up all the time, but it's kind of
11 interesting to go through and to see really all the work
12 that's been done in this area in one capacity or another
13 over the years.

14

15 So we've got good progress on our
16 interviews. We've completed like I said 18 to date, and
17 most of those have been transcribed and gone over for
18 corrections. We have a good start on the annotated
19 bibliography. And then we, too, have developed a
20 relationship with the folks at Eco Trust, and this effort
21 started a couple years ago, prior to my coming here,
22 where tribal representatives had contacted them and had
23 been offered assistance with various GIS technical
24 support. We do have RPU capability at the tribe,
25 however, as you all know, it's a very complicated skill.
26 It takes time to develop, so Eco Trust has been very
27 good, and their senior GIS analyst, Dave Albert, has been
28 very helpful.

29

30 One preliminary print that we've made
31 combines some of the orthoquad data that is available
32 through USGS, the Geographical Survey, and combined with
33 some of the data that came out of the TRUAC's study. And
34 I can leave this out on a table for you to look at, but
35 it has kind of a neat look to it. I'll take it around
36 and this is something that we'll continue to work on and
37 refine. I'll just take it around quickly and you can
38 take a look at it. Afterward I'll leave it out on the
39 table. I'm sorry I don't have anything to hang it on
40 right now. But this is kind of the direction that we're
41 going. And it requires in pasting (ph) multiple
42 orthoquads together in order to define the territory that
43 we're looking for, but we hope to be able to produce a
44 variety of GIS maps including various data sources and
45 various images together to make some significant maps.

46

47 MS. WILSON: May I ask a question, Madame
48 Chair?

49

50 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Marilyn.

00329

1 MS. WILSON: Harold just mentioned Tom
2 Thornton and Harold Martin did a traditional place name I
3 think map of all the different areas. Has that been
4 utilized in all of your information gathering?

5
6 MR. BELTON: I would like to comment on
7 that. One thing that one comes to realize soon into this
8 type of work is that it can be very sensitive. Not
9 everyone agrees on where these areas are and were, and
10 certainly here in Hoonah, and I'm sure Mr. Howell from
11 Glacier Bay can agree with me that this work can be very
12 sensitive. The Hoonah Indian Association is also
13 involved with the Park in Tlingit place names of Glacier
14 Bay and the surrounding areas, and I'm not exactly sure
15 right now how we would bring the two together. I believe
16 the tribal administrator at the present time has
17 instructed me to not bring the place name work that
18 they've been doing with Glacier Bay directly into this
19 project at this time, although I believe it's the full
20 intention to do that at the appropriate time. But I
21 think what everyone is wanting to be sensitive to is the
22 appropriate process for bringing our elders and these
23 projects to a place where we can all comfortably and
24 appropriately deal with them. Would that be correct to
25 say, Wayne?

26
27 MR. HOWELL: Yes, that's one aspect of
28 the plan.

29
30 MR. BELTON: I'd like to ask Wayne to
31 contribute to this, because he's very close with the work
32 in Hoonah.

33
34 MR. HOWELL: My name is Wayne Howell, I'm
35 the Cultural Resource Manager at Glacier Bay National
36 Park, and we've been working with the Hoonah Indian
37 Association on the project that Harold brought up, the
38 place name map that Dr. Tom Thornton worked on. And
39 actually HIA is getting ready to produce the final copy
40 of that map. It will be out in paper and CD format very
41 soon.

42
43 But one thing to look at is you can only
44 put so much information on any one map and convey that
45 information effectively. And if you end up putting all
46 the place names as well as that set of information on it,
47 you're going to end up with a very cluttered map. So
48 this is -- it's just different ways of doing the same
49 thing. This will be one map, and then the place name map
50 could be a companion map that could go with it, but not

00330

1 all on the same page.

2

3 MR. BELTON: Thank you. So we're making
4 progress in all three of the initial areas: the
5 annotated bibliography, the interviews and the GIS work.
6 We do have a completion schedule that we're trying to
7 stay with, because some of the folks that are responsible
8 to ensure that these projects are being completed are
9 saying, you know, we need some deliverables, and we are
10 trying to comply with those expectations. But I'm also
11 realizing every day that this is the type of work that
12 could go on and on and will always be a work in progress.

13

14 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have a question.

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

17

18 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have just a general
19 question for all of you is that when you -- you've all
20 referred to Goldschmitt Hawes. What has been your
21 experience with the elders that you've interviewed to
22 date on how closely they follow the original report that
23 was done by them? Do they concur with it in most cases,
24 or are you finding divergence?

25

26 MS. DANGEL: Go ahead.

27

28 MR. BELTON: Actually it depends on who
29 you talk to. You talk to some folks and they say, oh,
30 yes, that's very close. Very close. Then you talk to
31 others and they say oh, no that map needs to continue up
32 past Cape Fairweather, we need to include Dry Bay and the
33 Alsek River in that. Then you get anybody from Yakutat
34 sitting up a little bit taller in their chair, and they
35 say, don't talk about Dry Bay. And I think therein lies
36 the significance of this work. I think that initially
37 we're thinking we're going to produce a body of work that
38 more clearly defines where these territories were, and I
39 think that's wild. I think what we're going find out of
40 this work is that it's the opposite. What we need to
41 understand I think is the relationships that people had,
42 and how the territories were used based on those
43 relationships, and by those protocols of asking
44 permission and those interfamily connections. I think
45 therein lies the real significance of this project rather
46 than more clearly defining where that boundary line went,
47 because that boundary line is really more of a Western
48 concept than an indigenous one.

49

50 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. We do have Mike

00331

1 Turek who's going to talk about other TEK projects, and
2 we have Meg Cartwright who's going to be talking about
3 some of the stock assessment projects, and we're in the
4 middle of the evening. So do we want to ask more
5 questions or keep going? One question, I know this is
6 multi-year, because it's kind of drug out longer than we
7 wanted it to, but it is intended to be multi-year. Is
8 there a completion date that we're looking at?
9

10 MS. CRAIG: We're looking at February
11 2003. And that's (indiscernible).

12
13 REPORTER: I'm sorry, the microphone.

14
15 MR. FRANK: Repeat it.

16
17 MS. CRAIG: The answer to the question,
18 Angoon is looking at 2003. February 2003, sorry.

19
20 MS. DANGEL: Sitka Tribe will probably be
21 finished around March of 2003.

22
23 MR. BELTON: The Hoonah Tribe is hoping
24 to be done shortly after the first of year.

25
26 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So then are any of the
27 three tribes intending to apply for FIS money for future
28 TEK work?

29
30 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

31
32 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: We encourage you to.

33
34 MS. CRAIG: Yes, from Sitka. Yeah.

35
36 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: One of the things that
37 I think the council needs to discuss, and I talked with
38 Meg Cartwright out it is that this is a perfect vehicle
39 to continue to train local people in rural Alaska to do
40 social as well as biological research, to do enough of it
41 that they themselves qualify to apply for their grants so
42 they continue to hold the knowledge that they develop,
43 recognizing that the money that FIS handles through
44 Southeast is minimal compared to the needs of Southeast.
45 Part of the discussion and direction we have to give is
46 where else can we seek money, how much do we have to
47 encourage these guys on so that they can start in doing
48 their own research and displacing university people like
49 me. And so I'd like to keep that in the back of our mind
50 as we hear the rest of the discussion, to think about

00332

1 what we can do to keep this going, to try and, as it was
2 mentioned, the stock assessment work was expanded in part
3 because they were able to interface with the salmon funds
4 from Stevens. Are there types of funds that we can
5 interface with TEK in order to expand the amount of TEK
6 work that is being done. Bob.

7

8 MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, we were
9 able to get this set of projects going, and we ran them
10 through the Forestry Sciences Lab which was where I was
11 working previously. At this point that's no longer
12 possible, so we really need tribes to be applying
13 directly for these funds, and I'm sure I and other staff
14 would assist tribes, but the tribes would need to be
15 principle investigators on subsequent TEK work, and I
16 think a success of this project is that definitely tribes
17 are set up to do exactly that.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
20 Turek. So, Mike, earlier this evening you handed some
21 stuff out to us, so we have State of Alaska, Department
22 of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, and follow
23 that by this green colored handout.

24

25 MR. TUREK: Madame Chair, and Council
26 members, my name is Mike Turek. I'm with the Alaska
27 Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence.
28 And I'm here this evening to briefly discuss the project
29 that we're working on, the FIS projects we're working on
30 with tribes in Southeast Alaska. And I'll start with our
31 two projects that we're doing with -- in 2001, the
32 Klawock River and Saffran Lake traditional sockeye salmon
33 use project and the Kake sockeye salmon use project.
34 Work continues on both these TEK projects. These are
35 collaborative community based TEK projects, and the level
36 of community involvement is the most that I've been
37 involved with since I've been working with the Department
38 for eight years. So this is loaded (ph) with a little
39 uncertainty when considering the time line. It's taken
40 more time than originally planned since these were new
41 projects and as the projects developed we ended up -- the
42 communities got more involved with the projects and took
43 over more control of the projects in many respects, and
44 that has lead to it's taking more time than originally
45 planned. But I think it's for the better of the
46 projects.

47

48 What happened in Klawock was we
49 originally planned on doing 10 to 12 key respondent
50 interviews concerning traditional sockeye knowledge, and

00333

1 the tribe wanted to do more, and it ended up being about
2 25 interviews, and some quite extensive with Klawock and
3 Craig elders. So that's taken more time to do the
4 interviews and also transcribe the interviews. And we're
5 only now just beginning to start preparing to enter the
6 interview data into the ASEN (ph) searchable data bases.

7

8 In Kake what happened is that the Kake
9 staff decided they wanted to be responsible for the
10 interviews, the transcriptions and also for a part of the
11 report writing, and so that also took a little more time.
12 But I think it's better for the research, and I think
13 it's really helped with developing the skill levels in
14 the tribes with the tribes.

15

16 For the Klawock River project we hired
17 Donald Yates from Craig and James Rowan and Peter Brown
18 from Klawock to work on the project as temporary fish and
19 wildlife technicians. They worked with our staff, Nancy
20 Rotner (ph), they conducted interviews, and were trained
21 on the interview techniques and also in the observations
22 of the contemporary fisheries, and that worked out quite
23 well. They did a very good job, and after working with
24 the Subsistence Division, Both James Rowan and Peter
25 Brown were hired to conduct interviews for the Alaska
26 Traditional Diet Survey being conducted by the Alaska
27 Native Health Board. And they got those jobs because of
28 the experience they had with us conducting interviews.
29 And we've spoken with people at the Alaska Native Health
30 Board why are very impressed with the ability of these
31 two young men to conduct interviews. And Peter Brown has
32 also worked for the Commercial Fish Division this past
33 summer on the Klawock River stock assessment project.
34 And one or both of these individuals if we do some
35 steelhead work, we'd like to have them involved since
36 they know how to do the interviews.

37

38 One problem we did run into in Craig and
39 Klawock was just of technical support. They didn't have
40 easy access to computers, so that slowed some of the work
41 down, too. They didn't own personal computers themselves
42 and had a hard time getting access to personal computers
43 for the writing.

44

45 In Kake, Elizabeth Cheney (ph), we hired
46 her. Actually what we did was we transferred funds from
47 our project to the Organized Village of Kake. We did a
48 cooperative agreement to fund some of the work Elizabeth
49 Cheney did, which was the interviews and the
50 documentation of the contemporary fisheries. But Liz

00334

1 went back to school, she's now in law school in New
2 Mexico, so since she left, we've been working with Don
3 Jackson and the other, Charles Johnson on completing the
4 project. And we've gotten chapters from them already,
5 and most of the interviews. We still haven't gotten all
6 of the interview material from them yet. But the report
7 will look different after they get done, because parts of
8 it are actually written by the tribe, so it will have the
9 -- it sounds like it's coming from the village, not from
10 us, which is what we wanted. And so I think that's going
11 to be -- that will be interesting how that goes. I'm
12 excited about that.

13

14 So those projects continue. We continue
15 to work on them. We've set a date of December 31st of
16 2002 to have draft final reports which we can share with
17 the RAC, and have for community review and the Federal
18 staff. But we've asked for a six-month extension of the
19 developing, completing the data base aspect of it. The
20 ASAN data base, because it's taking us longer to get the
21 interview material and get it put into the data base
22 format than we originally planned.

23

24 Other projects that we're working on from
25 the FIS, the continuing management and development of
26 Southeast Alaska subsistence fisheries geographical
27 information system, GIS data base, which we began in
28 2001. This is a GIS data base designed to integrate
29 fisheries data from Southeast Alaska, primarily from the
30 Department's Commercial Fisheries data base into an
31 accessible visual framework. And that's been funded for
32 a second, and a third year actually. The third year
33 project which we'll just be starting this year is a
34 cooperative project between the Division and Tlingit and
35 Haida on further development of the data base, and also
36 beginning to work on getting the data base accessible
37 through the internet.

38

39 Another project, which is part of the
40 statewide project, the validity and reliability of the
41 fisheries harvest assessment methods, is a project that's
42 a statewide FIS project with the Subsistence Division.
43 And here in Southeast what we've done is we've worked
44 with the communities of Kake, Angoon and Hoonah last
45 winter, and we collected -- we did subsistence salmon
46 surveys, face-to-face surveys, hire local people to
47 conduct the interviews, and we completed those last
48 winter, and the data is being processed now by our data
49 management group in Anchorage.

50

00335

1 For 2002 we have a Wrangell traditional
2 salmon use project which the funding was broken up over
3 two years, and we'll be working with the Wrangell
4 Cooperative Association on this, and this year what we
5 did for the project is we took a trip up the Stikine
6 River with Dick Stokes and John Feller, and several
7 Federal staff, and myself and Nancy Ratner, and Nancy was
8 interviewing Dick Stokes during the trip, and we'll
9 follow up this next year with the rest of the funding to
10 document the fisheries of Thoms Creek and Virginia Lake
11 and continue with some key respondent interviews. And
12 we'll begin that with working with the tribe this late
13 winter, early spring on that.

14

15 This coming year, in this next summer,
16 there's the Hula (ph) Klawock salmon survey project,
17 which is a Tlingit and Haida project. They're the
18 primary investigator. But we're working with them on
19 that, and Steve Langdon, professor of anthropology,
20 University of Alaska, is also one of the investigators on
21 that. And we've done some initial planning with him.
22 He'll be doing key respondent interviews with elders in
23 Klawock, and in Hoonah about traditional fisheries. And
24 he'll be working in Hoonah primarily on documenting the
25 contemporary fishery.

26

27 Those are all the FIS projects we have.
28 I'll also briefly mention we're working on a Sustainable
29 Salmon Fund project. We got funding from the Sustainable
30 Salmon, which was discussed earlier at the meeting, to do
31 a project on the Chilkoot and Chilkat Rivers, and we're
32 conducting interviews this winter in the subsistence
33 fisheries in Haines and Klukwan, house-to-house -- excuse
34 me, face-to-face surveys on salmon and steelhead harvest.
35 And we're also this summer in Haines and Klukwan, we had
36 a graduate intern, Marvin Smith who's from Juneau, and
37 she worked with Jenny Hotch who's from Klukwan, and
38 who's also a university student at UAS in the
39 anthropology department. And they did some interviewing
40 and also documentation of the fisheries, and they also
41 have quite a bit of information from a previous
42 researcher with the Division who worked on the Chilkat
43 River and Chilkoot River on a king salmon project that
44 will be included in this. And that's all the projects I
45 have to discuss with you. If you have any questions, I
46 can answer them.

47

48 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Are there any
49 questions?

50

00336

1 MR. TUREK: The handout I gave you has a
2 more detailed description of the projects, and it also
3 have some other projects we're working on that aren't FIS
4 projects, so you know how to get ahold of me if you have
5 any questions later after reading that. And this handout
6 that I included, this is was made by Nancy Radner and
7 Nancy Long. Nancy Long works in the Communications
8 Division of the Department, and this was done for the
9 Salmon Festival in Portland, and the Division had a both
10 there, and Nancy Radner's responsible for putting
11 together this information about subsistence salmon
12 fishing in Alaska, primarily Southeast Alaska, and some
13 of these -- you'll some of these quotes from, like it
14 says Tlingit subsistence fisherman, that's from Nancy's
15 work in Klawock and Craig. And we'd love to be able to
16 start doing more things like this that are brief and
17 informative, and colorful, and things that we could start
18 sharing with people in the villages. Sometimes the
19 technical reports we have are a little bit too
20 intimidating for a lot of people I think, and just a
21 little bit too much at one time, so we're looking at
22 trying to do more of this kind of thing, brief
23 information that we can share with the communities and
24 with people, and just kind of get the word out about
25 what's going on in the villages as far as subsistence.

26
27 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield and
28 then Marilyn.

29
30 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, just a
31 question for Mike, in the six month extension that's
32 required, is that something that you're requesting an
33 action item from us, or just (indiscernible -
34 simultaneous speech).

35
36 MR. TUREK: I'm requesting it from FIS.
37 I'll be submitting a funding final request.

38
39 MR. LITTLEFIELD: All right.

40
41 MS. WILSON: Madame Chair, Mike, what
42 will be done with all this information that's compiled?
43

44 MR. TUREK: For one thing, we'll be
45 submitting reports to FIS, and then we're going to be
46 working on these Ask Sam (ph) data basis. They'll be on
47 a CD and they're searchable by word, so if you wanted to
48 access information on salmon fishing, you could search it
49 by word. And that's to try to make it a little more
50 interesting. People may not necessarily want to pick up

00337

1 a technical report. But we'd also like to be able to do
2 some more of these brief kind of one or two page
3 information sheets that we can hand out to people, that
4 would be something that more people may read than the big
5 technical reports. That's the idea right now. In the
6 future we'd like to be able to get into more visual
7 things, perhaps videos and some other things like that,
8 but at this point, one thing we really want to start
9 doing a better job on is coming up with some brief things
10 we can share to people's in the communities, something
11 they're more likely to read than the technical papers.

12

13 MS. WILSON: Okay. Thanks.

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So, I know you've been
16 here for the last three days. It sounds like John wants
17 a publication on how to do gink (ph). But I think you
18 heard in our discussion with McBride and Weaver that we
19 are looking at steelhead and hooligan as two areas of
20 concern. And I hope that in speaking to all of the TEK
21 presenters that you will consider what kind of projects
22 could be done on TEK for those regions. In terms of
23 hooligan, I'm not sure who would pick up the ball and
24 take it, but I hope to see a TEK proposal in the next
25 year.

26

27 MR. TUREK: Madame Chair, Council, one
28 thing we could do, since we haven't started doing a lot
29 of the interviews for Wrangell is we can include asking
30 people about Stikine. When we talk about Stikine salmon,
31 we could also have them -- we could ask them about
32 Stikine hooligan.

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Uh-huh.

35

36 MR. TUREK: Often we get -- I mean, that
37 just makes sense. We're sitting down and talking to
38 somebody about, like I say, it's awfully hard to keep
39 them on one species, so we often pick up other
40 information when we're doing these interviews and we're
41 trying to concentrate on salmon, but we could very easily
42 just, you know, also ask people about hooligan on the
43 Stikine.

44

45 MR. MARTIN: Madame Chair?

46

47 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Martin.

48

49 MR. MARTIN: Mike, this is good. I think
50 you should have pictures from Southeast.

00338

1 MR. TUREK: We wanted to have some
2 pictures from Southeast, but unfortunately the only
3 pictures we have from Southeast showed people in boats
4 without lifevests, and the Department wouldn't let us
5 publish those.

6
7 MR. MARTIN: That's traditional.

8
9 MR. TUREK: That's traditional. Yeah.
10 But we're trying to also work on taking more photos.
11 That's something on these projects. We're trying to
12 build some kind of a photo bank, so we can actually
13 include pictures from Southeast.

14
15 MR. MARTIN: I thought you already had a
16 picture (indiscernible).

17
18 MR. TUREK: Oh, we've.....

19
20 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

21
22 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So just to follow up
23 on that, we had recommended earlier to go to the Federal
24 Subsistence Board that that 49 or 59,000 be used for some
25 steelhead survey work on POW. You thought that could be
26 done. Just like off my brain idea is if all of that
27 money is not needed, could any of it be sent over to
28 Wrangell to say, okay. we're going to do Stikine and Unuk
29 on hooligan if more money is needed in that area?

30
31 MR. TUREK: Madame Chair, as we said,
32 we'd have to talk to Cal about it probably, and FIS.

33
34 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. I think it's a
35 good idea. Okay. Thank you, Mike.

36
37 MR. TUREK: Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Meg.

40
41 MS. CARTWRIGHT: Madame Chair, can you
42 hear me?

43
44 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: I hear you good.

45
46 MS. CARTWRIGHT: And Council?

47
48 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Meredith says if you
49 put that down, she can tune it to you.

50

00339

1 MS. CARTWRIGHT: Thank you. My name is
2 Meg Cartwright, and I work with the Department of Fish
3 and Game, and I am involved in cooperative projects with
4 the six tribes and the Forest Service on 13 lakes in
5 Southeast Alaska. I am not going to be the only --
6 there's other presenters tonight. Real quick, Jack
7 Lorrigan from STA is going to talk about the Sitka
8 projects, and Frederick and Ben were going to talk about
9 the Hoonah projects. We appreciate you staying so late,
10 and I'm going to try and go through this pretty fast, so
11 feel free to ask me any questions tomorrow.

12
13 So we work on sockeye salmon research on
14 important sockeye subsistence systems that have been
15 identified by the communities in Southeast Alaska. These
16 fisheries research monitoring programs are funded by the
17 Forest Service with oversight by OSM, and this year we
18 also had contributing funds from the Southeast
19 Sustainable Salmon Fund as well as the Alaska Department
20 of Fish and Game. Typically these studies have three
21 cooperators, six tribal governments, ADF&G, and the
22 Forest Service. And in the projects that I oversee,
23 typically there's a Fish and Game crew leader and two to
24 three tribal technicians. And like I said, in 2001 we
25 looked at 13 different lakes. We had a staff of 45 to 50
26 people. We consulted limnologists, biometricians. Ben
27 Van Alen who was working for Fish and Game did a
28 tremendous amount of setting up of these studies, and we
29 continue to consult with him. And, of course, we
30 consulted the public on a regular basis. Technical
31 support came from the limnology labs of Fish and Game, as
32 well as we published our annual reports through Fish and
33 Game. If any of you would like a copy of those, I would
34 be glad to send them to you electronically or in the
35 mail.

36
37 This is a map of Southeast Alaska and all
38 the lakes that we worked on, and mostly what I want you
39 to take away from this is that the lake projects were
40 centered around what Floyd calls little cities. For
41 example, here at Wrangell, we had three lakes, Thoms,
42 Luck, Salmon, Kake had Falls, Gut, Kutlaku, et cetera, et
43 cetera. So if we lose funding, we're going to have to
44 break up these projects that are centered around these
45 towns. And I'm kind of worried about that, but for now
46 we have funding through next year.

47
48 The short-term research objective is to
49 collect data for five years. We currently have funding
50 for three. We're trying to figure out how many adults

00340

1 are coming back to each one of those lakes, how many fry
2 they produce in the lake, the amount of food available
3 for these fry in fresh water, number of adults harvested
4 in the terminal fisheries, both sport and subsistence,
5 and we take a look at lake characteristics and biological
6 data like how old these guys are coming back. Here's a
7 picture of the Angoon crew setting a seine. I think
8 that's on Kook. Here's the Martin (ph) work, where there
9 were spotters.

10

11 And here's Bob Sanderson from Hydaburg.
12 He's 72 years old, and he's working on the Hetta project,
13 and he gets frustrated when the young people can't keep
14 up with him. And we did community meeting in Hydaburg,
15 and Bob's just a walking encyclopedia of all the
16 fisheries in the area. And if you're looking for someone
17 to do a TEK project, I would highly recommend paying
18 somebody to follow him around. He's been interviewed a
19 lot, but Doug McBride and were talking about that he
20 hasn't been interviewed about the fisheries information
21 that he knows that would be very valuable to us. So I
22 think that would be a very worthy project.

23

24 This is the Angoon crew again walking
25 streams and counting fish for Fish and Game. This was
26 outside the stock assessment projects. The manager in
27 Juneau had these guys walk Kanalku stream once a week in
28 July as an in-season management tool. I think just again
29 one of the benefits of getting to know the technicians in
30 Angoon. Here's the Angoon crew again. This was when
31 they went up to Kook Lake and removed the debris from the
32 caves (ph) with Ben Van Alen. Again an extra special
33 project that we involved them in.

34

35 Long-term research objectives are to set
36 a range of escapement numbers and see if within that
37 number that we put into the lake an adequate number of
38 adults return, that the sockeye fry densities are
39 adequate as well as subsistence fishery needs are met.

40

41 I'm about ready to give you the 2001
42 results with the warning that this is just one year's
43 worth of data, and biological data varies highly from
44 year to year, so I would recommend that you don't take
45 any management actions based on information from 2001.

46

47 Here's the lakes in order of how many
48 adults returned. Salmon Bay had the most, over 20,000,
49 and Kanalku and Iningen (ph) had the lowest returns. The
50 Kanaku and Kook, the ones in red, it's not clear how many

00341

1 fish really returned to Kanaku and Kook because there was
2 so few returning that we couldn't get enough fish in hand
3 to make a good estimate. Hoktaheen is a crazy place to
4 fly into, and then 9/11 happened, and we didn't get in
5 there for a month so we missed the peak. Hetta has some
6 problems of its own, and so we're not quite sure how many
7 fish returned there. But the rest of them we were able
8 to do mark/recapture to estimate those that were
9 returning, as well as we had some weirs and I'll show you
10 some of that information a little bit later.

11

12 This is the only science graph, okay?
13 And I just couldn't help myself. The blue bars in this
14 are sockeye salmon fry densities in the lake. Hetta had
15 the highest fry density. And the line here shows the
16 mean zooplankton biomass, or the amount of food. And if
17 you drew a trend line through there, you would see that
18 in these lakes that had few adult returns had the high
19 food levels, and by Hetta they had declined.

20

21 This is a hydro-acoustic survey transect.
22 This is how we count the number of fry in a lake. If you
23 just ignore the purple line and look at the yellow line,
24 this is a line going straight across the lake. So if you
25 look on the left-hand side here, it's like pulling off
26 the shore, as the depth of the lack drops, and then as
27 you're coming up on the shore on the right you see the
28 bottom comes up again. This is Kanalku who had the
29 lowest density of sockeye fry, so anybody who felt like
30 maybe we missed the spawners coming in, this is another
31 opportunity to see just exactly how many fish are in the
32 lake. And hydro-acoustic gear is just like a fancy fish
33 finder, and the red dots are targets and fish. So here's
34 Kanalku with the lowest density, and here's Hetta with
35 the highest density. So this is just to give you an idea
36 of the contrast between a lake that had a significant
37 number of adults returning, and one that did not, plus
38 everything, survival between when the adults came in and
39 the fry in the lake.

40

41 We had four systems in which we
42 interviewed the fishermen on the grounds for their
43 subsistence harvest, and this graph shows the striped bar
44 is what was reported on the subsistence permits. The
45 black bar shows what we estimated the catch was on the
46 grounds. And you can see in all cases with varying
47 degrees that the number on the grounds was higher than
48 that reported, and other than the Hetta, it only shows
49 one permit being returned with 40 fish on it. Bob
50 Sanderson made a point to go to every single household

00342

1 and ask them how many fish they harvested from Hetta, and
2 he left no stone unturned, and I'm wondering if they
3 thought that was all they had to do. He'd incredible.
4 So then the white bars here is the number of fish that we
5 estimated came into the lake, and you can see that in
6 proportion to the number harvested in Klawock it's about
7 35 percents. It falls in Klag -- or it falls in Hetta
8 where it's close to 50. And Klag last year had an
9 insignificant amount taken in the subsistence fishery
10 compared to the escapement.

11

12 We have weirs on Klawock, Falls and in
13 Klag. So these are those estimates. Here's some data
14 from the just reported subsistence harvest on the
15 permits, and how many fish came into the lake, and you
16 can see the ones that we're concerned about in red,
17 because we didn't have very many fish coming back, we
18 couldn't get a good estimate, or else were the ones that
19 have equal or greater subsistence harvests in front of
20 them. The others look like they're in good shape.

21

22 So over-all, in general, just a quick
23 view. 2001. Low returns to Kanalku, Gut Bay and Kook.
24 We weren't able to get an estimate at all in Gut Bay. It
25 just doesn't lend itself for mark/recapture. We still
26 think it's politically important to get information, so
27 this year we did an index. We just go around the lake
28 and count every time every time we'd go in. Falls, mixed
29 bag. I'm concerned about Falls. I see an increase in
30 effort. The black line is the number of permits, and I
31 see the harvest staying about the same. The red diamond
32 on this is the estimate of harvest in 2001 from the
33 spawning grounds that we did. Healthy adults returns
34 just for one year at least appear in Salmon Bay, Leftans
35 (ph), Sitka and Klag. Unclear results from Hetta. We
36 had a beach study group and a stream study group, and
37 their marks went back and forth. They couldn't decide
38 where to spawn. Klawock, we had a weir count of 7,00, a
39 mark/recapture of 14,000 last year. A big discrepancy
40 between those two with lots of effort to try and keep
41 that weir fish tight. Those efforts have increased this
42 year, and it looks like mark/recapture and the weir
43 estimate will be about the same. Hoktaheen, I'll let the
44 Hoonah project talk about that. They took it over this
45 year. And Hasselborg River we dropped from the project,
46 because the water gets really high this time of year, and
47 we just couldn't keep the nets in, so we added Kutlaku
48 this year.

49

50 2002 season, just a preliminary thing is

00343

1 it looks like at Falls Lake we had an escapement of about
2 1,000 with two to 3,000 taken in the subsistence fishery.
3 Gut Bay continues to be low. When we've gone in this
4 year, we've observed 80 to 50 fish each time we've gone
5 in compared to at least we had a couple hundred last
6 year. Kutlaku, I'm going mark/recapture. Klawock as of
7 September 12th had 10,000 fish through the weir. Dave
8 Johnson said he thinks it's up to 12 now. It's just
9 incredible. Sometimes it dribbles to three or four, and
10 then all of a sudden a thousand fish come in. We're not
11 really sure what's going on there. Bob Sanderson
12 reported 900 fish taken from Hetta, 1,001 from Eek and
13 1300 from Kasook this year. Very different than the
14 subsistence fishery last year when there large amounts of
15 adults returning to Hetta. So when Hetta's low like this
16 year, then they use the other systems. Thoms, Salmon
17 Bay, Luck, mark/recapture in progress.

18

19 Kanalku I'm happy to report had 200 fish
20 last year as an estimate, and we've seen at least 700 to
21 800 this year. And I'm going to talk a little bit about
22 why that is. It's totally due to what happened in Angoon
23 this year.

24

25 Kook also is showing an increase I think
26 thanks to the crew that goes in there and takes out the
27 debris jam. Now the fish can come up. And Sitka has
28 always been pretty healthy, and also an on-going
29 mark/recapture.

30

31 Cooperative projects. What's in it for
32 all of us? I think the most important thing is
33 maintaining healthy stocks. Fish and Game has an
34 opportunity to go in and look at these small systems that
35 we've never had enough money to look at, and the tribe
36 gets to work with us in fresh water lakes to see what the
37 escapement really is. I think it has fostered better
38 communication between Fish and Game and the tribes. Some
39 good examples are a Sitka meeting in which Kake, Angoon
40 and Sitka asked for some changes in the permitting of the
41 subsistence fishery, and they got them all. Fish and
42 Game said, okay, we're going to try it. Fish and Game
43 wanted to close Kanalku. They said it's been chronically
44 low for a long time. The Community of Angoon asked that
45 Fish and Game not close it, they would like to handle it
46 internally, and they did. And I think the 700 fish that
47 are there is a consequence of, for the most part, people
48 staying out. There were a few people that went in, and
49 apparently the rest of the community got on the CB and
50 said, what are you doing in there, get out of there. So

00344

1 I think it's much more effective than Fish and Game
2 trying to close it. And I think that as real positive.

3

4 My staff and I travelled to almost every
5 community this winter to give the results from last year,
6 and to hear what people have to say. Partnerships, I
7 would define our partnership with STA as a partnership.
8 Jack Lorrigan is the fisheries biologist for STA and he's
9 done an excellent job, and we just try to stay out of his
10 way and give him help when he needs it, and let him go
11 with the rest. The Eek Lake proposal was put in by
12 Hydaburg Community Association. I think you guys maybe
13 know about our relationship with Hydaburg in the past has
14 been very bad. Fish and Game tried to go in and do a
15 lake enhancement project in Hetta Lake in the late 70s,
16 and everything got stolen. All the time. No matter, you
17 know, just leaving the camp for 20 minutes, so Fish and
18 Game pulled out and said, okay, if you guys don't want to
19 do this project, you know, we're leaving. So contrast
20 that with what we see now is Tony Christianson who's head
21 of the Hydaburg Community Association, Cooperative
22 Association, is really gung-ho to do this research. He
23 put this proposal in. We said we'd back him up. I can
24 see that there might be some opportunities to do some
25 partnerships with Hydaburg in the future on Hetta Lake.
26 It's provided jobs all around, especially for Fish and
27 Game and the tribes, and it's provided an opportunity to
28 start capacity building.

29

30 Areas in which I think we need some
31 improvement are better estimates of subsistence harvest.
32 I don't think we're there yet. I think it's some trust
33 things, but in terms of a stock assessment thing, we need
34 to know how many fish are coming back to the terminal
35 areas. I think we can do a better job of developing
36 capacity building. I see us as just having this little
37 project with three-month positions, and I've tried to
38 look at on the outside looking in, is this something I'd
39 want to base my career on is a three-month job? I don't
40 know. For some people I think it's great. Other people
41 might want more development. I don't think -- I don't
42 have the time to do it, but I think we need to, you know,
43 hire somebody to coordinate, to see whether we can
44 combine several jobs. And I think -- and it would be
45 great if we could have some stability in the funding,
46 especially for long-term objectives. I spend 75 percent
47 of my time just trying to figure out how much money we
48 have and writing proposals to get more.

49

50 So ideas for capacity building, I'm just

00345

1 going to touch on them, is combining local jobs. Say
2 Mike's got interviewing the winter, and we've got some
3 three-month project, there's watershed stuff going on.
4 Could we combine all of these and make a six to eight-
5 month job for somebody and attract some good applicants.
6 Rotating positions. I have come to see how -- you know,
7 fisheries work, fish just go all the time. They don't
8 care what's going on in your life, and oftentimes that's
9 not compatible with the tribal technicians, so maybe
10 three people for two positions so they could rotate out
11 and do some subsistence fishing and harvesting in the
12 summer, which kind of precludes them from doing it in
13 these projects. Office support for tribal governments,
14 if we're working towards having them take over these
15 research projects, then they need someone in the office
16 who knows what we're doing, and we need to pay them. And
17 so mechanisms to move technicians who have been in here
18 for a while and have learned the jobs, moving into the
19 crew leader position, Fish and Game. I think it's an
20 excellent way to get them there and then they can go from
21 that. And I've already talked to the human resource
22 people on how we can do that. It's doable. Plug in for
23 the fisheries technology program at University of Alaska
24 Southeast out of Ketchikan. They will long-distance
25 delivery anywhere in Southeast, so these guys can take
26 these classes, and it's just perfect for our program.
27 Central Council's interested in getting involved, and
28 maybe some oversight from them. These are things I'm
29 just throwing out, and, of course, I'd love to see the
30 Partners for Fisheries Monitoring come to Southeast at
31 some point. It's not here yet.

32

33 Future funding sources. You have in your
34 booklets the Federal FY 03 proposals with matching funds
35 from the Governor's fund. I've been told by Andy
36 McGreagor, who's the regional supervisor for Southeast,
37 that he will make them a top priority for Governor's
38 fund. But it has to go through a process and panels.
39 Shareholders and stakeholders and who knows what will
40 happen, but the Kake project and the Klag project are
41 contingent on these matching funds. And then looking in
42 the future for more matching funds from Southeast
43 Sustainable Salmon Funds as well as starting to work with
44 the tribal governments on what money they might have
45 available.

46

47 So I'm just going to leave you with a
48 couple of shots here. This is the crew arrived at Sitka
49 Lake, and then here's the camp life at night. Here's
50 underwater beach boating (ph), and this is Kook Lake in

00346

1 the morning. I always like to add a little plug for
2 fisheries habitat so that our fish don't end having to do
3 this, which occurred in Washington. The culverts got
4 plugged, and the fish had to cross the road to get to
5 their spawning ground. That's it.

6

7 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Thank you, Meg. I
8 don't know if you wanted to have the other two guys
9 present before we start asking questions?

10

11 MS. CARTWRIGHT: Yes, why don't we do
12 that? I think that would be great. So, Jack, you want
13 to come up and.....

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: A two minute break.

16

17 (Off record)

18

19 (On record)

20

21 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA:presentations,
22 Hoonah Indian Association, subsistence fish project and
23 Sitka Tribe. Okay. And are you starting, Jack, or is
24 Hoonah starting, or have you guys deciding? Okay.

25

26 MR. LORRIGAN: Good evening, Ms. Chair,
27 Council. My name is Jack Lorrigan. I'm the biologist
28 for the Sitka Tribe of Alaska. I have been at STA for
29 about six and a half, seven years now. We had these
30 projects last year in cooperation with Fish and Game,
31 Douglas office, and the Fish and Game Sitka office, and
32 the U.S. Forest Service, and in one lake in particular we
33 also have another partner at Salmon Lake with Ensera (ph)
34 since their facility is in such close proximity to Salmon
35 Lake. I'll start from the North and work my way south.
36 Klag Bay this year, we had the weir in by the middle of
37 June, and the crew counted about 17,000 plus sockeye
38 through. We had a little bit of problem at the beginning
39 of the run. A lot of people came up and harvested a lot
40 of fish, and then we had 24 fish through the weir for a
41 long time. And based on the numbers through the weir,
42 they ended up closing Klag Bay to try and protect the
43 first third of the run, because we had no idea how big
44 the run was going to be. Based on the crew's creel
45 survey and their observations, they estimate that
46 probably four to 6,000 fish were harvested from Klag Bay
47 that probably won't be reported. There's some real good
48 fishing going on. It will be interesting to see what is
49 reported on the permits when they come back. One of the
50 reasons for the perceived excess is that people were

00347

1 fishing for a limit of 50 fish, and it was maybe being
2 taken advantage of by some. So with that in mind, the
3 weir passed about 17,000 fish. They were able to mark at
4 a rate of 18.4 percent, which means that for every 1,000
5 fish, 184 going through had a mark on them. And they did
6 a recapture a couple weeks ago and they found a
7 mark/recapture rate of 18.2 percent, so that gives us
8 pretty good confidence that our weir is tight, and they
9 were only counting through what is in the lake. Right
10 now we have one more year left to go on Klag Lake. We
11 anticipate hopefully to keep this funded. It turns out
12 that it is a very important sockeye resource for the
13 Community of Sitka, because a lot of people come up
14 because they couldn't go to Redoubt or Salmon Lake, so
15 they went to the next best system which was north, which
16 was us. And they're done with Klag Bay, they move south
17 towards Nikla Bay.

18

19 Working our way south, we have Salmon
20 Lake, and they had 750 sockeye return this year, and
21 about 45,000 pinks, so the lake's getting nutrients, but
22 they're not sockeyes. We don't know the reason for such
23 a low number of fish this year. We don't have a creel
24 survey going on at the mouth of the lake. We don't know
25 if anybody fished at this time yet at down at salt water,
26 and how well they did. We hear reports about people
27 going in there and subsistence fishing, but we have no
28 idea what their effort's like.

29

30 The reason I don't have a Power Point
31 presentation for you is that my season literally -- the
32 biggest part of it ended last week, and I haven't had
33 time to do anything. At this time we had another crew go
34 out to get Klag Lake one more, get a recapture done and
35 get the camp broke out, and then send another -- we'll
36 continue through Halloween, because we're looking at the
37 coho run in that system.

38

39 Salmon Lake, my crew is in partnership
40 with the Fish and Game office from Sitka, so there's a
41 Fish and Game crew there plus two STA employees out there
42 throughout the summer and fall for those runs. They've
43 got about 200 coho through the system, and they've
44 decreased the limit in that system down to one fish a day
45 for coho just to protect that run, because those fish
46 have to run through such a huge gauntlet in the Sitka
47 Sound area.

48

49 And our last lake, a new project, is Red
50 Fish Bay, Tumakof Lake, and we had 23,000 fish come

00348

1 through that, and there's an estimate of another 1,000
2 below the weir that did not come through. They had
3 turned red and they were still bright fish mixed in, but
4 during high flows or whatever, they just stayed in salt
5 water for whatever reason by the time we pulled the weir
6 a couple weeks ago. And from old literature back in the
7 1900s, they were still seeing bright fish clear through
8 November I think. It's a really unique system. The
9 reason why we're there is that in the year 2000 there was
10 some illegal seining that went that they harvested a very
11 large portion of that run, and this year was a good
12 baseline data gathering year. 23,000 sounds like a nice
13 healthy run. They've seen as many as 35,000 and 70,000
14 in that system, for such a small lake. There's no inlet
15 stream there. It's all lake spawning. We learned a lot
16 there, and we hope to find out just how bad it's been
17 impacted in the future. We're going to be doing one more
18 mark/recapture in Red Fish. Hopefully we can get some
19 fish this time. The characteristics of the lake is it's
20 very bowl shaped, it drops right off. And if you try to
21 throw a seiner (ph) on a fish, they'll dive right out of
22 it, so it's hard to catch them. We may have to look at
23 morts when they start floating, and maybe get some idea
24 of what's going on that way.

25

26 That's all I have for the projects right
27 now. You can ask me tomorrow.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So that means you'll
30 be here in the morning?

31

32 MR. LORRIGAN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Uh-huh. Frederick.
35 Hoonah.

36

37 MR. VAN ALEN: Okay. Good morning,
38 Madame Chair and Council. I'm Ben Van Alen from the
39 Forest Service in Juneau.

40

41 MR. GALLANT: I'm Frederick Gallant.
42 Thank you, Madame and Council.

43

44 MR. VAN ALEN: And what we're reporting
45 here is basically this is a new project that was funded
46 the first time this summer. I goes for the next three
47 summers. At least that's what we have funding for. And
48 it's basically a co-op project like all the others are
49 here in Southeast. This one is with the Hoonah Indian
50 Association, and they employ three people, three crew

00349

1 members, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game employed
2 one person who ran the Neva weir, a weir on Neva Lake,
3 and then I was involved as well as a lady, Cindy
4 Langadakis from Juneau for a bit, a couple of weeks.
5 Let's see. Now, what I'm just going to show are
6 basically just slides like you would sit in your living
7 room and watch I hope.

8

9 But anyway, Pavlov Lake is a little dinky
10 lake, it has a falls and a fish pass on the outlet.
11 Here's a view from the other direction, basically looking
12 south now. And the lake is just marshy, it's frog
13 habitat basically. This fish pass has been there many,
14 many years. We put this traps at the top of it where the
15 will choose to come up the fish pass, basically just swim
16 into this trap, and then wait patiently for us to dip net
17 them out. There's William Saunders working the dip net,
18 clipping the fin, and Fred's doing it there. William's
19 working the tally-wacker. We boated from there across
20 the lake basically to the inlet stream, and we walked the
21 inlet stream, count fish as we go, see bears, and we saw
22 a fair number of fish actually. There's a beautiful
23 little spot in there that was right up from the lake, it
24 was like custom designed for us working a beach seine.
25 So we came back and fished the beach seine here, had no
26 problems catching fish. Found out that we'd marked about
27 42 percent of the sockeye that came into the lake, and
28 with that census data, it gives us an estimate of about
29 1,300 sockeye in the lake, so it's a pretty small run of
30 sockeye relatively speaking, relative to Tuntakof anyway.
31 We used to walk down from the tropic (ph) you can see
32 behind Fred in the other one there to a place where we'd
33 just cook meat on a stick there on the beach, kind of a
34 rustic camp site. This is Sam Willard in the foreground
35 on the left. Then we constructed basically a floating
36 (ph) tent which the crew lived on for the latter part of
37 the summer. In fact we built that the morning that a
38 bear visited the camp we down in the beach frontage
39 below, so I think our timing was pretty good. And we got
40 two thumbs up for that one. Now, this is what they were
41 worried about. This is a picture just taken at your
42 local dump, but that's what they didn't want to have in
43 their camp. This is something Fred might talk a little
44 about.

45

46 MR. GALLANT: Yes. Thank you. I've
47 received a letter from the Governor, if I may read it,
48 addressed to me, saying, Dear Mr. Gallant, I recently
49 read the Anchorage Daily News of your amazing fight to
50 stay alive while balancing on the edge of the cascades of

00350

1 Pavlof Lake. You're admirable bravery, strength, wisdom
2 and determination are a true inspiration to all Alaskans.
3 Best of wishes to you and your family.

4

5 This was an unintended part of my job I
6 wasn't expecting to be at 12:00 o'clock in the afternoon.
7 However, we did get 10 coho and one pink that day before
8 this happened. It was very -- he night before was
9 thundering and lightning. The rain was very heavy all
10 throughout the night, and all throughout that day, the
11 28th of August, and fortunately we had unexpected guests
12 of about 70 people in groups of 20 off of a vessel called
13 the Sea Lion, and they were inquiring about what we're
14 there for, what our study's for. We explained to them
15 who we are, who we work for, what we're there for,
16 studying the stock assessment on sockeye salmon. And I
17 had intended to go upstream with the boat there, or the
18 skiff, and me and Jerome were in it going back to eat
19 breakfast after entertaining these 70 people. And we
20 ended up drifting back into the waterfall itself, and
21 Jerome had jumped out. There was a shallow enough place
22 where he thought he could jump out and hold the boat in
23 place from going over. However, we had passed the crest.
24 And I was going to bail out myself, but I told Jerome to
25 get out of the way and get to safety. I was more
26 concerned about his safety that I was mine. I was
27 feeling very responsible for the boat, and there was
28 nothing I could really do. I tried to bail out, but my
29 foot got wedged in between the back seat and the stern of
30 the boat, and I couldn't get out. It was already too
31 late, I was already past the crest and I jump out and I
32 went under for about a minute and a half in the water.
33 My chest waders filled up. I did have a life preserver
34 on though. We managed to spin out of it, and float down
35 the fall about 10 more feet, and I landed right behind
36 the skiff that was teetering off of the fall there.
37 There was really no way to go either side of me, or I
38 couldn't go back up. The only thing I felt safe doing
39 was just standing there until I could be rescued or
40 something. I thought that was my best bet.

41

42 Here's the Coast Guard hoisting me up,
43 and it was a tremendous relief to be hoisted out of the
44 position I was in. After spending two and a half hours
45 out there on that rock out there with the water rushing,
46 it was crazy. But I have two beautiful daughters at home
47 that I felt that it was worth fighting for, plus my job.
48 I didn't want to lose my job. So here's a little bit of
49 the aftermath, which is very minor to the property of the
50 Forest Service. It was little pin holes on the skiff

00351

1 that I was in, and I don't think it took too long to
2 repair that. I had one day of R&R and I was back out in
3 the field the following day in Hoktaheen I believe.

4

5 Here's Jerome and I. In the background
6 if you can notice the wall there, the water was actually
7 rushing over those walls right there. It was about 35
8 inches that day.

9

10 This is they were breaking camp in Pavlof
11 and I was in Neva at that time.

12

13 MR. VAN ALLEN: Uh-huh. These are some of
14 the instant findings basically. We did operate a trap
15 there late June, early August, and we caught and marked
16 557 sockeye and 873 coho. We didn't operate the trap
17 actually during at least the period when half the coho or
18 probably I'd say three quarters of the coho were actually
19 passing, so we might multiply that number by quite a bit
20 if we wanted to know what the actual escapement of coho
21 was. We did do age, sex, size sampling of fish. We know
22 about the timing into the lake and on the spawning ground
23 now, which we didn't know before. We have an index of
24 abundance in the spawning area. We did limnology
25 sampling in all the lakes. We learned a little about
26 water safety. And actually this project was being able
27 to get an estimate of total escapement of sockeye is
28 somewhat of a bonus. It wasn't in our project plan, but
29 we were able to do it, and so anyway I feel good about
30 that piece.

31

32 We moved across now to Neva Lake, is over
33 in Excursion Inlet. It is another small lake, too small
34 to fly in and out of. Anyway we go in there, we built a
35 weir, and the gentleman on the left, Wayne Long, employed
36 by Fish and Game, he's worked for Fish and Game a lot of
37 years, he actually lives over there, so this is in his
38 back yard, and he basically -- we went in, brought the
39 weir, but he operated the weir for the bulk of the
40 summer. And this is the day after, it was raining both
41 days, so my camera's kind of fogged up. And it's a
42 fairly simple operation. We did some, like I say, lake
43 limnology work, took measurements. We also walked the
44 inlet stream there. We radio-tagged some fish at Neva,
45 so we learned where they go when. We got back and forth
46 basically driving Forest Service four-wheelers. We
47 clipped fins, measured length, plucked scales, pluck
48 another scale. That's the kind of work we do. At
49 Excursion they got to eat at the cannery facility. It
50 was hard duty.

00352

1 So our basic findings there, the weir
2 count itself is over 4,000 sockeye, which is kind of
3 impressive. We wouldn't have thought there were that
4 many in there. And 573 coho by the time we pulled it.
5 We did mark/recapture studies, we evaluated the accuracy
6 of the weir count, and actually that work is still going.
7 Our next trip is planned in there this coming week.

8
9 Moving out to Hoktaheen out in Yakobi
10 Island. It's another small lake, but this one we can fly
11 in and out of. There's actually two lakes in the system.
12 And on our second trip in there we were timed perfectly
13 to catch fish with a seine off the mouth of the main
14 spawning stream. Fairly successful at catching them. We
15 had data on a stick at this point. We did stream
16 walking, catching fish in there in this stream with dip
17 nets, marking them. We had all kinds of water
18 conditions. Some low, some high. We also marked fish in
19 the stream between the lakes, and again that place we're
20 using a beach seine. It was fairly easy to sample fish,
21 catch fish and mark them. Each trip we'd be able to
22 easily in a day of marking daily catch, would be able to
23 have over half the fish marked.

24
25 These pictures, the last two, are Carl.
26 So keeping good field notes is critical. We save a lot
27 of money. We didn't even have an outboard. In fact we
28 didn't even have oars or paddles. This is our first
29 trip. We thought they were out there, so we had to
30 improvise with plastic plates and sticks and -- but, hey,
31 we got along. Our camp changed over time. This is our
32 first trip. By the time of our last trip in there, we
33 had visquine and tarps all around everything, because the
34 wind was blowing from various directions, raining cats
35 and dogs, and anyway, we made do as needed. This is
36 probably one of our later trips. The last set off the
37 mouth of the inlet stream was mostly coho. Basic
38 results, we are doing the mark/recapture. Our next
39 trip's planned for this weekend if the weather permits.
40 We got a lot of scale samples there. We did limnology
41 sampling, and we know about timing of fish, and we'll be
42 able to compare the index of escapement this year with
43 last year, so this will be the second year of that. So
44 plans for next year are basically to do the same, so
45 continue to trap at Pavlof, and continuing operating a
46 weir at Neva, and continue our mark/recapture indexing
47 work at Hoktaheen, although I'm kind of interesting a
48 weir there, maybe getting in-season information, and I
49 would try to do that if it's a good place to operate a
50 weir geographically as well as it won't cost us any more

00353

1 money. Thanks.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Any questions? Okay.

4 You guys will be here tomorrow?

5

6 MR. VAN ALEN: Yes.

7

8 CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: When we're more awake

9 and we might have one? Okay. Recess until 9:00 a.m.

10

11 (Off record - 9:24 p.m.)

12

13 (PROCEEDINGS TO CONTINUE)

00354

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

4)ss.

5 STATE OF ALASKA)

6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the
8 State of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby
9 certify:

10

11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 175 through 354 contain
12 a full, true and correct Transcript of the VOLUME III,
13 SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
14 MEETING, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 2nd
15 day of October 2002, in Hoonah, Alaska;

16

17 THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript
18 requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under
19 my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge
20 and ability;

21

22 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested
23 in any way in this action.

24

25 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 15th day of October 2002.

26

27

28

29

30 _____
31 Joseph P. Kolasinski
32 Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04