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CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Please find your seat. We have still a lot of agenda ahead of us. We are going to be addressing number 12 and number 13 on the agenda. On the hot seat is Mr. Pete Probasco, and he has other commitments, and so he'll be leaving sooner, and he requested to be moved up on the agenda. And so we'll be hearing from Pete. These are a couple of areas that are very sensitive and important to remind the people in this area, so I would recommend that you pay close attention and organize your questions as they come to your mind, and let's work our way through customary trade. Good morning, Pete.

MR. PROBASCO: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I hope each of the -- for the record, my name is Pete Probasco, I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management. I would hope each of the regional council members have a copy of the customary trade supplemental materials before them. My presentation will address customary trade, and all of you are familiar with it. You've been going through this for the past little over a year and a half now, and we're in the process of working towards a final rule on defining customary trade.

If you recall, Mr. Chairman, back in May of 2002 that the Federal Subsistence Board was originally scheduled to take final action on customary trade. Based on comments received primarily from the Regional Councils, Federal Government, and some of the public, the Federal Subsistence Board elected to defer action on customary trade until this January, 2003. And at that meeting they may take final action, and it's their goal to take final action at the meeting of January 2003.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pete, if you would, can you I think back up a little bit and explain to the people in attendance here the process we went through to getting to this point, and the reason we're bring this before the RAC now?

MR. PROBASCO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

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

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

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

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

The proposed rule adopted by the Board in December 2001, which on page one of this document, recommends that no dollar limit be set on the exchange of cash for subsistence caught fish, parts or eggs between rural residents. There's no limitation from rural to rural. The proposed rules prohibits such exchanges from fishery businesses, whether rural or non rural. In other words, fishery businesses cannot purchase subsistence harvested fish. However, the exchange between rural residents and others, non rural residents, would be allowed as long as the exchange does not constitute a significant commercial enterprise. The Board purposely left that language in the proposed rule for the purpose of getting additional clarification and comments from each of the councils, the Federal Government and the
public, and hopefully to clearly defined what is meant by
significant commercial enterprise.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, if you go to page nine of
your booklet, this will give you where we're at today,
and where we will be going for the next few months.
Currently we're in the process of trial consultation, which is headed up by Carl Jack, and Regional Council meetings, which are occurring in September and October. The public comment period ends November 1st. The Federal Subsistence Board meeting will occur on January 14th of 2003, and the goal is to have the publication of final rule in February, and, of course, the final rule goes through numerous steps, regulatory requirements, and the goal is to have a final rule effective by 2003 fishing season.

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

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

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

Mr. Probasco: Page 13, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Thomas: Page 13, right in the middle of the page. The customary trade of eulachon to others is permitted as long as all sales are to individuals and the fish do not enter commerce at any point. Now that's a change from what we had. We had it doesn't enter the commercial market. That's easier to identify than commerce. And what we'd like to stay away
from is ambiguous language, and I think that commerce at
least to a majority of council members is a little more
ambiguous than commercial market would be. Everybody
readily understands a commercial market. Commerce would
represent a multitude of things. Anybody else have any
observations, questions? Pete?

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah.

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

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

MR. PROBASCO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: And in our own
thoughts, and give us a chance to get our hat on. Dolly.
MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Probasco stated that it's his job to take our feelings back, and so I think we should have that discussion now if he's leaving, because I certainly have my comments.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Then we'll do it.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Floyd.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: When what?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah.

MS. GARZA: So are you looking for
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
sea life centers, so is Sea Life Center commerce?
Because the intent from the Cordova people I've talked to
is that the fishery that sells it to the Sea Life Center
directly competes with subsistence uses in that area, and
that's something that they've had a hard time competing
with. There's problems with State versus Federal
jurisdiction there. But I would like to figure out how
to in that sentence address an enterprise like Sea Life
Center, and I don't think it's commerce, but I don't know
if their purchasing it makes it commerce.

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

MS. GARZA: Okay.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

MS. GARZA: One other question. So this
process actually will have no impact on it since that
process is through ADF&G?

MR. PROBASCO: That's correct.

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

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I support the comments that we made previously that are listed on page 13. When we discussed this, if you look at the language, it says the exchange for cash between rural residents and customary trade of subsistence harvested fish, their parts, their eggs, legally taken under the regulations of this part, we felt that was the key, at least one of the keys when we were discussing this. Legally taken under these existing regulations. For Southeast Alaska, and maybe Cal can summarize these, but that is 40 coho annually, six trout, 10 dolly varden. I mean, we're talking about an insignificant amount of fish that are legally taken. If you were selling 500 coho, you could not possibly legally take those under the existing regulations. So maybe Cal could summarize what is the maximum amount that could be legally taken under the regs, because I remember our discussions, we felt that was self-limiting on significant commercial
enterprise which is mentioned in the definition of customary trade. And another thing that we talked about was that any dollar limits, while they might be fine for one person, may not work for another. In other words, some may sell 25, some may sell 1,000. I don't know. And we did not want to put a limit on that. So I support the language on 13, and maybe if Cal could summarize what we could legally sell today.

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

MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pete.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: That's enough.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: One request, I was struggling to hear you. My hearing isn't that keen in
any case, so if we could accommodate that, I'd appreciate it.

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

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

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

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or separate.

MS. GARZA: I guess my other comment is I don't think this is premature. If they make their
decision in January, this is the last time we're going to see it, and that decision will be made. It will not come back to us.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

(Affirmative)

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Second.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Moved and second. discussion.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Hal.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Change what?

MS. GARZA: May.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All right. May to shall.

MR. DOUVILLE: Is that what your motion is?

MS. GARZA: Shall not?

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

MR. KOOKESH: Second.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Will not?

MR. KOOKESH: And I seconded it.

MR. MARTIN: Shall not.

MR. KOOKESH: May to shall not.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Better not.

MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Better not.

MR. PROBASCO: We have the intent captured, Mr. Chair, I don't know, you know, what English version they'll use, but it's very clear that you want it stronger.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, since the language is made official.....

MR. MARTIN: Shall not.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: .....we're trying to be as official as we can.

MR. PROBASCO: Correct, but also know that through the regulatory process it will go back to our house of lawyers and we'll have all kinds of interesting.....

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. What do we desire for stronger language.

MR. KOOKESH: Those lawyers don't know everything either.

MR. PROBASCO: No.

MS. GARZA: Shall.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Shall? Shall? Is shall the new word?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mike had a question.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You may not (indiscernible).

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

MR. PROBASCO: You know, rural to rural, rural to others.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: So this is speaking specifically to commercial.

MR. PROBASCO: Correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

MS. GARZA: We didn't in Yakutat.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, we will this
time.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been
MS. GARZA: Marilyn.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: That's part of this motion.

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

MS. GARZA: Friendly.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was an amendment.

MS. GARZA: Friendly amendment, Marilyn.

MS. WILSON: Hmm?

MS. GARZA: Friendly amendment.

MS. WILSON: Oh, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nobody was opposed to it.

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Shall not.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Shall not. Say aye anyway.

IN UNISON: Aye.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Those opposed, same sign.
(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Pardon me?

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

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

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

MS. GARZA: Floyd.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Floyd.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

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

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

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to make a comment addressing something similar. There's only two or three people that fish hooligan, and I know that by the time they're done, they probably -- if you put a $500 limit on something like that, it would affect that, right? In my mind it would, but that's just one, another issue that would be in line with John's.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: No.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Oh, yes.

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

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

MR. DOUVILLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Patty?

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. Harold.

MR. MARTIN: On thing, Mr. Chair, I agree
with John. I think what we do in customary trade is self-limiting. As I remember, last year we talked about that no one goes out with the intent of selling subsistence caught fish to commercial enterprises. It's our personal use. In the old days we very rarely traded for cash. We traded food for food.


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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: I lost my train of thought. I'll remember later.

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

MR. MILLER: My Tlingit name is Ka-shu-tek. And I'm a master (ph) of Snail House. When my grandmother, she was a medicine woman, her name was Mary Wilson Serabia, and we're the owners of Snail House and Head House through her. And when her brothers died, Frank Wilson and Alexander Wilson, we had put up 5,000 newspaper style sockeye for the pay-off party. We had 2500 silver salmon, the same newspaper style. We had 2500 chum salmon as the newspaper style also. And then the other half tribe Miday (ph), that was also put all kinds of species of sockeye, silver and chums. So in different Tlingit families and different ways, you have
different levels of like the queen and king of England
and stuff, there are different ratings in your family.
And we were always told that our family -- we can use any
crest under the Raven as long as we acknowledged the
tongue first. So in our family, when someone in our
family is deceased, we put up as much as we can so we can
give as much as we think always make the spirit feel good
and comfortable, that he is well thought of. It also
depends on the -- how well that person was liked in the
community. If he was well-liked by a lot of people over
there, we gave plenty, because that feeling still
radiated out to everybody. And our family was always
known that whenever people were hungry, we never asked
for anything, we just packed up a box of food for them
and took it over there and left it on their porch. They
didn't have to know where it came from. And today that
custom is still going on. And over in Excursion Inlet
last summer, I had my son and my daughter, and my son is
12 and my daughter is nine, and they're Woosh-kee-ton.
And I taught them the old Tlingit way of making gaff
hooks that Uncle Pete Duncan had showed me as a child.
My son had asked me, Dad, there's going to be a time that
you're going to be too old to make these, so if you show
us now, it's not going to die.

And traditionally that's how we always
gaffed our fish in the rivers in the Excursion area is we
used gaff hooks, because people can manipulate the laws
to find a way to harass us, cite us. And this is still
going on with the Department of Fish and Game. When
we're over there, we're treated as criminals before when
they see us in the river. They're hiding away,
videotaping us, and then they come out and ask us about
permits and ID cards. Instead of that, they can just
come right out and ask us, and we'll provide it with them
up there. If we have our children up there, we're not
violating the law. We're teaching them. And it was kind
of hard with my kids. It was pretty stressful, because
they would sense the guy watching us, and I would just
ignore them, because I already knew he was there and I
didn't know who he was. But a lot of us, we grew up with
weapons, and a lot of us are still pretty active from the
Vietnam war, and some of us are still having a hard time
dealing with it, so if people start sneaking up on us,
the reaction could be awfully deadly, and this isn't a
threat or anything. This is reality.
The Fed fish and game guy, he knows
better, because he's our nephew. My nephew. And he's
always instructed, he says, don't play favorites, because
it's going to come back to you. So I didn't have my Federal fishing permit with me, and he told me, he said, this is a warning. He said, you carry it with you at all times, so I apologized to him, because normally I keep it in my wallet and I don't take my wallet with me when I go up the rivers, because it's easy to lose.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You're doing a good job.

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

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

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

MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

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

MS. GARZA: No, just a comment.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Comment.

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

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Harold.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you for bringing that up.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Good job. Kunacheesh.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. KOOKESH: I have a question.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You'll lose your hair.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five years in the electric chair.

MR. KOOKESH: Is there penalty systems in place there?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: (Indiscernible)

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

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

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

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

We do not use the customary trade with the term monetary, and trade on a monetary basis, I see in ANILCA barter is in there. And I think it should be left alone. If a Tlingit wants to trade or use the monetary basis, it is our business, and I have not yet seen any Tlingit get very wealthy off of trading or selling a little bit of fish. Just recently my son was going fishing, and he really needed some money, and I didn't have any money to help him out, but I had some dry fish. I'm not going to tell you how much I sold it for, but my son didn't go away broke.
What I see is more enforcement, and what this telling me is we're the law breakers, and I think that we abide by our own laws very well.

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

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

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

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

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

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


MS. HANLON: Page 16.

MR. PROBASCO: 13.

MS. HANLON: Oh, 13.

MR. PROBASCO: Under Southeast.


CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly?

MS. GARZA: Ernestine, when you look at alternative 1 that says take no action, there are still regulations that exist. So taking no action doesn't mean...
that nothing will happen. It means that the current regulations will stay in place. If you compare that, which is on the bottom of page three, to what we recommend on page 13, our attempt at the Council is to be more liberal. And so you might (indiscernible - simultaneous speech)....

MS. HANLON: Compared to what page?


MS. HANLON: Compared to what other page?

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

MS. HANLON: Three?

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

MS. HANLON: And this is regulations from ANILCA?

MS. GARZA: From OSM.

MS. HANLON: OSM?

MS. GARZA: Office of Subsistence Management.

MS. HANLON: Oh.

MS. GARZA: Pete.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: See, there's 10 regions in Alaska.
MS. HANLON: Uh-huh.

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

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

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

MS. HANLON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The tribe and the government, yeah.

MS. HANLON: Okay.


MS. HANLON: Thank you.

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

MS. HANLON: I see.

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

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chair.

MS. HANLON: I have sekalish (ph).

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Marilyn.

MS. WILSON: I don't know where my mike is, but I see.....
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Your mike?

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. HANLON: Okay.

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

MS. HANLON: No, not at this point.

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

MS. HANLON: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Anybody else? Dick?

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair.

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

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

Ms. Garza: Okay. We need to keep rolling, you guys. Any other comments on customary trade? Is there any other public testimony?

Ms. Hanlon: Wanda is typing a letter now, and it was for this specific thing.

Unidentified Voice: It could come later.

Ms. Hanlon: I don't know what (indiscernible) - away from microphone)

Ms. Garza: Yeah, well make sure we hear from her. Yeah. Okay. Was there something else you were doing?

Mr. Probascio: The easy one.

Ms. Garza: Okay.

Mr. Probascio: (Indiscernible)
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The easy one?

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

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

MR. PROBASCO: I leave today.

MS. GARZA: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

If we go back to September 2000, you had a proposal before you, Proposal No. 27, that requested
that a Federal subsistence and season harvest limits be
established on the Stikine River for sockeye. As you
recall, the Board deferred action in December of 2000,
and recommended attempted coordinations between the
Pacific Salmon Commission. Since then we also addressed
another proposal, Proposal No. 35, which requested that
new regulatory language be developed to protect coho
salmon by limiting the fishery to federally qualified
subsistence users, and that a Federal permit, harvest
data, limits, and methods and means be established. The
Board adopted this Proposal 35 with modifications in
December of 2001. Nonfederally qualified uses were not
excluded, for federally qualified users, a subsistence
coho fishery is established for Southeast Alaska, except
for Sections 3(A), 3(B), and 3(C), Prince of Wales Island
where regulations have been established earlier. And
then we had a federal permit, and we addressed methods
and means.

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

But essentially where we're out, the
Federal Subsistence Board, program is going to continue
to move forward with the implementation of the
development of subsistence fisheries on these rivers, but
also at the same time respects the bi-lateral protocols
that have been established under the Pacific Salmon
Treaty. Even though there's a commitment to a
collaborative approach to fishery implementations, in
other words, developing these subsistence fisheries,
there's still continuing questions that were raised by
the Council and others as to whether this issue may
legitimately be interpreted as a domestic matter, in
other words, within the State, or for resolution amongst
U.S. interests, or does it still need to go through the
Pacific Salmon Commission and the treaty process. Further inquiry will be made to the State Department or to the National Marine Fisheries, we're still trying to sort that one out, to resolve the question of ANILCA and the Pacific Salmon Treaty authorities. However, we still need to move forward, and we understand the frustrations of the Council and the public on getting these fisheries established, and so staff with the Office of Subsistence Management and the Forest Service are continuing to work through the bilateral Transboundary Panel to establish these fisheries, consistent with the annexes that are identified in the treaty process that abundance-based management plans have to be developed for these transboundary rivers, and they've given themselves until May 2004 to develop these management plans. The Alaska section of the Transborder Panel intends to hold a planning meeting this December of 2002. Federal substance staff and a member of your Southeast panel will attend this meeting. In the past it was Mr. Stokes. Whoever the Council elects to attend this meeting is up to you. And we'll attend this planning session. The goal is to have these fisheries established no later than May of 2004. I want to stress that that's not a guarantee. It's a Federal process, State process, but that is the goal, and we're working towards that end, to establish these subsistence fisheries.

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

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

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

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

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

In terms of the Pacific Salmon Commission process, it is one of the most -- I don't know if you've been to their meetings, it is one of the most secretive processes that I have ever known about. The Pacific Salmon Commission can meet for five days, and they have exactly 45 minutes that's open to the public. When they have Transboundary Panel meeting, people can be kicked out of those meetings. You're invited not to be at those meetings, and people don't see what's going on. And so you don't have the opportunity to talk to the Talkan
people or the Canadian side people and say, that's not
true. You have to pull them aside after the fact. And
so the concerns that I came off with was I think that we
need to as a Council say this is who we want on the
Transboundary Panel so we now have somebody that's inside
that room that can represent our interests. Well, I have
a list of who's on that panel There is no one there
who's pro-subsistence. It is from my understanding the
only panel of the whole Pacific Salmon Treaty process
that does not have a Federal appointee. So it's
primarily commercial fishermen. On other panels there's
someone from NMFS, but they're not dealing with it,
because they don't care about the transboundary. That's
Alaska/Canada in-river, it's not their marine waters.
And I would suggest that this council recommend that
somebody like Cal Casipit or somebody on OSM serve on
that panel, because there is a requirement for a Federal
position. There is no federal person on that panel. I
appreciate the fact that OSM is continuing through this
process. I think that it could have been finished much
earlier if we had been more aggressive. I think that the
harvest that will occur from that fishery will be very
small, and it is a customary and traditional practice.
It is not a new fishery, which is another argument that
has been thrown out. The people of Wrangell have a long-
time historical use of that fishery. They have a treaty
which we haven't found yet, but we know exists between
the Tlingit and the Wrangell people that says they traded
and bartered. That was part of their process. The
Pacific Salmon Commission is moot when it comes to
established fisheries like that.

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Powell.

MS. GARZA: Caroline Powell. And
secondly is John Feller from Wrangell. I think we should
support those names. I think that we should support
somebody from OSM or Forest Service to sit on the
Transboundary Panel, because there is a spot that is
unfilled for a federal seat. I think that we should have
communications between them. I think we should be able
to sit down with the Tlingit people and explain and ease
their concerns about conservation, because it is not a
conservation issue. it's merely an allocation issue.
And it has been misrepresented to those people time and time again. It is an issue I'm thankful that you are on, because I will not stop until it's resolved. I will not stop until it's resolved. If I have to file a lawsuit against and go after FOYA through National Marine Fisheries Service to find out what's going on in the Transboundary Panel meetings, I will. It's been a horrible, horrible process. John and then Butch.

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

MS. GARZA: Okay. For the Transboundary panel, it's my understanding that Tlingit and Haida was forwarding two names. That's Caroline Powell from Yakutat, since Yakutat has transboundary rivers, alternate John Feller from Wrangell. That Cal Casipit as the Southeast fisheries/Forest Service person be the federal person, an alternate would be someone from OSM.

In terms of the December 2 meeting, we need to make sure that we have somebody there. If Dick is that person, I would also like to be involved. I would gladly get there on my own dime, but I think I would -- if the Council would allow me, I would like to continue with this process.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Uh-huh.

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

MS. GARZA: Yes.

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

MS. GARZA: Is there a second?

MR. STOKES: Second.
MS. GARZA: Okay. Under discussion, Butch?

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

MS. GARZA: Excuse me?

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

MS. GARZA: Go ahead.

MR. LAITI: I agree with everything Dolly said, and I'd like everybody in here to read Monday's newspaper of the Douglas Indian Association members. In the paper they state their customary and traditional use on the Taku for the last, oh, starting in the early 20th century where they had villages on the Taku. I'd like the Taku to be included. But if everybody reads the Monday newspaper, they'll find out that the Douglas people have customary and traditional use on the Taku. And the Taku River for the last couple years has been showing record returns on king salmon, sockeye and cohos.

And for a different question, the Federal Government still has not defined the headwaters of the Taku.

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

MS. GARZA: Is the Taku in the transboundary?

MR. PROBASCO: Yes, ma'am.

MR. LAITI: Yes, it is. The transboundary.....

MR. PROBASCO: (Indiscernible) rivers.

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

MR. LAITI: And I think.....

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

MR. LAITI: I think before we go
supporting certain individuals, I think we should get a few more names to go to this meeting.

MS. WILSON: Do we want another name

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

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

MS. GARZA: John who?

MR. LAITI: Morris.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: He's from Douglas?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. GARZA: No, for the Transboundary Panel.

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

MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

MS. GARZA: That's Harold's preference.
MR. LITTLEFIELD: I agree with you 100 percent, but I don't know if it needs to be -- we could do it separate.

MS. GARZA: Make it one step?

MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh.

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

MS. WILSON: To change John Feller?

MS. GARZA: To Dick Stokes.

MR. MARTIN: Dick Stokes.

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

MR. MARTIN: Pardon me?

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

MR. LAITI: Sure. Yeah.

MS. GARZA: That's an option.

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

MS. GARZA: Okay.

MR. LAITI: Okay.

MS. GARZA: Good. Pete.

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

MS. GARZA: Okay.
MR. PROBASCO: Madame Chair. Ms. See.

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

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

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

MS. GARZA: John.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you for comments. I'm going to support this motion. I think it's important that we go ahead and support this motion and send it forward, because that somehow seems to get the State to act. This is not a new fishery. Subsistence fisheries are not new. They predate contact with Europeans. The Pacific Salmon Treaty does not talk about coho. And I think fully the intent and discussion at Yakutat on
Proposal 35 was to include all of the rivers in Southeast Alaska. And I still stand behind that and believe that, that all of the rivers where we have a customary and traditional use, that we need to be allowed to access those, and therefore I'm going to support this. We need to have a voice in this matter. This will ensure that our point of view is heard, and hopefully provide the Commissioner with some impetus to look at some different thoughts, so I'm going to support it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.

MS. GARZA: The question has been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. GARZA: Opposed?

(No opposing votes.)

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

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

MS. GARZA: Okay.

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

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

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

MS. GARZA: Okay. Five minute recess.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. We had a motion to do on 13? Agenda item 13.
MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Uh-huh.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is the clarification ready?

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is that clear on the record?

MR. CASIPIT: It's clear.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Clear enough?

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah, okay.

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

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

MR. MARTIN: That's what I understand.

He's not allowed to attend.
MR. CASIPIT: I think Mr. Martin is referring to the last Transboundary Panel meeting that I went to where I was alternately invited and excluded from various discussions at the Panel level, and I think maybe that's what Mr. Martin was referring.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Say that again?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly?

MS. GARZA: I think you're confusing two different things. I didn't understand it. Tlingit and Haida has put two names forward for the Transboundary Panel to seat on the Panel, and that was Caroline Powell,
John Feller. Through our motion, we supported Carolyn Powell and Richard Stokes.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Correct.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Moved and seconded. Discussion?

MS. WILSON: Who seconded it?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike.

MS. WILSON: Mike.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Why?

MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Further discussion?

MR. MARTIN: Question.

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

MS. GARZA: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All opposed?
(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carries. So we've got two nominees from, or two people from this body designated for that. Was there anything else on 13? Before we move, we have a Chu-ka-nati (ph), owner of Glacier Bay, who wants to share some of her wisdom with us. Agu (ph), Wanda. Customary trade.

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

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

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

Alaska natives and Alaska native cultures are being targeted. We are forced to play on an uneven
field while Federal and State governments continuously
misinterpret our cultural way of life within the
conservation economy way we exist.

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

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

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

With just the above three heavy-duty
issues, it is easy to feel afraid an Alaskan native
customary and traditional user of the natural resources that surround us. This is the same feeling of dread that we have whenever the bigoted Alaska State Legislature meets. What are they going to do to us next we ask each other and ourselves.

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

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

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

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

The Bureau of Indian Affairs used to be called the Department of War. That mentality still
exists as the inter-office division heads are primarily retired military officers who maintain a bad attitude about Indians. Their record speaks loudly for themselves.

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

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

This is my testimony. Sincerely,

Kashuduhah (ph), Tlingit of Glacier Bay. Thank you for hearing me out. I hope it wasn't too long. I will submit this to Bob for the record.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. He's got a bucket up there he puts his correspondence in. Thank you, Wanda. Anybody else on customary trade? Pete, did you have anything else?
MR. PROBASCO: No, Mr. Chair, and thank you.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Pete.

Dolly, do you have something?

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

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

MS. GARZA: When.

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

MR. CASIPIT: No.

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

MR. PROBASCO: We will.

MS. GARZA: Okay.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, sir.

MR. PROBASCO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Marianne?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: So on the date.

MS. WILSON: (Indiscernible)

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

MS. GARZA: My coffee's running out.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: If she wants to be heard, she'll let you hear. Okay. We're going backwards on our agenda, but we're going to get back on track a little closer than we were. We're accommodating these
maneuvering of the agenda items to allow for people that have to be other places, and in a very short time, so their time here is limited. That being the case, I'd like to call Doug McBride to talk to us about the FIS projects, review and recommendations. Tell us who you are, where you're from.

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

MS. WHEELER: Yes.

MR. McBRIEDE: Certainly since the last council meeting, so you won't have McBride just to kick around any more. Okay.

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

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

The first thing is in this blue handout, which also is the very first thing under tab E, and it is the 2003 Fisheries Resources Monitoring Plan. So this is the plan for projects that we're bringing a recommendation forward for your consideration, for your review and for your Council on this. And that's the first thing we'll be talking about. So I'll be walking through this blue handout. If you turn to the first -- or, excuse me, the second page of that handout, the purpose of what we want to do again is just to review and
discuss the draft 2003 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan, and as I say, it's all contained under tab E. We're going to be talking about funding recommendations that we're making for 2003, and at the end of this discussion, we very much would like your review and comment from the Council on these funding recommendations. If you turn the page, just real briefly that I'd like to go through in this presentation, I'm going to -- since most of you've heard this and I think are very familiar with this, I'm going to make this part very, very abbreviated, but I'm just going to very quickly give you a background for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan, very quickly go through the study selection process. Then we'll get into the actual recommendations, the draft plan that we're presenting to you, and then move into the questions, discussions and Council recommendations.

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

Then actually the first time I met you and spoke with you was at that big meeting in Anchorage. That's when we started the 2001 program. That is the full amount of money that was available, what was it, $7.15 million. That started in 2001. That's that great big, essentially the biggest part of the bar, that started in 2001. We're just completing the second year, or we just completed the second year of that installment.
As we move into 2003, we'll finish the third and final year of that commitment. Then last fall we talked about the year 2000 program, so if you go to the 2000 bar, and go to the third section of the bar, you'll see that kind of smaller, kind of lighter shaded area second from the top. That's what we did last fall, and then the Board deliberated on that in December, and that program was just started this past year. That very top little piece of the 2000 bar, that's the fisheries, that's the partners for fishery monitoring program. That comes out of this program. That really doesn't relate to Southeast in that that money is completely coming out of the Department of Interior side per Council recommendation. That part of the program, it is not going on down here in Southeast, but when you do the statewide accounting, that affects the total amount of money, but it's completely under the Department of Interior side, so it really doesn't impact anything down here.

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

So if you flip the page, going back to the blue handout, we'll go back to the agenda. Like I say, I think that's all that I need to talk about in terms of the background for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. What I'd like to do now is just really briefly talk about the study selection process. And again if you flip the page, I don't think we need to spend a lot of time on this, but clearly our job on the part of the FIS staff is we provide the oversight for this program. The recommendations that we're going to
present to you for funding are made by the Interagency Technical Review Committee. We just call them the TRC.

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

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

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

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

So now if you flip the page you'll see a table that looks like this. This is the identical table to what's on page 134 in the Council book, and this is what was available for project proposals, and what is recommended under the stock status and trends category, so this gets at assessment of stocks, and it really keys in on sockeye stock assessment. There were four projects originally on the table that had, you know, completed investigation plans, and you can see them there. I won't read them. One of them, the top one, was a project that was started 00, the Falls Lake sockeye assessment, and that was withdrawn. That's why it says withdrawn over there, and there's no dollar amount. But it was only withdrawn because we worked with the investigators, which are the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries and Organized Village of Kake. They do that in cooperation. And that work is included in the next project down, 01-125. So in the recommendation we are addressing False Lake, which clearly is a very major issue. It's certainly been the subject of regulatory action on the part of the Board and some in-season action on the part of State and Federal managers. So again the original project, 00-044, Falls Lake sockeye assessment, that administratively isn't on the table, and what is on there -- but the subject matter is included in the next project, 01-125. So what we're really left with are three projects. The first one, 01-125, addresses Falls Lake, Gut Bay, and Kutlaku Lakes. Those are all in the immediate Kake vicinity, and again that's a cooperative project between ADF&G and OVK. Then the next project, 01-128, Lag Bay subsistence sockeye stock assessment, that's in the Sitka area. That's a project that's run by Sitka Tribe of Alaska, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Forest Service. That's an on-going project, was a previously funded project on which the funding commitment had expired. We had that one. And then the third one is a brand new project, Eek Lake sockeye stock assessment. That's in the (indiscernible) lakes (ph) of Hydaburg. And again that's a new system that had not previously been investigated or assessed. And our recommendation really is very straightforward.

We're recommending funding all three of those projects. And there's one other thing I need to talk about on this, because the only reason that we had enough money to fund all three projects is because the first two projects, the 125, the Falls, Gut and Kutlaku, and 128, Klag Bay, the proposal that we received for our
program is only half the cost of those projects. And the
reason for that is because the proposal as submitted
takes the other half of the cost of that project and
makes that request to what's called the Southeast
Sustainable Salmon Fund. A lot of people know it as the
Governor's Fund, but there's a -- I think a lot of you
are aware there's a large, well, certainly by our
standards, a large amount of money available through that
fund, and their focus goes well beyond subsistence, but
it includes subsistence, and so several of us have worked
a lot with that program, and what we have in front of us
are proposals for those two projects that represent 50
percent cost sharing between the Fisheries Resource
Monitoring Program, our program, and the Southeast
Sustainable Salmon Fund. So if it were not for that cost
sharing of those proposals, we'd be looking at not
funding all three of these projects. Harold?

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

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


MR. McBRIDE: So just to summarize the
recommendation for the stock size and trends, all the
projects address sockeye assessment, which is your
highest issue for stock size and trends projects. We
feel that all of them have a very strong capacity
building component and local hire components. Most of
the projects actually address regulatory and conservation
concern issues, and the two largest projects, the funding
strategy is to share costs 50/50 with the Southeast
Sustainable Salmon Fund, which from a financial
perspective is -- allows us to recommend funding of those
50 projects. At this point I'm going to turn it over to
MS. GARZA: Before we to that, I have some questions. So getting back to page 126, the bar graph of the funds available, so the 1.827 is statewide, and so our share is the 213?

MR. McBRIDE: 286.

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

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

MS. GARZA: I think in the previous meetings we have looked at the full range of proposals, those that were not recommended as well as those that were recommended. And I that's important to us, because we as Council members need to know if Wrangell submitted something and they didn't get it, we don't want to have
someone from Wrangell calling us and say what the heck's going on, you guys aren't even considering it, why should we bother spending a bunch trying to pull something together, and it may also help us to sit down with them and say, okay, what do you need to do to this proposal to make it work? And so it's important for us to know the full range, even if they receive very little consideration as not meeting the objectives, even if they don't meet our objectives, if the tribes are taking that step, that means that they have interest, and we need to figure out how to work with them.

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


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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I agree with the Chair, because I would like to see these projects. In other words, we either accept these, or we reject them and leave money on the table. In other words, if we were to reject any one of these projects, we would leave money on the table, and there may be a project, for instance, in TEK which we gave high priority to, and projects which have high partnering, which we also prioritized and then
have a project in here with no partnering, we may well
want to look at that. And I think the Councils needs to
have those range of options available to it, and a
community representative from Hoonah or some other place
may well lobby for that and convince us that that project
is more viable. So I think we need to see them. I would
like to see them, I don't know when, but we have only one
option, either accept this or reject one of these and put
the money back. It goes back into the fund, and I don't
think that's -- I'd like to spend all the money, because
we don't have enough.

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

MS. GARZA: Marilyn.

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

MR. McBRIEDE: That's a good question.
The Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund, it's Federal
money. Its origin really came through the U.S./Canada
treaty process. But it's federal money that by and large
goes to the State, so the primary administrator of those
funds if you will is the Alaska Department of Fish and
Game through the State, and it has several different
components. It's really aimed at in large part in
addressing treating issues, although it's got several
different components to it. For instance, there's one
component, as part of the treaty process, that actually
looks at Columbia River issues, so it's not even part --
it's not in Alaska, but what's going on in the Columbia
River is affecting Southeast Alaska fisheries in a huge
way, so it's addressing that. There's another component
in there that's called economic -- I think it's the
economic development portion of the fund. There's
actually a stakeholder committee that has nothing to do with Federal or State bureaucrats. And what it really gets at primarily are enhancement issues. So it's looking at that. Then there's another segment of the fund that looks at habitat issues, trying to address sustaining salmon production in Southeast Alaska by looking at some of the habitat issues associated with salmon production, and then the fourth part is very analogous to what we would call stock status and trends type projects. And what they've established is a science advisory panel, so they've asked scientists from the State and Federal governments to help advise them on what would be good projects. I'm part of that committee. Mike Turek who's here from the State, he's on that committee. There are people from the Forest Service on that committee, people from both Commercial Fisheries Division and Sport Fish Division with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, input is being given or being put into that as it relates certainly to subsistence matters, and so we've actually received $100,000 already for the Klawock sockeye project. If we hadn't already received that money, the Klawock sockeye project would have been in front of you in '03, because the funding commitment runs out in '02 for that project, but we were able to receive $100,000 which is actually going to fund the Klawock project next year in '03, so we didn't have to consider that for funding here. I think some other money that Mike Turek might talk to you about later actually went into some ethnographic research for Southeast. That came out of the Southeast Sustainable Salmon fund, and then what we have right now are these two proposals that represent 50 percent cost share between our program and their program.

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

MS. GARZA: Okay. Polly?

MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Ms. Chair. My name is Polly Wheeler, and as Doug said, I'm a recent employee with the Fisheries Information Services. I'm the lead anthropologist for FIS. I have an assistant, but I'm sort of responsible for all the projects statewide, which is different than how the biology side works. These guys each have an area, but I have the whole state. The two projects that were submitted on the TEK harvest assessment or harvest monitoring side were the subsistence fisheries harvest survey data dissemination, which was actually pulled. It made it through the preproposal stage and onto the -- it was
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
through this, this is -- the reason I asked this question earlier is this SEARAC went on record as in strong support of partnering. And we wanted -- and our intent was that we wanted to involve the tribes, the local communities and others in this program, that we felt that was appropriate. This is one that just has one individual, it's a significant amount of money, and when I read through the book, the lead PI has agreed to hold a, one, training session in Southeast, and for that we are adding $10,000. I thought there was just -- I mean, it just seemed a little excessive to me. It would be better to send $1,000 to the tribes. I mean, I don't -- that's not capacity building, but -- at least -- I wanted to see these other projects. And it was my understanding before that projects that had been previously submitted and had passed the technical review committee in prior years would be presented to us. And I don't see any of those. There were some steelhead projects that passed review before and whatever. And they just kind of like disappeared. I don't see them any more. So maybe you could address the $10,000 for one training session in a community?

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

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

MS. GARZA: Okay. So I guess I'm a bit confused. I guess I didn't see the TEK. So I thought it was pulled. So I thought it was pulled. So it is still being considered, but with modification through OSM discussion with the grant applicant?

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Yeah, John.

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

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

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

MS. WHEELER: The concern at the -- and
40 Cal may be able to help me out here, but the concern,
when the TRC addressed this project, one of the concerns
was if all the permit data were available. There was
some -- and the PI subsequently came back and said that,
yes, all these permit data are available. And that was
-- it was unclear at the time of the review, and when
they approached the TRC about the availability of all the
different permit data. And that's why that sentence is
in there. Keep in mind, because of the bureaucratic
machine that churns forward, we have to get -- a lot of
these documents were done in early August. They had to
be into the printer by early August, so there's been some
changes that have occurred since that time that we've got
more information now than we had at the time when these
-- all the material had to go into the books for
publication.

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

MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

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

MS. GARZA: Polly?

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

MS. GARZA: Cal.

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

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

MR. McBRIE: Yes.

MS. WHEELER: Yes.

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

MR. McBRIE: Yes.

MS. WHEELER: Yes.

MS. GARZA: Okay. Polly.

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

MS. GARZA: Okay.

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

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

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

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

If you flip the page in that green handout, or you can follow on page 168 in the book, it's the same graph that we talked about a few minutes ago. It's the finances of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. And the reason I'm going to talk about this is to look ahead a year and to see how much money we think is going to be available statewide for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects in 2004. There's that sort of large open area, and it's got a number, and it's 4,883. That's $4,883,000. That's how much money we're anticipating statewide will be available for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects in 2004.

Now, the reason that that money increases substantially over what we just talked about for 2003 is because of how the program is administered. When we make a permit for a project, or actually we do a call for proposals, we allow project proposals that extend up to three years in duration. They don't have to be three years, but they can be that long under a single proposal. And so once a project is finally deliberated upon and accepted by the Federal Subsistence Board, if it was a three-year project, then we make that commitment out for
And then the other thing we did in our call for 2003, the one we just talked about, is for any project that was being brought as a continuation project, we only allowed them to submit a single year, just a one-year project. And we did that because what we're trying to do is kind of clear the decks if you will in 2004. We wanted to maximize the amount of money available in 2004 so that each council could sit down and have a discussion of strategic priorities. In other words, at that point we had gone through three years of program, and for the most part we will have completed our funding obligations on the table so that you could kind of look at everything and say, okay, what's really important versus what's not. What's important to continue, what's important to start up new. So that's what we were trying to do administratively. So that's a large part of why this bar is a lot bigger than it has been in the last couple years. I mean, we did that by design.

Back in March when we met in Juneau, I gave you a short presentation. It's very similar to this. And we talked about strategic planning. And what staff had drafted up is a process if you will where we asked a series of questions, and what we were trying to do is ask very pertinent questions to frame in what we think is important to fund on into the future. And so if you turn the page in your green handout, you'll see this page that's listed as future issues for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. And these are the questions that we are proposing to be asked to try to form (ph) our way through what's important versus what's less important for the amount of money that's going to be available. And what we're trying to get at with these questions, for instance, that first one, how well have project selections to date addressed Council issues and information needs. What we're trying to do is look at the issues and information needs that you've identified, look at the history of the projects that we've funded and
said, well, is there something here that's -- you know, is there an issue or information need that's just never been funded over the last three years, and that's what that question gets at.

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

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

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

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

What we're going to do with that down from our perspective is we're going to make that the focus of our presentation to you in March. Right now we're talking about the things that we're talking about, but what we want to come to you with in March then is a more comprehensive look at here's all the projects that
have been funded, what are the results to date, what's
the performance to date. So I'm just going to very
briefly address the first four -- the answers, at least
our thoughts on the answers to the first four questions
for the Southeast Region. So if you just turn the page.
And everything I'm going to present from here on out is

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

On the next question.....

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Before you go on.
MR. McBRIDE: I'm sorry. Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: What we'd like to know
on the Unuk -- okay. I understand that the Forest
Service gathers that information. What do they do with
that information?
MR. McBRIDE: I'm going to defer to
somebody from the Forest Service.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: They thought they were
excused. Forest Service, front and center. We were
discussing conclusions summary for Southeast, and the
question was how well have project selection to date
dressed Council issues and information needs. And one
of them is the Unuk River hooligan. And I'm wondering
who gathers that information, and where does that
information ultimately wind up? And what's done with
that information?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. The reason I
asked the question is because I've been working with that
office. I suggested that they put together a management
plan for that fishery. They said they'd have one. They
said they'd have one in place by the end of January. I
haven't seen it yet. That's a sensitive, very sensitive
resource, and use of the resource, and it has to be
directed like dry spaghetti, because it doesn't take much
to disrupt that system. And the behavior of the experts
from the government coming in there to do their studies
is like having the running of the bulls through the Unuk
River by comparison to how the fishermen harvest and then
take care of that system. And that needs to be
addressed. It was nothing but chaos this year up there.
Okay. The Forest Service was going to use a throw net,
collect a few fish for samples. They couldn't catch any.
So they got 100 fish from one of the fishermen there to
do a study with. So, you know, the fishermen can look at
the system, they can look at the conditions and tell
whether or not that is going to be a productive effort or
not, or if it's going to create a conservation concern.
They weigh all that, and determine appropriately
according to that. There's summers we don't have
hooligan. This year was one of them. They went out and
came back empty. And there were other factors. There
was ice, lingering ice in the system. But they had
helicopters landing on the ice. They had boats and
seaplanes running around up there. Somebody needs to get
some protocols and disciplines to these people on how
goes about these sensitive areas. I'm not sure where
the biologists stay, but I'm more comfortable with them
studying bivalves and that kind of stuff. It's pretty
difficult to hurt a clam. But you can hurt them. The reason
I'm saying all this is because to me they're real big
issues out of no necessity at all. It's real cumbersome.
It created a lot of dissention between a lot of people
that didn't know each other. And it only occurred since
this time last year, see, and so what I'm -- the reason
for my comments is try to attract the right parties here
that might have access to the appropriate parties to get
that point of responsibility and professionalism and
cautions on these systems. You know, we talk about the
delicate balance of things. Well, you don't address a
delicate balance with a bulldozer, you know. You do it
with little small dram weights. And so that's the point
I'd like to make. That's a bone of contention. There
isn't a bone of contention like that anywhere in the
State right now, and it's a small system in the State.
So I'd like to see that handled a little more
professionally. Boy, professionalism went clean out the
window this year. Out the window. I mean, it sounds
like a bar fight down there at the district office in
Ketchikan. But it doesn't need to happen. So Mr.
Thompson, Casipit, and those people, I'm hoping you're
hearing our words, and get that message across to the
people in the Forest Service, because those are the
stewards of this system in the Unuk. Ironically there
wasn't any hooligan in Southeast at all this year. So I
could blame the whole thing on the Ketchikan District
office because of their clumsiness at the Unuk, that it
spoiled the runs at Stikine, the Chilkat and the Situk.
That not being the case, but I just thought I'd interject
that. I had to get my hooligan from the Copper River.
Part of the ones that were pumped out onto the truck.

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

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

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

MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You've got the gavel.

MS. GARZA: Polly.

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

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

MS. WHEELER: Yes. A point well taken.

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

(Off record)
(On record)

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Bert.

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

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

MS. GARZA: Polly, speak up.

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

MR. ADAMS: Okay.

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

MR. McBRIDE: Could you repeat the
question?

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

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

MR. McBRIDE: Almost five million.

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

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

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, that formula
was actually done by the Federal Board. And I don't have
it in front of me, but basically what they're trying to
do, they recognized that when they looked at fisheries
monitoring program, they wanted to put some money
everywhere around the State, so then they were trying to
figure out, how do we do it? Do we do it just equitably,
or what do we base it on? And they really based it on I
think their basic understanding of the letter (ph) of
issues. And so each region -- it's not equitable across
regions, you know, in terms of the same exact same dollar
amount. But I think Southeast gets the third highest
amount after the Yukon and the Kuskokwim if I remember
the way the formula works correctly. And then the other
thing that adds to that, it's just the way in which the
money comes for our program. There's a total of $7
million. Five million of it comes through Interior, two
million comes through Agriculture, which is where the
Forest Service is. And all the Agriculture money gets
spent where there are forest lands, which is Southeastern
and south central Alaska, so, you know, it's kind of a
combination of those two things.

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

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

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

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

MS. WHEELER: Okay. Doug, feel free to
step in if I miss a couple. The first year of funding,
in the 0 year funding, there was a project funded, the Southeast traditional territories project, and that involved six communities I believe, and that's still on-going. It got a slow start. There were a number of staffing changes. Mr. Schroeder might be able to speak to that project specifically, but it is on-going. I'm trying to work with the communities to get that project going, and that's sort of delineating traditional territories for each of the South -- for some of the Southeast communities.

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

MR. McBRIDE: That's the Hoonah project.

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

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

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

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

MR. TUREK: Twenty-four communities in Southeast.

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

In terms of projects that would work for TEK, I mean there's a number of different ways of approaching these different projects. I mean, I
mentioned to you over lunch there's issue specific
projects being one of them, but, you know, documenting
traditional harvest and use patterns is clearly important
from a management perspective, so that managers can
actually understand the kind of activities that go on.
My recommendation would be in terms of being able to
build a project, and build a program is to have smaller
projects that are very focused, and that are maybe one
year in duration so that then you can subsequently build
on those projects. You can build on those successes
rather than having a multi-year, multi-community project,
but I think there are certainly enough issues that
identify that could merit getting a local perspective or,
you know, traditional perspective of use on the
particular issue. And you all would know that better
than I.

MS. GARZA: Okay. Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Do you have any recommendations how that could be
accomplished this year if we decided to -- I think there
was 96,000 in the budget, the TEK budget target, and had
49,000 for this project, or something like that. Is
there any way to tap into some of those funds or
alternate funds so that this could happen now? Because
we know we don’t have good steelhead numbers there. That
was really clear. And is there any way that we could
utilize some of those funds now in your recommendation?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Go like this.

MS. GARZA: So have you done that kinds of things with these grants where you can just tack in
more money if a project didn't work and you have extra money?

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

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

MR. CASIPIT: It can be done.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Ad hoc.

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

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

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

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

MS. GARZA: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

MS. WHEELER: Okay.

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

MS. GARZA: Yeah. But.....

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You've got it, Dolly.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Yesterday when we were talking, we had no numbers, not just from traditional users. We didn't have -- we're talking about stock assessment, not TEK, but I don't have much problem taking those TEK funds and using them for stock assessment, I mean, if we don't hit the three to one and we don't have a viable project. We haven't voted on
that, and maybe it is viable. But in my opinion -- well, I won't say any more right now, but the stock assessment as opposed to the household surveys or whatever that Mike has going on right now would be of more interest to me. We don't have good numbers, and we're not talking about just the harvesters. We're talking about we don't have good numbers in the commercial fishery, we don't have good numbers in the sport fishery. We don't what's happening in those rivers. So that was more my point I think was the over-all stock assessment of what's happening on -- which is outside of TEK, you know, if you try to lock us into that.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Mike.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: A motion is in order.

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

MS. GARZA: Second.

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

MS. GARZA: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carried.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly and then John.

MS. GARZA: But I guess why I was going to do the TEK one is because I don't think the 49,000 is
near enough to do the stock assessment, so it's like what
can you do with a small amount of money to get this
started. One of the big things that Mike kept bringing
up yesterday was 600 isn't enough. 600 isn't enough.
600 isn't enough, realizing that hopefully next year
we'll see a large proposal for steelhead assessment on
Prince of Wales.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

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

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Marilyn?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Right now. Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: First I want to recollect
that it was at our last Hoonah meeting which was quite a
few years ago, that it was one of the first, it was the
first or one of the first meetings where this Council
recommended that they fund -- it wasn't titled FIS then,
but that we needed resource information. And it was at
Hoonah that we began to get it on the record. And so I
think it's appropriate that we're back in Hoonah again
with some follow up, that we work and it shows. But I
want to comment on Dolly's proposal here about adding on
to the Klawock TEK project, and I think it's an excellent
idea, and if the bureaucracy can be that responsive, then
that would be cool. But I put a lot of faith in the
system, in a project that's already shown it can work,
and I appreciate that Mike Turek has longevity in the
State Subsistence Department, and has followed through on
these projects to make sure that they come close to
completion. And there's a certain level of trust that I
have knowing that if you can tack this onto the Klawock
project, that we'll get some good numbers. I agree that
we do need to do some steelhead assessment. It happens
to be one of the priorities at this meeting. At one of
our past meetings Situk, Ahmklkin, Ahrnklin were our
priorities, and so we identified those as a need for our
list. And so because we had presentation in Yakutat from
Ms. Ramos, I was very pleased with the product that she
presented to us, and there's a certain level of trust
within these area. Okay. They've shown they can do it
for -- they've shown what they can do for Yakutat. I'm
willing to say maybe we should Situk and Ahmklkin,
because I know they can do it. They've already shown
they can do it. The same would apply with Gutkoo (ph),
Hoptahee (ph), Falls Lake. You know, we had a
presentation in Yakutat on that with Mike Jackson and Meg
Cartwright. They've shown what they can do there. I've
approved of it. I think they're doing a great job. And
if we know projects are working, then maybe we ought to
prioritize funding in that direction.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The only thing that our
vote represents on here is that to take advantage of an
opportunity to an issue that we see wants being
considered as a priority of use. Dolly.
MS. GARZA: Right. And so I was just trying to get an idea of what the possibilities were. We have not addressed the four proposals that are before us, and if we chose not to support one, then we would look at that first bit of language and say, can we do that. And so I was just trying to get an idea from FIS staff, is that a possibility if they don't support the one TEK project. So we are a bit out of sequence, but I had to have an idea in my mind if it was even a possibility. So the question I had for your, Doug was in terms of right now we're telling you that right now that we think that Prince of Wales steelhead is it. When you take it back, does that mean that that will go into the RFP proposal process next year, and then when it comes back to us, we still have our own criteria for how we do it, and if there's 10 proposal then we're going to rate them, are they TEK, are they salmon stock, and is the steelhead the one that we wanted if that was so important. So I think we're okay.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Doug?

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I guess in answer to some comments and questions, and, Dolly, you perfectly described what will happen. We will add Prince of Wales Island steelhead in the issues and information needs that will go out in the call for proposals so that, you know, potential investigators know that this process is interested in that subject matter, so that will happen. But in addition, I mean, nothing else is changed in terms of the other issues and information needs, and we're also going to publish TEK and stock assessment for sockeye and coho and harvest monitoring and all of that stuff. And then earlier you were questioning about, you know, are you going to have a choice of projects, that there will be some that are recommended and some that don't. I mean, I think very much what is going to happen this time next year is we're going to bring a package of unfunded work left on the table. That's what I think is going to happen.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

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

MS. GARZA: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

MS. WHEELER: The partnership and capacity building is a criteria by which all of the
MS. GARZA: But I think Doug covered it in the beginning, so in the very beginning it was.....

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's been moved and second. Discussion.
MR. MARTIN: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Motion carries.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

MR. MARTIN: Second.

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

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair, I will also be voting against this. I think this is a waste of money. We are trying to fund a project which in the very first sentence of technical merit says it doesn't believe it's possible. Partnershiping is totally nonexistent. Having one meeting. While this may be important, it's
not worth that amount of money, and I would like to see that money go somewhere else. And even if it doesn't, I'm going to vote against it.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Does anybody support this motion?

MS. GARZA: Question.

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

(No in favor votes)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.


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

MR. DOUVILLE: Second that motion.

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

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


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

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, could you go over the motion again?
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Up there.

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

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Do I hear a motion?

MS. GARZA: I so move.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Opposed?

(No opposing votes.)
Mr. Chair, in support of what Doug and Polly know that previous action of the SEARAC this morning also showed the hooligans to be an important species. They do not appear on our previous list of prioritized items, and I believe it should be. At least in my opinion it should be known that those projects are also prioritized by a previous action this morning where we listed those specially in the customary trade. So it may be that we need some information. I don't know how to add those, but I think that they're not within the four broad guidelines, but I think it's still a concern of the Council.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Polly.

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

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

MS. GARZA: Are you moving?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I am moving.

MS. GARZA: I will second it.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It's up there.

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Could you read the motion to the Council. Could you give me wording on it, please?
MR. LITTLEFIELD: Do you want to wordsmith it for us, so it's pretty?

MS. GARZA: That we prioritize Unuk River hooligan.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Hooligans.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Speak for yourself, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Are we good to go?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: It looks like we mutual confidence established. No? Mike's looking at me a
little bit of a skeptical focus. Next. Where does that bring us to now?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pardon me?

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

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

MS. GARZA: Call for the question.

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

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Chickamin.

MS. GARZA: Chickamin rivers.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Good.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The question's been called for.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Wait a minute.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Pardon?

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

MS. GARZA: We already passed that.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: No, but isn't this
replacing the regulatory review with.....

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Okay.

MS. GARZA: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.

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

MR. DOUVILLE: Did you make a motion?

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

MS. GARZA: Second.

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: The motion is on page 170 to replace regulation review, and after TEK harvest monitoring, salmon assessment for sockeye and coho, and regulation review, I'd like to replace regulation review to include the species identified in the previous two
motions, which is particularly hooligan and steelhead,
POW steelhead. And if you want it, it's the Unuk and the
Chickamin hooligan, so we're not talking about hooligan
somewhere else.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Chickamin hooligan.
John.

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

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

MR. MARTIN: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Those opposed, same
sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: The motion carries.

MR. STOKES: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dick.

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

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

MR. STOKES: Well, maybe that was a
federal project then. Is that what it was?

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

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

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

MR. STOKES: I couldn't hear you.

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

MR. STOKES: Yes.

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

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

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

MR. TUREK: Yeah.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Did everybody hear?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

(Affirmative)

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John?

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. How long break?

MR. STOKES: Five minutes.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Five-minute break.

(Off record)

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

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yeah?

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

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

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

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

MR. LORRIGAN: (Indiscernible - away from microphone)

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

MR. LORRIGAN: Who has to leave?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Forest Service people, OSM people.

MR. LORRIGAN: Okay. We're leaving tomorrow at 11:00.
MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, at this time to update, probably the one set of people who do have to leave are some OSM people, the FIS folks have to leave, and it would be real useful if they heard the TEK presentation from the Southeast tribes. Other than that, our schedule is at the Chair's discretion.

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

MS. GARZA: They need to leave tomorrow.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You're leaving tomorrow?

MR. LORRIGAN: At 11.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: At 11?

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

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

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you.

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

MR. LORRIGAN: Okay. Will you be here?

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Excuse me?

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

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

MR. SCHROEDER: I got your attention.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Welcome to both of you.

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

MS. GOULARTE: Carol Goularte.
MS. WILSON: And how do you spell that?

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

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MR. SALINAS: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MR. SALINAS: Thank you very much. May
name is Fred Salinas. I'm the Deputy Forest Supervisor for the Tongass, and.....

MS. GOUARTE: We've already introduced.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you very much.

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

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

I'm saying these things so that everybody does understand that the folks that developed the plan again sincerely believed that wilderness had been considered. That had gone through all the steps in the
processes in the analysis of the management situation to
look at all the roadless areas, and we're looking at 115
today. They looked at those and said -- and through the
process of looking at attribute that would apply to all
of these areas, they felt that based on what had occurred
in the recent history that the Tongass Land Management
Plan had considered wilderness, and so that's why it was
left out.

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

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

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

As you know, the Forest Service when we
put our draft out, we identified a preferred alternative.
That was alternative 1, which is basically what we call
the no action alternative. We came out with that
preferred alternative because it did in fact we believe
represent, will represent the existing '97 plan. Now,
I'm going to repeat some things, but again I want
everybody to understand why we came out the way where did
at that point in time. We felt and believed that the '97
plan wasn't broken. We thought it was a good plan. We
thought it had a lot of good collaboration. We're not
saying it's perfect, because I'm not sure there's any of
those kind that exist. We did believe at that point in
time it represented one of the best efforts to bring
science and management together in a land management
planning effort. We also thought that it believed that
it struck a very good balance for use and protection,
because that's really what this whole discussion is all
about. How much use do you allow and how much protection
and what kind of protection do you want? Wilderness in
fact does protect, but as you look at the Tongass Land
Management Plan as it currently exists, we also felt and
believed that it afforded a lot of protection just as it
stood. Again, not being perfect, but again it offered a
lot of good protection, a lot of good management that
addressed the issues such as subsistence. And every time
we proposed a timber sale or some other kind of project,
particularly a timber sale, those that we have agreed
that we would do, eight, 10 hearings on those that the
Forest Supervisor would sign. And that was just, you
know, recent work that we did, but again recognizing that
subsistence and maybe the basis, the criteria, the data
that we were using needed to have a harder look at that.
But again all of that work and interaction with this
Council and with individual tribes and with individual
communities was not detracted at all, or taken at all or
taken away from or diminished in any way by the '97 plan.
In fact, we thought all of those interactions, all of
those activities could take place and will represent the
issues.

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

The second issue states what would be the
social and economic effects of wilderness designation on
the 32 communities and the recreation and tourism, fish
and timber and mining industries in Southeast Alaska?
That's really important to us again, because we represent
all peoples in the entire national -- all of the
resources of the national forest and how do you strike a
balance with the decisions you make right up to the level
of protection that you want on these lands. We make the
statement that the Tongass is roughly 17 million acres.
There's 19 wildernesses in the Tongass representing
almost six million acres. Again, the inventory of
roadless areas is 115 representing 9.6 million acres.

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

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

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

An important question, or important point
that we are at this point is, you know, what has changed
relative to the point in time when we started to
implement the '97 plan, and as we look at possibly
recommending additional wilderness within these 115
roadless areas. Important questions that I think must be
considered, and I'm saying this because as we look at all
the comments that we received, including yours, it's
going to be very important that as we look at those -- as
we look at those comments, it's important to understand
that the whole process of a supplemental EIS and taking
comments isn't a voting process. In other words,
everybody raising their right hand to indicate that
they're in favor of this alternative or that alternative
 isn't sufficient for us to be able to analyze the issues
 and analyze whether or not we would recommend a portion
 of an inventoried roadless area for wilderness. Here's
 an example. If in fact you feel 10 of the inventoried
 roadless areas should be made wilderness, and you -- and
 that's your believe and recommendation, it's important to
 back that up with some rationale, because as we look at
 it, one of the first things we're going to do is run it
 through what we all the WARS rating system, which is the
 Wilderness Attribute Rating System. If it comes up
 really high as something that really should, has really
 high attributes for wilderness, it's going to come out
 fairly high, but if you -- and if you add onto that
 you've made comments how important that it is, or how it
 relates to the importance of subsistence and subsistence
 lifestyle and needs, again I think that adds cumulatively
 to the support and the rationale for moving that forward
 as a possible recommendation for wilderness. But if it
 doesn't have -- if somebody just feels that wilderness is
 the best way to protect development, that doesn't get us
 as much basis and as much background and information to
 make a recommendation there. I'm saying these things,
 because they've been somewhat misunderstood as we've gone
 through the process.

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

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

MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madame
Chair. Could you explain the LUD 2 designation so that everyone understands what that means?

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

MR. KANEN: Yes.

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

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

MR. SALINAS: Okay. LUD 2 designation, they do allow personal use for wood for cabin logs, fuel wood, float logs, trolling poles, and it says et cetera. That gives you an idea though. Permit water and power developments if designed to be compatible with the primitive characteristics of the area. Permit roads only for access to authorized uses, for transportation needs identified by the State or for vital linkages. You know, I'm not sure what that might be, but it may bring to mind
something like the intertie, allow mineral development, and I read this one before, permit boats, aircraft and snow machines unless such uses become excessive. Permit fish and wildlife habitat improvements, design structures to minimize the effects to recreational resources, permit primitive recreational facilities. Major concentrated recreational facilities will generally be excluded it says. That's the list that's here. Again, hopefully that will be helpful to you.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: As a Council document.

MS. GARZA: Yeah.

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

MS. WILSON: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Marilyn.

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

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

MS. GARZA: Except without getting into
it, can we have public comment? Is there anybody in the
public that is here to testify to the Council regarding
SEIS?

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

MS. GARZA: Are you Matt Davidson?

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

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

MR. DAVIDSON: J-I.

MS. CAPELLA: J-I.

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

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

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

MR. DAVIDSON: And I really appreciate
the opportunity to come before you today and speak on the
wilderness SEIS. SEACC, the Southeast Alaska
Conservation Council is a coalition of 18 community
conservation groups across the reason. We have member
groups in many of you all's home communities, and some of
you may be familiar with them. And we will appreciate
the Council's interest in this issue, and efforts to
speak out.
The Council has a long-standing participation in the Tongass Land Management Plan process, and I know it's tedious and this current rendition is also a lot of energy, so I appreciate your efforts. I appreciate Fred's overview of the T-1 (ph) process and his overview of the 1997 Tongass Land Management Plan. I think what he didn't mention is that the 1997 Management Plan was appealed by 33 different parties, including the timber industry. The 1999 record of decision settled those appeals, but then the timber industry lawsuit threw out that decision, and so we're back with the '97 plan. The judge found that the forest Service didn't follow their own rules by considering new protected areas in the Tongass, and that this process is our opportunity to speak out for those areas, and I appreciate the Council's efforts to speak out for important subsistence areas in the region.

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

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

In terms of where we are in the process, the public comment period ended the end of August and the Forest service is currently reviewing those comments, and then sometime this fall or winter we expect to have a
final decision released. Interestingly enough, in the
last couple of weeks in Washington, D.C. our
Congressional delegation has been attempting to stop this
process by capping funding to complete the SEIS and to
exempt the Forest Service decision from any judicial and
appeal review. So we'll keep you posted on that, but at
this point the process is still moving forward as we
understand.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Davidson.

MR. DAVIDSON: Yes?

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

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

I'd like to say that, you know, a lot of
us have different opinions about wilderness areas and the
Tongass. You talk about it being a 17 million acre
forest and there being six million acres of wilderness
already. We know that the majority of those acres are
not wildlife habitat, not areas that are heavily used for
subsistence. Some of them are along the edges of
subsistence areas, but a lot of that is rock and ice and
not areas that we use. In the '97 plan, of the acreage
that is currently in the timber base, the Forest Service
has indicated, the Deputy Regional Forester has indicated
that all those major watersheds that are in the timber
base they're planning to enter in the next 10 years, and
we've seen that with over 30 logging projects planned
right now in these large areas eligible for wilderness
and LUD 2 protections, and including two very
controversial timber sales, one at Gravina Island near
Ketchikan, and one right here outside of Hoonah at Neka
Bay where they're planning to put a timber sale in a
wilderness area that's heavily used for subsistence.
Especially here in Hoonah where there's been no
consideration of the impact of the private corporation
logging on subsistence, and the Forest Service's
responsibility to maintain subsistence in these areas, so
Nek Bay is highlighted by SEACC as an important area
that should be protected as wilderness or LUD 2, and it
would be great to see that on a list that this Board put
together to honor these folks in Hoonah who rely on the
subsistence.

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

And the issue about being specific about
what areas and what your uses of those area, I think
that's very important, but the question of using the
Forest Service's rating system as the best measure, he
called it the WAR score, which is they said they plug
each of these areas into a formula and they come up with
a number which, you know, I think 30 is the highest
number. But none of the others in the Tongass received a
30, or maybe one or two did, and they are very remote,
they're a lot of rock and ice. I think we need to tell
them that the areas that we want protected are the fish
and wildlife habitat areas, and we're not interested in
having mountain tops as wilderness. We want areas that
people can access and people that they go there and they
hunt and fish and they use the areas. We don't need more
wilderness necessarily, that's not the highest priority
is rock and ice. We want areas that are the low
elevation, big remaining stands of trees that, you know,
produce deer and fish in the region, and we can see the
effects, and we have, you know, a pending train wreck in
some of these areas where they have been heavily logged,
and in the next 30 years, we're going to have deer
problems on places like Prince of Wales which this board
knows a lot about, so let's protect our remaining areas,
and I'll be hear t answer any questions if you have any.

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

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

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

MR. DAVIDSON: (Indiscernible)

MS. GARZA: Mr. Thomas.

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

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

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

MR. DAVIDSON: Forest Service
presentation?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: These same comments,
did you -- yeah. Forest Service presentation?
MR. DAVIDSON: The presentations were very similar. The presentation about the need, whether or not there was -- basically one of the presentations said that they supported the '97 plan, they think the '97 plan was sufficient. And the response usually from the audience was that the '97 plan was not sufficient, and this is why, because you want to go log these areas that we go and hunt and fish in. And so whether or not their analysis was correct is really not the issue for a lot of people. It's about the areas that they want to go to and want their grandchildren to continue to go to and have them be in their natural state.

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

MS. GARZA: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

To summarize I guess and make it briefly, a couple things in our letter and Carol Goularte, the Sitka District Ranger, did receive this, and I'm sorry that we didn't make copies for the Council members here, but some of the things that the Sitka Tribe looked at was protecting our native allotments which is in this area where the Sitka Tribe picked alternative 3. We do have numerous allotments in that area where it's pretty important that the past 10 years, at least the 10 plus years that I've been with the council that they're very, if you will, protective on this area. Protecting our customary and traditional resources, protecting all archaeological sites, documented and undocumented from disturbance, finalizing the special forest products policy, and protecting all of our traditional monument sites from disturbance. Also, Mr. Chairman, Council members, we did have some concern about some of the laws that are interpretational laws on subsistence, permits, et cetera, so we did have some lengthy discussion on that, in trying to figure out the different laws, Federal, State, ANILCA, subsistence, et cetera, so we're still working on that as well with the tribe and the district. One of the concerns may be looking down the line if implemented was the concerns and understanding the roles and responsibilities and how they're going to be regulated and enforced, so in a nutshell that's -- the
tribe did send its comments regarding alternative 3, which is the best, or not the best, that the tribes took action on.

Thank you, Mrs. Chairman.

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You guys know the drill.

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

MS. GARZA: Your names for the record?

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

MS. HANLON: Ernestine Hanlon.

MS. CULP: Wanda Culp. I also sit on the subsistence committee for the Hoonah Indian Association. And I can't help but feel a little embarrassed that we don't have any of our tribal leaders here to fill us in
on specifically what is going on with the SEIS, but I have to compliment the Forest Service on their talking about 2.5 million acres with activities to change timber stands. That's the nicest way I've ever heard of logging called yet. But it was mentioned that Neka Bay is on the hatchets table there for some more logging in a very important area to us, and, of course, we oppose this. And there has been a letter that Dave will talk about from the current Hoonah Indian Association president who calls for extra protections of Neka Bay because of the heavy logging that has happened around there both by the forest Service and Hoonah Totem and SEAlaska. These impacts have been devastating to our area, and yet they're not included on things like this planning with the Forest Service.

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Blind?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Porches?

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

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

MS. CULP: They're ancient. And we also have burial sites within Port Frederick that are Chu-ka-nadi (ph) burial sites that need protecting as well. I was struck with the idea that under wilderness that there could be Title VIII wilderness opportunity. I think that slipped our minds throughout time, because with Glacier Bay when the wilderness was established, it literally took away every bit of our traditional winter salmon fishery just by a hatchet mark on the books. They didn't -- they came in and got information on where we fished in the winter, and the next time they came in again they have brought this colored map showing as wilderness areas, and that's how Hoonah people lost their winter fishing. So we've been kind of afraid of the wilderness designations. But then realizing again that we do have
this opportunity under Title VIII of ANILCA, I would request and also of the Hoonah Indian Association that a government-to-government relationship be established with the Forest Service here in our own midst. That will enable us to explore the Title VIII wilderness opportunities that we could establish for our benefit finally.

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

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

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

The Village of Hoonah as mentioned is situated on Port Frederick and is surrounding by privately owned land which has already been heavily clear-cut over the past 30 years. There is concern that a significant portion of protective fish and wildlife habitat has already been negatively impacted and even eliminated by this effort, and that the cumulative effects of future clear-cut timber harvests on adjacent Federal lands may well threaten some of the last remaining old growth protective reserves which lie along critical fish streams and wildlife corridors. This is certainly the case in the Neka Mountain and Neka Bay area. In addition to being one of our last pristine locations reasonably accessible by traditional users in small skiffs, the area continues to attract more and more light recreational users from outside the area. We would ask for additional long-term protective measures that would prevent any further road-building or clear-cut logging above and around Neka Bay, including measures that would prevent the proposed Otter Lake timber sale. Additional logging of this area would require the
reconstruction of the eight fathom log transfer facility, a salt water log dump that we feel would be detrimental to shell and ground fish resources, including king and dungeness crab. Establishing additional predictions for this area would maximize benefits of the remaining protected habitat for deer, a primary food resource, as well as brown bear, several varieties of salmon, halibut, and countless other plant and wildlife species.

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

The above reasoning would also be applicable for other areas that are of interest to the Hoonah people. Some of these areas have also experienced very heavy clear cutting in the past, and it would be our desire to see future management decisions that seriously considered protecting remaining areas for their value as customary and traditional harvest areas, as well as irreplaceable destinations for light recreational use. He thanks them for the opportunity to submit these comments and for their consideration.
MR. BELTON: I will provide you with that.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Ernestine, do you have.....

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Questions? Comments?

Thank you very much.
MS. HANLON: Personally I don't know if
the alternative for no action, no logging, that's what
I'm in favor of.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman,
(indiscernible).

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Please.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: We need somebody at the
hot seat.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Dolly.

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

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

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

Let me just turn back and see the rangers, if they know if we've got that map produced, or if we're still working on it. It doesn't look like we know for sure on that, but I can follow up on that. I do
know that's an important -- a good question, John, and
that I think that would show a lot.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. SALINAS: Right. I'll address this
general. It is true that ultimately when we get to
the point where we make recommendations to the Regional
Forester and basically to Congress on what we see comes
out of this process as roadless lands that we would
recommend for wilderness, it is possible, and it is true
that we would look across the board at all of those
alternatives, and what may come out from those,
particularly if it's strongly supported. Maybe the best
way for me to say what I'm trying to say is that the
Hoonah Indian Association letter that was sent to the
Content Analysis Team I think is a very good example of a
substantive letter that we can take and work with,
because it does get specific, it does address specific
issues related to the lands of their interests and their
concerns and issues. So I think when you see the Content
Analysis Team, and incidently, we will be reviewing their
report here in a couple weeks I believe, the entire
Tongass Leadership Team will be getting together to
listen to that report by the contractor, and the content
analysis team, and we'll be reviewing and considering
what that means relative to, again, making
recommendations for that final record of decision. And,
yes, we can bring together across the board several
alternatives and pick those things that make the most
sense, that are supported and substantive in terms of
recommending wilderness.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Or other designation
other than wilderness?

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

Again, you know, I wanted to point out,
if I may, that, and this is something I missed a little
bit when I was commenting on the current supplemental EIS
process. It has been very good on many accounts. It has
caused us to go back and look at all of our inventory of
roadless areas and these maps and clean them up and
verify what's actually out on the ground. And in that
respect, it's been very good. And it's also caused us to
sit down with all of the local tribes and interests and
subsistence, whether it is subsistence issues or any
other issue. And one of the things that I think has been
particularly useful is I did sit in on the meeting, that
government-to-government meeting that was mentioned with
Sitka Tribes, and to hear the District Ranger and Sitka
Tribes begin to take out of that meeting something like
customary and traditional use areas, because that being
really the issue, and the underlying principle and basis
of why we were at that table, and what can be represented
and come out of a process like the supplemental EIS. It
carried those folks to look at really what was the
underlying interest, and it caused them to focus on that.
And I just want to mention that that process in itself is
causing those people to look at those issues and those
things can be addressed. I want you to know that they
can be addressed as we currently stand, under the current
plan, under the current process that we have available to
us. They didn't need a supplemental EIS. What they did
need though was the government-to-government work
together to recognize the true sense and issues of
customary and traditional uses, and for us to really
start to pay attention to what that means to you, and how
we should address that, whether it's in a timber sale
proposal, or even a shoreline EIS, recreation outfitter
and guide thing, so I just wanted to make that point.
Thank you very much.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Ready for a break?

Five minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

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

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: John.

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

MR. MARTIN: Second that motion. Second.

MS. GARZA: It's been moved and seconded
to adopt the letter of August 14th as official Council
through an ad hoc meeting.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Discussion?

MS. GARZA: Discussion.

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: No.

MR. DOUVILLE: May I make a comment?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Douville?

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

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: That's correct.

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Littlefield?

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

MS. GARZA: Patricia?

MS. PHILLIPS: Is there a motion?

MS. GARZA: Yes.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes, there is.

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

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

MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair, the

intend of that was to accept this as if it was the

minutes of the Council meeting, because this is basically

a summary of a several hour long meeting, and if I had

objections with it, or wanted to include something with

it as one of the Council members, I would. It is not at

all meant to say that we endorse alternative 6 or

alternative 1 or any alternative. Just a record of what

we discussed. That's all it was meant to be.

MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Patricia.

MS. PHILLIPS: I would have commented

with more extensive comments in other areas had I

participated, but I was unable to be a participant in the

teleconference. I sent an e-mail correspondence to those

who have e-mail concerning the comments that I made

concerning the SEIS, and those that don't have e-mail did

not get a copy of my letter, so I'm wondering if I'd been

a participant, if my comments would have been reflected

in this letter.

MS. GARZA: So as a protocol, in

accepting this letter it's my understanding that we went

through that process at that time in order to meet

certain date requirements. I'm looking at you. If we

modify this letter because Pelican wants to add sections

of protection or list their concerns, can we add that to

this letter as an amendment at this time, and the letter

still goes forward? Yes. So if you wanted to say, okay,

please include blah-blah-blah-blah-blah to this letter,

this is the time.

MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair?
MS. GARZA: Patricia.

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Point of order, Madame Chair.

MS. PHILLIPS: Huh?

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

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

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

MS. GARZA: Keep going.

MS. PHILLIPS: I want to say that I support LUD 2 designation rather than wilderness designation. Most of the homes in the Pelican area are unique to Alaska. The U.S. Forest Service public SEIS comment period regrettably closes before there was an organized comment by the FACA Southeast Regional Advisory Council to the Federal Subsistence Board. I am a SEARAC member. However, the following remarks are my own.

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, there is
a motion on the floor, and we need to speak to the
motion, and that's all that is in order at this time.

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

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

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

MS. WILSON: Madame Chair?

MS. GARZA: Marilyn?

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

MR. KOOKESH: Can we remark?

MS. GARZA: Floyd?

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

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

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, my motion
was to approve the letter of August 14th basically as a
record of the minutes of what took place at that meeting.
It's not what could be added later, which can be added as
soon as we approve this motion, you can go on, the Chair
could let you talk about this, and I encourage that,
approve it, support it. But it is not germane to the
motion. The motion was to approve this letter as written
a true representation of what took place that day. And
if you were not there, then it is not a true
representation of what took place that day. Your
concerns can be addressed immediately after we approve or
not approve this. It's just not to the motion. It's not
speaking to the motion at all, and we have to speak to
the motion that's on the table.

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

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

MS. GARZA: Okay. So the process would
be we would vote on the motion to accept this as
correspondence, as official Council correspondence of
record as an ad hoc committee. Then Council members who
were not there or even council members who were there who
thought of additional areas may say I wish to add to the
list of concerns these things.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes. That's my
interpretation, Madame Chair.

MS. GARZA: So what he's saying is you
can't add to a meeting that you weren't at as official
correspondence, but you can still add as the concerns as
a Council member.

MS. PHILLIPS: I just want it on the
record that it wasn't a posted public meeting.

MS. GARZA: Right.

MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

MS. GARZA: And it is listed as an ad hoc
Council meeting. Okay. So the motion is to accept the
letter as is as official.....
MR. LITTLEFIELD: Call the question.

MS. GARZA: correspondence of the Regional Advisory Council at an ad hoc Council meeting by audio conference. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. GARZA: Opposed.

MS. PHILLIPS: No.

MS. GARZA: Okay. Patricia.

MS. PHILLIPS: I'm going to consolidate my statements, because I already submitted them to the process. Where was I?

Furthermore, it states each RAC shall have the following authority, ANILCA 805(a)(3)(B)(iv). Recommendations concerning policy standards and guidelines and regulations to implement the strategy. In approved timber harvest sales, I support alternative measures and timber harvest methods. these alternatives would combine ecosystem management with acceptable practices given the social and environmental objectives of subsistence uses, view (ph), watershed protection, wildlife corridors and habitat conservation plans. Alternatives will include select tree logging, filter (ph) wood, a method that leaves 30 percent of the trees unharvested, variable retention, patch cut, longer rotation time of timber harvested.

Several isolated communities are dependent on subsistence resources of the surrounding area in close proximity. It is important to maintain buffer zones to protect the diversity of wildlife.

Forest management plans require more in-depth analysis to minimize and mitigate affected forest logging practices. It is important that logging be reasonably controlled to lessen the impacts to communities and local resources.

In 1996 or 1995 each member of the Council was given a report to Congress, anadromous fish habitat assessment, and I would like to see the Forest Service adhere to the best management practices and all the recommendations and findings that this report delivers. And I'm going to cut it off there.
MS. GARZA: Okay. One of the things that we did at the audio conference was to highlight areas that we felt needed further protection. Were there any areas that you felt that you could put in as a bullet, such as for Hoonah protecting the, is it Neka?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Neka Bay and Neka Mountain.

MS. GARZA: Neka Bay and Neka Mountain.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: 342 and 343.

MS. PHILLIPS: I would support LUD 2 designation of Neka Bay.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Neka Bay? Bay or Mountain?

MS. PHILLIPS: Neka Bay, Neka Mountain.

MS. GARZA: So what I would suggest is that we take a break now, and Council members who were not at that audio conference, if they would wish to add areas of concern that they write them down so when we come back, we can bring them up. The ones that we listed were listed by the 134, whatever designated they received. That would be the easiest, but if you just come up with bays or areas, et cetera, then we can work with that, too. We'd like LUD 2 for Neka Bay and Mountain. So we'll recess until 7:00 o'clock. Come back with any ideas that you think we need to continue to take forward on SEIS.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: I know that Bill Thomas will not be coming back, and Richard Stokes will not be coming back, so I think we have the rest of the Council, except I haven't seen Floyd.

(General conversation)

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. I'll call the meeting back to order. When we had recessed at 5:00 p.m. for dinner, we had approved the August 14th letter as official correspondence from the Council. We then talked about the opportunity for Council members who were not on
that audioconference to list their concerns as the
Council members who were on the audioconference to modify
or add to their concerns. Do I hear any of those
concerns at this time?

MS. WILSON: Madame Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Marilyn?

MS. WILSON: I would like to know what
the situation if we pick an alternative like for
wilderness, what is the stipulation on the land then? I
forget, but you can't use it I know. Could we have a
real quick run through on the wilderness?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Carol?

MS. GOULARTE: Thank you, Madame
Chairman. Marilyn your question was, you said that
alternative, what would be the stipulation?

MS. WILSON: What happens to the land if
it's under wilderness.....

MS. GOULARTE: Designation?

MS. WILSON: Designation, yes.

MR. KANEN: Okay. In the SEIS under
goals, it's to manage all recommended wilderness to
maintain wilderness resources while providing for public
access and uses consistent with maintenance of the
presently existing wilderness characteristics of the
area. Objectives, maintain recreational activities. I'm
skimming here a little bit. Provide for public.....

REPORTER: Move the microphone a little
further away from your mouth. Thanks.

MR. KANEN: Okay. Excuse me. Provide
for public use of the recommended wildernesses in
accordance with ANILCA provisions for motorized and non-
motorized access, and travel, including reasonable
traditional subsistence uses by rural residents. Provide
trails and primitive facilities that are in harmony with
the natural environment, and then promote primitive and
semi-primitive recreation experiences. And then let me
turn to some of the activities. Wilderness is not open
to any new mineral entry. Prior existing rights are
valid. Let's see, under recreation and tourism, maintain
existing public use cabins and shelters at present or improved condition. Consider additional public use cabins and other shelters consistent with the need for health and safety purposes. Base new cabin or shelter locations on analysis of public health and safety needs. Under (f) it's got, with the help of user groups to develop leave no trace camping and use programs that encourage dispersal and use of durable campsites. Where dispersal is not feasible, develop designated campsites and encourage their use. Subsistence. Rural residents engaged in subsistence uses shall have reasonable access to subsistence resources, appropriate use of snow machines, motor boats and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents shall be permitted subject to reasonable regulation to protect wilderness resource values. And this is assuming that it's an ANILCA flavor of wilderness. Trails. Provide for a diversity of outdoor recreation trail and waterway opportunities. Transportation. Allow use of snow machines, motor boats, fixed-wing airplanes and non-motorized methods of surface transportation for traditional activities that are legal and for transportation to and from villages and homesites. And, Marilyn, I can give you this if you want to read through all of it, but those are some of the things that jumped out at me that I would think would be important to the villages.

MS. WILSON: Can a road be built on a wilderness area, or do they just use the existing road system if there's one on there, and it's designated as wilderness?

MR. KANEN: I was looking for roads. Transportation. Okay. New roads and new airstrips are not permitted except to access surrounding state and private land and valid mining claims, subject to stipulations to protect the natural and other values of such lands. Any transportation developed in association with mineral exploration and extraction will be in accordance with approved plan of operations and subsequent annual work plans. Any existing roads in the recommended wildernesses are closed to motorized use unless needed for valid existing rights or consistent with the objectives of ANILCA.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madame Chair. Dale, could you summarize the subsistence section...
of the wilderness, please? This is a subsistence board.
Can you summarize the subsistence portion?

MR. KANEN: Why don't I read it, it's only about five lines. Under subsistence it says rural residents engaged in subsistence uses shall have reasonable access to subsistence resources. Appropriate use of snow machines, motor boats and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents shall be permitted subject to reasonable regulation to protect wilderness resource values.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Could we have the same for LUD 2 designations? That was for wilderness, and I would like the same for LUD 2.

MR. KANEN: I don't see a subsistence category. I don't see a subsistence category. You know, from the other activities that are permitted, I would guess that it would be, if anything, a little bit less restrictive. Under transportation as far as your question on roads, existing roads are generally closed to highway vehicular use. Any proposed roads will use the following guidelines. Allow vital force transportation system linkages, including roads and transfer facilities. Roads other than vital transportation linkages will not be built except to serve authorized activities such as mining, power and water developments, aquaculture developments, or transportation needs determined by the State of Alaska. Generally in LUD 2 you would not, you know, have a timber-related road, timber-harvest related road. Under recreation, primitive recreation facilities such as recreation cabins, boat docks, moorings and trails may be constructed and maintained. Under minerals, forest lands within this land use designation are open to mineral exploration and development.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Thank you, Dale. Mr. Littlefield.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, I just want to clarify for the record if Dale or Goularte would clarify that with a LED 2 designation, the existing activities, subsistence activities would be able to continue in their customary and traditional manner.
unabated, is that correct?

MR. KANEN: Yeah, I don't see a real conflict with the subsistence activities that I'm familiar with and ANILCA wilderness.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Either one of them, subsistence?

MR. KANEN: Well, and even less so I guess with the LUD 2. I guess, and I'm thinking more to some wilderness training that I took in the Lower 48, and it generally had more to do with the '64 wilderness flavor. They began to worry quite a bit about leave no trace, so whether or not, you know, your fish camp's going to have to disappear at the end of the season, whether or not you're going to go -- density, how many people are allowed into an area at a time. Wilderness activities I guess tend to be more closely regulated. You know, and so what, it's going to be 50 years out. That's why I'm telling the Council that I think that not only in saying if you decide you want to recommend areas for wilderness, you also include the activities that you know, you would like to see it open for, as well as activities you don't want to see in there. If you wanted to see a trail built into a use area, for example, in '64 wilderness, may not be able to use motorized, mechanized machinery to build access, may not be able to use motorized equipment other than your snow machines and your traditional access, your skiffs, your snow machine. You might not be able to use a power generator, power saw, those types of things on the beach for your bonfire.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Bert.

MR. ADAMS: Dale, would you help me out here a little bit. You know, you've got, you know, conditions for snowmobiles, motor boats, and, you know, other means of surface transportation. Would you be willing to see where ATVs fit into this category? That has been a discussion in Yakutat and in our Subsistence Resource Commission meeting we had just recently, and so, you know, I'd kind of like to get a little bit more clarification on that. Could that be included, do you know, as a means of transportation?

MR. KANEN: If it's okay, let me pass that to Carol. She has had more of those issues on her district than I've had on mine.
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
notify the Forest Service that they, or request the
Forest Service to consider those units, value comparison
units identified by the August 14th SEARAC letter,
identified by the tribal governments of Southeast Alaska,
identified by the local government and state government
as areas of possible consideration for higher protection
than is currently given.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Is there a second?

MR. MARTIN: Second that motion.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So the intent of the
motion is to have the Forest Service consider what we
listed in the August 14th meeting -- go ahead.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Speaking to my motion,
this backs off from alternative 6, but it includes those
areas that have been identified by the local governments,
the tribal governments who have a government-to-
government relationship with the Forest Service, those
things should be considered very high on the list I
believe. The Governor has identified four specific areas
deserve some protection. I deliberately did not say
whether that is LUD 2, whether that is wilderness. I'm
just saying it deserves some order of higher protection
than is currently offered. So if you look at the SEARAC
letter, I think I can let Mike talk to that, that is
currently designated, there are some lands that we've
identified by numbers that are currently designated LUD
2. They would be considered for some other alternate
form of ANILCA type legislation. And I want to make
clear that I'm looking at ANILCA type legislation, not
pre-snow machine, before they even had generators, '64.
So if it was not protected at all, and was listed as a
wilderness area, or inventoried area, then it could be
considered for a remote recreational site or LUD 2 in
consultation with the people who are affected. That's
what I'm hoping will come out of this, that they will get
with the people who are affected in the Hoonah area for
Neka Bay, or the Ash Bay area in Sitka, the islands in
Craig, and so on, and consult with the local people and
consider giving those areas special protection. That was
the intent of my motion.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Thank you, Mr.
Littlefield. Is there any other discussion on motion.

MR. ADAMS: Call the question.
CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: The question has been called for. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Apposed?

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Motion passes.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Littlefield, does the text on the screen adequately capture.....

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Can't hear you.

MR. SCHROEDER: Does the text on the screen adequately capture the intent of your motion?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: You need to make the font bigger.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Make it bigger. I can't see and I can't hear at this time of night. I believe I said a higher level of protection, I did not say LUD 2 or wilderness, because there are some other --- in other words, you could have a remote recreation area. That's a different area. Those were given in my --- afterwards, but that was not part of the motion. Higher level of protection is I think what I said. And some would fall in LUD 2, some would fall in wilderness, but remote recreation may be acceptable to the local government or the tribal government. I think that pretty well captures it otherwise.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. Good. Okay. We're moving on from SEIS. We have TEK. I can't read this any more. Which will include several presentations by STA in combination with Hoonah I think and then followed by Mike Turek for some TEK projects, followed by Meg Cartwright on the stock projects for Craig, Sitka and somewhere else. Kake. So these are basically the projects that have been funded through the fishery information systems. These are the projects that involve our community members, our tribal members, and I'm just excited to see what they're doing. Although it looks like we have dueling computers up there.
MR. LITTLEFIELD: Competing power plants.

MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, I'd like to introduce the subject while they're getting set up.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Meredith, can you -- okay, there we go. I'd just like to provide a very brief background on how these projects come to be before you, because I think it's something of a success for Council action and Council interest in supporting TEK work. Going back to the Federal assumption of jurisdiction over fisheries in Federal waters a few years ago, the tribes in Southeast went through a planning process of trying to identify projects that would provide information useful to the Council and to the Federal Subsistence Program. The tribes met with the Regional Advisory Council at your Douglas meeting, and I think that was probably in spring of the year 2000. Someone could correct me. And the Council spent a good deal of time and energy hearing, reviewing possible projects that might take place to provide information that would be useful for future decisions. At that time the Council supported launching TEK projects that would document traditional use areas, traditional territories in Southeast Alaska communities and suggested that these be tribal projects such that each tribe would work on documentation of the tribal territories that they used.

In the first year, three contracts were given out, one to Angoon, one to Kake, and one to Hoonah to do this work. And last year three more contracts were given out to, this is going to be difficult, Sitka, Yakutat, and Craig. What you have before you here are some of the participants that were tribal representatives, the tribal staff who have been working on projects and through the communities in Hoonah, in Sitka and in Angoon. So what I've asked the tribes to do is to fill in the Council on the direction of these projects and to pull out some indication of the progress that's being made in reaching the goals on these projects.

I will mention that the intent of the Council two and a half years ago was that these projects would be undertaken in each tribal community in Southeast Alaska. Six of these are underway. Because of staffing problems this last year, we did not launch a further set of three communities. We felt that we needed to have a
little bit more completion on the existing six communities before launching three more communities as being part of this larger study.

This study proceeds under a generalized research design that you reviewed back in Douglas, and it's been before you a number of times. So with that I'll let our TEK panel introduce themselves and take it from there. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. I'm not sure who will start, but I would first like to start by apologizing to you for having you at night. It seems like a number of things just happened today that kept postponing these projects, and to me they are some of the most important work that is being done through the Federal Subsistence Board, OSM process. And as an Advisory Council member, I'm just elated to have you before me. Although I sound tired, I am elated. Thank you. So who's going to do the introductions?

MS. CRAIG: I'd like to thank the Council for having us here tonight. I'll start by introducing myself as we try to figure out the computer. My name is Robi Craig and I work for the Sitka Tribe of Alaska. I've had the pleasure of working at STA for the past seven years, and the more recent pleasure of assisting Angoon Community Association on their TEK project.

MR. FRANK: Madame Chairman, my name is Donald Frank. I was recently hired by the Forest Service as an Angoon Tribal Liaison/TEK Coordinator for ACA, and have been gathering information through interviewing, and with the help of Robi Craig putting some of these interviews together.

MS. DANGEL: I'm Helen Dangel, and I work for Sitka Tribe of Alaska, and I'm the Coastal Resources Coordinator and I've recently been working on the traditional ecological knowledge project doing research and interviews.

MR. BELTON: And my name is David Belton. I'm the director of Cultural and Natural Resources for the Hoonah Indian Association, and I was hired by the Hoonah Indian Association the first of March in 2001, and was introduced to this project soon after arriving, and have been working on it now about a year. And also we working with us at the Hoonah Indian Association Angela Sharclaine (ph). She's a young lady that is near
completion of her college work. She's been attending school down in California and working with the Hoonah Indian Association during the summers, and now she's on staff, went full time, and is working on the TEK projects. I've been working on some of the GIS and annotated bibliography aspects of the project, and Angela has been doing most of her work with the interview material. Angela is not here today because she's ill unfortunately.

MS. CRAIG: We have a lot of technological difficulties tonight. It isn't going to get much closer. Okay. I was going to start a little bit on the ACA project presentation, and then Donald will take over when we get to the interviews, which he's been conducting. And Mr. Schroeder was kind enough to take us through a lot of the beginning portion already, and what we did was just go ahead and put a little summary for you from the original TEK project abstract, talking about the identification of the need for these TEK projects. And you'll see, and I'm sure you all remember, and as Bob summarized, there's a need to document subsistence hunting and fishing areas to pay special attention to fishing camps.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Robi?

MS. CRAIG: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Please speak up a little bit.

MS. CRAIG: Oh, sure. To pay special attention to fishing camps

REPORTER: Ma'am, if you pull it a little further away from your mouth, then I can turn it up higher.

MS. CRAIG: Sure. Okay. And then just to continue to look at TEK. This again is something that Bob summarized, it was the RAC's decision to go ahead and make an action item to have these TEK projects, and this portion talks about your work, consulting with the tribal RAs to go ahead and start these projects.

The projects are composed of four different elements. The first is the annotated bibliography that David spoke about. That's to try to on a community level to look at all the information that's
maybe in the tribal archives that perhaps like the Sitka Native Education Program, other unidentified perhaps sources of traditional ecological knowledge as well as the more recognized Delaguna, Goldschmitt and Hawes. Then the second would be the taped interviews which Donald, Helen and David have all been working on, and that's talking to elders as well as present day subsistence harvesters. The maps, that's looking at both historical, like you'll hear when Donald speaks that he's been taking out Goldschmitt and Hawes for Angoon's traditional territory, and talking to elders, are these the clan territories that you remember. And then also we're going to start working with present day harvesters to say, are these the areas that you continue to use. And then we'll file a report which will bring together these elements.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: If anyone over there can't see, you're welcome to walk about back here if you need a better view of what's going on here.

MS. CRAIG: And then here we have a slide that just gives you a brief update of what's going on with the Angoon Community Association project. We've been working on the bibliography. You'll see in Helen's presentation a slide that shows the form that we're using to input this information into what's going to be an Axis data base. She'll be able to hit a key word for Angoon, sockeye, and up will come the resources that we found that identify traditional ecological use of sockeye. And also it could be by place, and we could break out the key words for those.

To date Donald has conducted 10 interviews with eight elders and two active harvesters. We've transcribed seven of these. You'll see some clips here later on in the presentation. Like I mentioned earlier, Donald's been working with elders to look at the old Goldschmitt and Hawes' maps and then we have a planned meeting to use mylar to go into mapped areas as people want to share that they're using for this fisheries and harvesting areas today.

And then we expect the final report to be out for participant, Council and community review by January of 2003. And going down a little bit further if I can on this, basically that we expect to have the final report to the printer by February of 2003.

And here we just wanted to share just a
couple of the excerpts of the sorts of information that we're finding, and both of these come from published sources. That one is a Delaguna who did a lot of in Angoon, and it talks about four sites, and it's an interesting article. And then the second example that we have for you is a work by Harold Jacobs, and it's published in the volume Rubiton (ph) Overcome from the Clan Connection. I think it was in 1993. And he talks about some of the information that he's gathered from his father and his grandfather and working in Angoon.

And another aspect of this work is that some of these published documents that might not have returned to the community, not Mr. Jacobs, but other studies that have been done using and documenting traditional ecological knowledge actually get repatriated back to the community, and people can decide if they're correct or not and decide if they want to use them or not or do more research.

And then I'll go ahead and turn it over to Donald to talk about the interview process, and I'll just flick through some of these as he talks about his experiences.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Please state your name.

MR. FRANK: Okay. My name is Donald Frank. If I mean, I'd like to introduce who I am. I'm a grandson of Daisy Tong. I was adopted by the Kar-wan-ton Eagle Roof from the Jump House in Klukwan. As I mentioned earlier, I was recently hired as Angoon Tribal Liaison/TEK Coordinator, and with the help of the tribal council I've been focusing on some of our tribal elders, interviewing and documenting some of the traditional lands that have been used for harvesting, and I can say that I've had a lot of cooperation, although there's a few that I could say that they were insulted more or less because this was done before by elders that precede us that knew a lot more, and you could say that they were true elders. But they were able to give me what information that they had. And I was able to interview some harvester that could say growing up that subsistence was their way of life, and without subsistence they would have had a hard time with feeding their family. Hope to have more work done for this project, but due to problems that came up in a month's time, the work came to a halt. But I continue to interview some people, and hope to get three more elders interviewed and some more harvesters to
finish up the interviews with customary and traditional
use areas. Thank you.

MS. CRAIG: If the Council had any
questions about the AC project, you're welcome to ask
those now before we go onto the Sitka TEK. And I'll just
continue to sort of go through these excerpts.

(Pause)

MS. CRAIG: So we envision a final report
coming out that will provide some of the summarized
information from the published and unpublished sources
that have already been documented. Like Donald
mentioned, there's a lot of work that's already been
done. There's a lot of work that's been done in
communities that needs to be returned back to the
communities to be read, to be looked at, to decide
whether it's truthful or not, and then also to contain
excerpts from the interviews, as well as for other people
who wish to, to have their entire interview in the back
in sort of an appendix. And then it will also have
project maps, and the CD Rom that were talking about is
sort of an insert in the pocket so that you can, and the
community can go ahead and use that to go ahead and
search the bibliographies. And there are phone numbers
if you have any questions.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Maybe we'll hold our
questions until we finish the panel.

MS. CRAIG: Sounds good.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Unless there are any
right now?

MS. DANGEL: Hello, my name is Helen
Dangel, I'm with Sitka Tribe of Alaska again, and let me
find our presentation. Okay. Okay. So this is my title
slide. This is, of course a joint project between Sitka
Tribes of Alaska and the Forest Service, Bob Schroeder.
This is just a general overview which we've kind of
already gone over. It's supposed to document traditional
ecological knowledge and traditional clan territories or
work plan territories, and to find out how these
territories are important today. The whole
presentation's geared towards about what this project is
actually trying to accomplish, and I think that's -- at
least my vision is how territories are used today so that
we know what the subsistence resources, how they're being
used. And this is the current map of the Sitka traditional territory that Sitka Tribe of Alaska uses for project proposals, et cetera, so it goes from the base of Baranof Island at Cape Ommaney up probably into Hoonah territory, Yakobi Island, et cetera. And the first program they kind of did is the bibliographic research to research books and find out what information already was out there on traditional territories, and to put this into an annotated bibliography. And for the most part what I found for the Sitka area is that most of the historical documentation done by an anthropologist does not have very much on traditional territories at all, so it just hasn't been a very good source, and the STA has a lot of previous interviews from previous projects that contained a lot more information, so that's what most of the bibliography has. And Robi Craig and I developed a data base that Robi mentioned previously to put this information in rather than just doing it in a word processor, and it can be searched this way with key words, and Robi did a lot of the technical writing for that. And it can also be exported to Word documents so it can just be a regular annotated bibliography.

And this is some forms on the -- just enter all the information and the key words, so you can search for stuff. It has a place for place names and clan territories, et cetera.

And then for the interview part of it we've used marine charts that Sitka Tribe already has, because most of the elders and subsistence users are familiar with using those and prefer to use them, and so that's what was used. And we put transparencies, just clear plastic over them to mark down the clan territories and other traditional ecological knowledge. A lot of that just kind of comes with the territory. People start talking about where they get stuff and stories, cultural sites, et cetera. And we videotaped these and I'm in the process of transcribing the interviews we've done so far. And so I've done several, and I'll continue doing them through October, and hopefully mostly finish up.

And the next part of this project is mapping which I've had some training on, and I'll be doing with the assistance of Dave Aubert who works in Juneau with Eco Trust. He's providing the GS support for this project, so we're going to make -- with GS you have a different layer over the base map and we'll have a different layer for each interview. And we'll make this in the composite for different clans. Hopefully that
will work out.

So this is one I've kind of made it as a learning project from Hauten, Begich and Hawes. It just has a couple people who were interviewed and the territories they provided. Looked for the (indiscernible).

And so just to make a couple comments about my initial findings, I'd just like to say that traditional territories are hard to define. There's no distinct boundaries necessarily. It depends on who you talk to also, but it's not necessary or the house but some others think traditional territories pass back and forth between your family, and it's like from father to 16 soon. It goes to the opposite clan. At least that's what some people are saying. And then others are, you know, well, this is definitely Tiksadi (ph), et cetera. Traditional territories are found from going through past interviews and also doing the interviews for the current project are not being used the same way. People don't necessarily go back to their clan, like with Kagwantaan don't necessarily go back to Kagwantaan because of a variety of factors, and some of these factors are -- I definitely heard less resources due to increased populations. Sitka's gotten a lot bigger, a lot of non native and lots of other people have moved in. And there's also pollution, degraded habitat I especially heard due to logging that, you know, the family's bay they can no longer because it's been ruined. And also changes in traditional ownership of the allotments. Again that's kind of it goes from father to son and then it goes, you know, it's split off into a bunch of different owners, so that really affects ownership. Sitka has Sheldon Jackson and Mt. Edgecumbe, a lot of people from other clans and from other communities and even, you know Eskimo, Inupiat, Aleut have moved in to go to school and stayed. And also with factors, modern life style, have full time jobs, and they just don't have time to go out and collect subsistence every day, so they're weekend warriors. And so that's all in how traditional territories are used today.

And this is a quote from an interview. It's just an anonymous elder, don't take anything from the picture. I asked, do you still use traditional territories for subsistence gathering, and the elder said, well, the answer would be no. The reason being Western culture has forced us into a pocket where we have to share what little we have left. You can't go against
another family and you ask permission. Now it's at the
point where you help yourself, you take it for granted
that we're all brothers and sisters. It's no longer a
Kiksadi (ph) and Kagwantaan it's the people. What we
have left, where we do the harvest, regardless of clan,
because we're being pushed into a smaller pocket for our
subsistence. And that's it.

MR. KOOKESH: Question. What
(indiscernible - away from microphone) anonymous elder?

MS. DANGEL: I just didn't want to
without going back to him first to say his name right
now. That's all. I'm sure it will probably be in the
final report, but......

MR. KOOKESH: This is a draft?

MS. DANGEL: It's a draft.

MS. PHILLIPS: Have you got some place
names?

MS. DANGEL: Well, actually Sitka Tribe
has done a big place name project already which we helped
produce some very beautiful maps that Robi Craig has
looked very hard at. So we do get some place name data,
but it's mostly already been documented. So, yeah,
there's some, you know. Some value (ph) names and stuff
like that. Anyone else?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Marilyn?

MS. WILSON: I was just wondering where
all this information is going to be stored, who can use
it or what's going to happen to the information that you
are gathering?

MS. DANGEL: Well, I'm not positive but I
know we're supposed to complete a final report, and I
think Bob Schroeder might be better able to answer that.
I mean, we definitely would send one to him, and I would
-- I'm guessing that we would provide copies to all of
the RAC, and probably Sitka Tribe. I'm not sure if it's
in our proposal where it's all supposed to be sent. Bob?

MR. SCHROEDER: Marilyn, the intention of
this project was that it would come up with a good
published documentation of subsistence territories,
mainly because that provides a real strong basis for
subsistence protection. So balanced against that is the
interest of the tribes to keep things private that need
to be kept private. So the project envisioned that the
tribe would maintain privacy where needed, but publish a
good documentation of traditional territories.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: John.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have a question.

REPORTER: John, you'll have to get close
to a microphone.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I have a
question on the map, the GIS map that was prepared by Art
View (ph), is it the intent to publish on the complete
layered map so that you don't identify special areas? Is
that the only thing that would be given out to the public

MS. DANGEL: Yeah, I think we are
planning on composing, compositing the different clans,
layers by clans, so it's not necessarily even by
interview, because people have different variations, too.
So there wouldn't really be any special areas that are
documented.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Harold?

MR. MARTIN: Some years ago we presented
a map with Tlingit place names to the Angoon Community
Association. That might be helpful to your project. See
Walter Frank or Ed Ganda (ph), Walter Jack. These guys
were on the community council at the time.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: David.

MR. BELTON: I'm David Belton with the
Hoonah Indian Association. I work in Cultural and
Natural Resources, and I've been involved in this project
since the spring of 2001. Working with me on this
project as I said earlier is Angela Sharclaine (ph). In
addition to leadership and support that we get from Dr.
Schroeder. It would be redundant for me to repeat the
purpose and method of this, because it's kind of the same
thing that was just described to you that they're doing
in Angoon and Sitka is what we're also doing here in
Hoonah.
Two summers ago, the summer before last, we were able to complete 18 interviews. Initially we targeted 20, and we may be able to get two more, but we have 18 that have been completed. Those initial interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and Angela has just completed going back to the original interviewees with the transcriptions and making the corrections, which is kind of a standard process with interviewing.

We also have been working with other agencies that have helped us. Primarily I'd like to make note of the National Park at Glacier Bay. One of advantage that we have here in Hoonah is that there's been so much research done on our area, and one of those reasons is because one of our traditional areas and very significant areas, of course, is Glacier Bay, and, of course, the National Park and Preserve and their staff have done an incredible amount of research over the years, and there's an incredible volume of work that has been done. So that has made this work much easier for us.

Initially we made a trip to Glacier Bay and were given access to many of the files that were there that contained material about Glacier and Hoonah territory. In particular we came across a piece of research that was done by Dottie Theateratis (ph) with contributions by Jennifer Sepez (ph) that was part of a cooperative agreement between the National Park and the University of Washington. Part of that work consisted of an annotated bibliography that was quite extensive, some 70 pages I believe. And from that we've been able to make additions.

One of the objectives of the annotated bibliography is not only to incorporate easy to find books, standard books, the Goldschmitt and Hawes report and other things that everyone is familiar with, but a special effort has been made to find unpublished materials, hard to find books, resource studies, things such as the shoreline EIS's that have been conducted over the years, various community development plans, early work with the Department of Fish and Game. You might remember the TRUAC study that's often referred to, the Traditional Use Area Cooperative Study that was done with ADF&G, and all these different sources provide us information that at some point or some place in there talk about traditional use. So we're trying to add those to other bibliographies that we've been able to find
associated with other works. We're developing actually a quite extensive volume of citations. It could be a life's work to do this, but fortunately we have the help of many researchers that have done this type of work over the years, and we're kind of trying to bring that all together into one place. So on one hand we have -- and if any of you would like to look through this preliminary, it's very much a draft, very much a work in progress, and I would imagine it will continue to be so. New things pop up all the time, but it's kind of interesting to go through and to see really all the work that's been done in this area in one capacity or another over the years.

So we've got good progress on our interviews. We've completed like I said 18 to date, and most of those have been transcribed and gone over for corrections. We have a good start on the annotated bibliography. And then we, too, have developed a relationship with the folks at Eco Trust, and this effort started a couple years ago, prior to my coming here, where tribal representatives had contacted them and had been offered assistance with various GIS technical support. We do have RPU capability at the tribe, however, as you all know, it's a very complicated skill. It takes time to develop, so Eco Trust has been very good, and their senior GIS analyst, Dave Albert, has been very helpful.

One preliminary print that we've made combines some of the orthoquad data that is available through USGS, the Geographical Survey, and combined with some of the data that came out of the TRUAC's study. And I can leave this out on a table for you to look at, but it has kind of a neat look to it. I'll take it around and this is something that we'll continue to work on and refine. I'll just take it around quickly and you can take a look at it. Afterward I'll leave it out on the table. I'm sorry I don't have anything to hang it on right now. But this is kind of the direction that we're going. And it requires in pasting (ph) multiple orthoquads together in order to define the territory that we're looking for, but we hope to be able to produce a variety of GIS maps including various data sources and various images together to make some significant maps.

MS. WILSON: May I ask a question, Madame Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Marilyn.
MS. WILSON: Harold just mentioned Tom Thornton and Harold Martin did a traditional place name I think map of all the different areas. Has that been utilized in all of your information gathering?

MR. BELTON: I would like to comment on that. One thing that one comes to realize soon into this type of work is that it can be very sensitive. Not everyone agrees on where these areas are and were, and certainly here in Hoonah, and I'm sure Mr. Howell from Glacier Bay can agree with me that this work can be very sensitive. The Hoonah Indian Association is also involved with the Park in Tlingit place names of Glacier Bay and the surrounding areas, and I'm not exactly sure right now how we would bring the two together. I believe the tribal administrator at the present time has instructed me to not bring the place name work that they've been doing with Glacier Bay directly into this project at this time, although I believe it's the full intention to do that at the appropriate time. But I think what everyone is wanting to be sensitive to is the appropriate process for bringing our elders and these projects to a place where we can all comfortably and appropriately deal with them. Would that be correct to say, Wayne?

MR. HOWELL: Yes, that's one aspect of the plan.

MR. BELTON: I'd like to ask Wayne to contribute to this, because he's very close with the work in Hoonah.

MR. HOWELL: My name is Wayne Howell, I'm the Cultural Resource Manager at Glacier Bay National Park, and we've been working with the Hoonah Indian Association on the project that Harold brought up, the place name map that Dr. Tom Thornton worked on. And actually HIA is getting ready to produce the final copy of that map. It will be out in paper and CD format very soon.

But one thing to look at is you can only put so much information on any one map and convey that information effectively. And if you end up putting all the place names as well as that set of information on it, you're going to end up with a very cluttered map. So this is -- it's just different ways of doing the same thing. This will be one map, and then the place name map could be a companion map that could go with it, but not
MR. BELTON: Thank you. So we're making progress in all three of the initial areas: the annotated bibliography, the interviews and the GIS work. We do have a completion schedule that we're trying to stay with, because some of the folks that are responsible to ensure that these projects are being completed are saying, you know, we need some deliverables, and we are trying to comply with those expectations. But I'm also realizing every day that this is the type of work that could go on and on and will always be a work in progress.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have a question.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I have just a general question for all of you is that when you -- you've all referred to Goldschmitt Hawes. What has been your experience with the elders that you've interviewed to date on how closely they follow the original report that was done by them? Do they concur with it in most cases, or are you finding divergence?

MS. DANGEL: Go ahead.

MR. BELTON: Actually it depends on who you talk to. You talk to some folks and they say, oh, yes, that's very close. Very close. Then you talk to others and they say oh, no that map needs to continue up past Cape Fairweather, we need to include Dry Bay and the Alsek River in that. Then you get anybody from Yakutat sitting up a little bit taller in their chair, and they say, don't talk about Dry Bay. And I think therein lies the significance of this work. I think that initially we're thinking we're going to produce a body of work that more clearly defines where these territories were, and I think that's wild. I think what we're going find out of this work is that it's the opposite. What we need to understand I think is the relationships that people had, and how the territories were used based on those relationships, and by those protocols of asking permission and those interfamily connections. I think therein lies the real significance of this project rather than more clearly defining where that boundary line went, because that boundary line is really more of a Western concept than an indigenous one.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. We do have Mike
Turek who's going to talk about other TEK projects, and we have Meg Cartwright who's going to be talking about some of the stock assessment projects, and we're in the middle of the evening. So do we want to ask more questions or keep going? One question, I know this is multi-year, because it's kind of drug out longer than we wanted it to, but it is intended to be multi-year. Is there a completion date that we're looking at?

MS. CRAIG: We're looking at February 2003. And that's (indiscernible).

REPORTER: I'm sorry, the microphone.

MR. FRANK: Repeat it.


MS. DANGEL: Sitka Tribe will probably be finished around March of 2003.

MR. BELTON: The Hoonah Tribe is hoping to be done shortly after the first of year.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So then are any of the three tribes intending to apply for FIS money for future TEK work?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: We encourage you to.

MS. CRAIG: Yes, from Sitka. Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: One of the things that I think the council needs to discuss, and I talked with Meg Cartwright out it is that this is a perfect vehicle to continue to train local people in rural Alaska to do social as well as biological research, to do enough of it that they themselves qualify to apply for their grants so they continue to hold the knowledge that they develop, recognizing that the money that FIS handles through Southeast is minimal compared to the needs of Southeast. Part of the discussion and direction we have to give is where else can we seek money, how much do we have to encourage these guys on so that they can start in doing their own research and displacing university people like me. And so I'd like to keep that in the back of our mind as we hear the rest of the discussion, to think about
what we can do to keep this going, to try and, as it was mentioned, the stock assessment work was expanded in part because they were able to interface with the salmon funds from Stevens. Are there types of funds that we can interface with TEK in order to expand the amount of TEK work that is being done. Bob.

MR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair, we were able to get this set of projects going, and we ran them through the Forestry Sciences Lab which was where I was working previously. At this point that's no longer possible, so we really need tribes to be applying directly for these funds, and I'm sure I and other staff would assist tribes, but the tribes would need to be principle investigators on subsequent TEK work, and I think a success of this project is that definitely tribes are set up to do exactly that.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Turek. So, Mike, earlier this evening you handed some stuff out to us, so we have State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, and follow that by this green colored handout.

MR. TUREK: Madame Chair, and Council members, my name is Mike Turek. I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence. And I'm here this evening to briefly discuss the project that we're working on, the FIS projects we're working on with tribes in Southeast Alaska. And I'll start with our two projects that we're doing with -- in 2001, the Klawock River and Saffran Lake traditional sockeye salmon use project and the Kake sockeye salmon use project. Work continues on both these TEK projects. These are collaborative community based TEK projects, and the level of community involvement is the most that I've been involved with since I've been working with the Department for eight years. So this is loaded (ph) with a little uncertainty when considering the time line. It's taken more time than originally planned since these were new projects and as the projects developed we ended up -- the communities got more involved with the projects and took over more control of the projects in many respects, and that has lead to it's taking more time than originally planned. But I think it's for the better of the projects.

What happened in Klawock was we originally planned on doing 10 to 12 key respondent interviews concerning traditional sockeye knowledge, and
the tribe wanted to do more, and it ended up being about 25 interviews, and some quite extensive with Klawock and Craig elders. So that's taken more time to do the interviews and also transcribe the interviews. And we're only now just beginning to start preparing to enter the interview data into the ASEN (ph) searchable data bases.

In Kake what happened is that the Kake staff decided they wanted to be responsible for the interviews, the transcriptions and also for a part of the report writing, and so that also took a little more time. But I think it's better for the research, and I think it's really helped with developing the skill levels in the tribes with the tribes.

For the Klawock River project we hired Donald Yates from Craig and James Rowan and Peter Brown from Klawock to work on the project as temporary fish and wildlife technicians. They worked with our staff, Nancy Rotner (ph), they conducted interviews, and were trained on the interview techniques and also in the observations of the contemporary fisheries, and that worked out quite well. They did a very good job, and after working with the Subsistence Division, both James Rowan and Peter Brown were hired to conduct interviews for the Alaska Traditional Diet Survey being conducted by the Alaska Native Health Board. And they got those jobs because of the experience they had with us conducting interviews. And we've spoken with people at the Alaska Native Health Board why are very impressed with the ability of these two young men to conduct interviews. And Peter Brown has also worked for the Commercial Fish Division this past summer on the Klawock River stock assessment project. And one or both of these individuals if we do some steelhead work, we'd like to have them involved since they know how to do the interviews.

One problem we did run into in Craig and Klawock was just of technical support. They didn't have easy access to computers, so that slowed some of the work down, too. They didn't own personal computers themselves and had a hard time getting access to personal computers for the writing.

In Kake, Elizabeth Cheney (ph), we hired her. Actually what we did was we transferred funds from our project to the Organized Village of Kake. We did a cooperative agreement to fund some of the work Elizabeth Cheney did, which was the interviews and the documentation of the contemporary fisheries. But Liz
went back to school, she's now in law school in New Mexico, so since she left, we've been working with Don Jackson and the other, Charles Johnson on completing the project. And we've gotten chapters from them already, and most of the interviews. We still haven't gotten all of the interview material from them yet. But the report will look different after they get done, because parts of it are actually written by the tribe, so it will have the -- it sounds like it's coming from the village, not from us, which is what we wanted. And so I think that's going to be -- that will be interesting how that goes. I'm excited about that.

So those projects continue. We continue to work on them. We've set a date of December 31st of 2002 to have draft final reports which we can share with the RAC, and have for community review and the Federal staff. But we've asked for a six-month extension of the developing, completing the data base aspect of it. The ASAN data base, because it's taking us longer to get the interview material and get it put into the data base format than we originally planned.

Other projects that we're working on from the FIS, the continuing management and development of Southeast Alaska subsistence fisheries geographical information system, GIS data base, which we began in 2001. This is a GIS data base designed to integrate fisheries data from Southeast Alaska, primarily from the Department's Commercial Fisheries data base into an accessible visual framework. And that's been funded for a second, and a third year actually. The third year project which we'll just be starting this year is a cooperative project between the Division and Tlingit and Haida on further development of the data base, and also beginning to work on getting the data base accessible through the internet.

Another project, which is part of the statewide project, the validity and reliability of the fisheries harvest assessment methods, is a project that's a statewide FIS project with the Subsistence Division. And here in Southeast what we've done is we've worked with the communities of Kake, Angoon and Hoonah last winter, and we collected -- we did subsistence salmon surveys, face-to-face surveys, hire local people to conduct the interviews, and we completed those last winter, and the data is being processed now by our data management group in Anchorage.
For 2002 we have a Wrangell traditional salmon use project which the funding was broken up over two years, and we'll be working with the Wrangell Cooperative Association on this, and this year what we did for the project is we took a trip up the Stikine River with Dick Stokes and John Feller, and several Federal staff, and myself and Nancy Ratner, and Nancy was interviewing Dick Stokes during the trip, and we'll follow up this next year with the rest of the funding to document the fisheries of Thoms Creek and Virginia Lake and continue with some key respondent interviews. And we'll begin that with working with the tribe this late winter, early spring on that.

This coming year, in this next summer, there's the Hula (ph) Klawock salmon survey project, which is a Tlingit and Haida project. They're the primary investigator. But we're working with them on that, and Steve Langdon, professor of anthropology, University of Alaska, is also one of the investigators on that. And we've done some initial planning with him. He'll be doing key respondent interviews with elders in Klawock, and in Hoonah about traditional fisheries. And he'll be working in Hoonah primarily on documenting the contemporary fishery.

Those are all the FIS projects we have. I'll also briefly mention we're working on a Sustainable Salmon Fund project. We got funding from the Sustainable Salmon, which was discussed earlier at the meeting, to do a project on the Chilkoot and Chilkat Rivers, and we're conducting interviews this winter in the subsistence fisheries in Haines and Klukwan, house-to-face surveys on salmon and steelhead harvest. And we're also this summer in Haines and Klukwan, we had a graduate intern, Marvin Smith who's from Juneau, and she worked with Jenny Hotch who's from Klukwan, and who's also a university student at UAS in the anthropology department. And they did some interviewing and also documentation of the fisheries, and they also have quite a bit of information from a previous researcher with the Division who worked on the Chilkat River and Chilkoot River on a king salmon project that will be included in this. And that's all the projects I have to discuss with you. If you have any questions, I can answer them.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Are there any questions?
MR. TUREK: The handout I gave you has a more detailed description of the projects, and it also have some other projects we're working on that aren't FIS projects, so you know how to get ahold of me if you have any questions later after reading that. And this handout that I included, this is was made by Nancy Radner and Nancy Long. Nancy Long works in the Communications Division of the Department, and this was done for the Salmon Festival in Portland, and the Division had a both there, and Nancy Radner's responsible for putting together this information about subsistence salmon fishing in Alaska, primarily Southeast Alaska, and some of these -- you'll some of these quotes from, like it says Tlingit subsistence fisherman, that's from Nancy's work in Klawock and Craig. And we'd love to be able to start doing more things like this that are brief and informative, and colorful, and things that we could start sharing with people in the villages. Sometimes the technical reports we have are a little bit too intimidating for a lot of people I think, and just a little bit too much at one time, so we're looking at trying to do more of this kind of thing, brief information that we can share with the communities and with people, and just kind of get the word out about what's going on in the villages as far as subsistence.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield and then Marilyn.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madame Chair, just a question for Mike, in the six month extension that's required, is that something that you're requesting an action item from us, or just (indiscernible - simultaneous speech).

MR. TUREK: I'm requesting it from FIS.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: All right.

MS. WILSON: Madame Chair, Mike, what will be done with all this information that's compiled?

MR. TUREK: For one thing, we'll be submitting reports to FIS, and then we're going to be working on these Ask Sam (ph) data basis. They'll be on a CD and they're searchable by word, so if you wanted to access information on salmon fishing, you could search it by word. And that's to try to make it a little more interesting. People may not necessarily want to pick up
a technical report. But we'd also like to be able to do
some more of these brief kind of one or two page
information sheets that we can hand out to people, that
would be something that more people may read than the big
technical reports. That's the idea right now. In the
future we'd like to be able to get into more visual
things, perhaps videos and some other things like that,
but at this point, one thing we really want to start
doing a better job on is coming up with some brief things
we can share to people's in the communities, something
they're more likely to read than the technical papers.

MS. WILSON: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So, I know you've been
here for the last three days. It sounds like John wants
a publication on how to do gink (ph). But I think you
heard in our discussion with McBride and Weaver that we
are looking at steelhead and hooligan as two areas of
concern. And I hope that in speaking to all of the TEK
presenters that you will consider what kind of projects
could be done on TEK for those regions. In terms of
hooligan, I'm not sure who would pick up the ball and
take it, but I hope to see a TEK proposal in the next
group.

MR. TUREK: Madame Chair, Council, one
thing we could do, since we haven't started doing a lot
of the interviews for Wrangell is we can include asking
people about Stikine. When we talk about Stikine salmon,
we could also have them -- we could ask them about
Stikine hooligan.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Uh-huh.

MR. TUREK: Often we get -- I mean, that
just makes sense. We're sitting down and talking to
somebody about, like I say, it's awfully hard to keep
them on one species, so we often pick up other
information when we're doing these interviews and we're
trying to concentrate on salmon, but we could very easily
just, you know, also ask people about hooligan on the
Stikine.

MR. MARTIN: Madame Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Mr. Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Mike, this is good. I think
you should have pictures from Southeast.
MR. TUREK: We wanted to have some pictures from Southeast, but unfortunately the only pictures we have from Southeast showed people in boats without lifevests, and the Department wouldn't let us publish those.

MR. MARTIN: That's traditional.

MR. TUREK: That's traditional. Yeah. But we're trying to also work on taking more photos. That's something on these projects. We're trying to build some kind of a photo bank, so we can actually include pictures from Southeast.

MR. MARTIN: I thought you already had a picture (indiscernible).

MR. TUREK: Oh, we've.....

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So just to follow up on that, we had recommended earlier to go to the Federal Subsistence Board that that 49 or 59,000 be used for some steelhead survey work on POW. You thought that could be done. Just like off my brain idea is if all of that money is not needed, could any of it be sent over to Wrangell to say, okay, we're going to do Stikine and Unuk on hooligan if more money is needed in that area?

MR. TUREK: Madame Chair, as we said, we'd have to talk to Cal about it probably, and FIS.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Okay. I think it's a good idea. Okay. Thank you, Mike.

MR. TUREK: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Meg.

MS. CARTWRIGHT: Madame Chair, can you hear me?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: I hear you good.

MS. CARTWRIGHT: And Council?

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Meredith says if you put that down, she can tune it to you.
MS. CARTWRIGHT: Thank you. My name is Meg Cartwright, and I work with the Department of Fish and Game, and I am involved in cooperative projects with the six tribes and the Forest Service on 13 lakes in Southeast Alaska. I am not going to be the only -- there's other presenters tonight. Real quick, Jack Lorrigan from STA is going to talk about the Sitka projects, and Frederick and Ben were going to talk about the Hoonah projects. We appreciate you staying so late, and I'm going to try and go through this pretty fast, so feel free to ask me any questions tomorrow.

So we work on sockeye salmon research on important sockeye subsistence systems that have been identified by the communities in Southeast Alaska. These fisheries research monitoring programs are funded by the Forest Service with oversight by OSM, and this year we also had contributing funds from the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund as well as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Typically these studies have three cooperators, six tribal governments, ADF&G, and the Forest Service. And in the projects that I oversee, typically there's a Fish and Game crew leader and two to three tribal technicians. And like I said, in 2001 we looked at 13 different lakes. We had a staff of 45 to 50 people. We consulted limnologists, biometricians. Ben Van Alen who was working for Fish and Game did a tremendous amount of setting up of these studies, and we continue to consult with him. And, of course, we consulted the public on a regular basis. Technical support came from the limnology labs of Fish and Game, as well as we published our annual reports through Fish and Game. If any of you would like a copy of those, I would be glad to send them to you electronically or in the mail.

This is a map of Southeast Alaska and all the lakes that we worked on, and mostly what I want you to take away from this is that the lake projects were centered around what Floyd calls little cities. For example, here at Wrangell, we had three lakes, Thoms, Luck, Salmon, Kake had Falls, Gut, Kutlaku, et cetera. So if we lose funding, we're going to have to break up these projects that are centered around these towns. And I'm kind of worried about that, but for now we have funding through next year.

The short-term research objective is to collect data for five years. We currently have funding for three. We're trying to figure out how many adults
are coming back to each one of those lakes, how many fry
they produce in the lake, the amount of food available
for these fry in fresh water, number of adults harvested
in the terminal fisheries, both sport and subsistence,
and we take a look at lake characteristics and biological
data like how old these guys are coming back. Here's a
picture of the Angoon crew setting a seine. I think
that's on Kook. Here's the Martin (ph) work, where there
were spotters.

And here's Bob Sanderson from Hydaburg.
He's 72 years old, and he's working on the Hetta project,
and he gets frustrated when the young people can't keep
up with him. And we did community meeting in Hydaburg,
and Bob's just a walking encyclopedia of all the
fisheries in the area. And if you're looking for someone
to do a TEK project, I would highly recommend paying
somebody to follow him around. He's been interviewed a
lot, but Doug McBride and were talking about that he
hasn't been interviewed about the fisheries information
that he knows that would be very valuable to us. So I
think that would be a very worthy project.

This is the Angoon crew again walking
streams and counting fish for Fish and Game. This was
outside the stock assessment projects. The manager in
Juneau had these guys walk Kanalku stream once a week in
July as an in-season management tool. I think just again
one of the benefits of getting to know the technicians in
Angoon. Here's the Angoon crew again. This was when
they went up to Kook Lake and removed the debris from the
caves (ph) with Ben Van Alen. Again an extra special
project that we involved them in.

Long-term research objectives are to set
a range of escapement numbers and see if within that
number that we put into the lake an adequate number of
adults return, that the sockeye fry densities are
adequate as well as subsistence fishery needs are met.

I'm about ready to give you the 2001
results with the warning that this is just one year's
worth of data, and biological data varies highly from
year to year, so I would recommend that you don't take
any management actions based on information from 2001.

Here's the lakes in order of how many
adults returned. Salmon Bay had the most, over 20,000,
and Kanalku and Iningen (ph) had the lowest returns. The
Kanaku and Kook, the ones in red, it's not clear how many
fish really returned to Kanaku and Kook because there was
so few returning that we couldn't get enough fish in hand
to make a good estimate. Hoktaheen is a crazy place to
fly into, and then 9/11 happened, and we didn't get in
there for a month so we missed the peak. Hetta has some
problems of its own, and so we're not quite sure how many
fish returned there. But the rest of them we were able
to do mark/recapture to estimate those that were
returning, as well as we had some weirs and I'll show you
some of that information a little bit later.

This is the only science graph, okay?
And I just couldn't help myself. The blue bars in this
are sockeye salmon fry densities in the lake. Hetta had
the highest fry density. And the line here shows the
mean zooplankton biomass, or the amount of food. And if
you drew a trend line through there, you would see that
in these lakes that had few adult returns had the high
food levels, and by Hetta they had declined.

This is a hydro-acoustic survey transect.
This is how we count the number of fry in a lake. If you
just ignore the purple line and look at the yellow line,
this is a line going straight across the lake. So if you
look on the left-hand side here, it's like pulling off
the shore, as the depth of the lack drops, and then as
you're coming up on the shore on the right you see the
bottom comes up again. This is Kanalku who had the
lowest density of sockeye fry, so anybody who felt like
maybe we missed the spawners coming in, this is another
opportunity to see just exactly how many fish are in the
lake. And hydro-acoustic gear is just like a fancy fish
finder, and the red dots are targets and fish. So here's
Kanalku with the lowest density, and here's Hetta with
the highest density. So this is just to give you an idea
of the contrast between a lake that had a significant
number of adults returning, and one that did not, plus
everything, survival between when the adults came in and
the fry in the lake.

We had four systems in which we
interviewed the fishermen on the grounds for their
subsistence harvest, and this graph shows the striped bar
is what was reported on the subsistence permits. The
black bar shows what we estimated the catch was on the
grounds. And you can see in all cases with varying
degrees that the number on the grounds was higher than
that reported, and other than the Hetta, it only shows
one permit being returned with 40 fish on it. Bob
Sanderson made a point to go to every single household
and ask them how many fish they harvested from Hetta, and
he left no stone unturned, and I'm wondering if they
thought that was all they had to do. He'd incredible.
So then the white bars here is the number of fish that we
estimated came into the lake, and you can see that in
proportion to the number harvested in Klawock it's about
35 percents. It falls in Klag -- or it falls in Hetta
where it's close to 50. And Klag last year had an
insignificant amount taken in the subsistence fishery
compared to the escapement.

We have weirs on Klawock, Falls and in
Klag. So these are those estimates. Here's some data
from the just reported subsistence harvest on the
permits, and how many fish came into the lake, and you
can see the ones that we're concerned about in red,
because we didn't have very many fish coming back, we
couldn't get a good estimate, or else were the ones that
have equal or greater subsistence harvests in front of
them. The others look like they're in good shape.

So over-all, in general, just a quick
We weren't able to get an estimate at all in Gut Bay. It
just doesn't lend itself for mark/recapture. We still
think it's politically important to get information, so
this year we did an index. We just go around the lake
and count every time every time we'd go in. Falls, mixed
bag. I'm concerned about Falls. I see an increase in
effort. The black line is the number of permits, and I
see the harvest staying about the same. The red diamond
on this is the estimate of harvest in 2001 from the
spawning grounds that we did. Healthy adults returns
just for one year at least appear in Salmon Bay, Lefants
(ph), Sitka and Klag. Unclear results from Hetta. We
had a beach study group and a stream study group, and
their marks went back and forth. They couldn't decide
where to spawn. Klawock, we had a weir count of 7,00, a
mark/recapture of 14,000 last year. A big discrepancy
between those two with lots of effort to try and keep
that weir fish tight. Those efforts have increased this
year, and it looks like mark/recapture and the weir
estimate will be about the same. Hoktaheen, I'll let the
Hoonah project talk about that. They took it over this
year. And Hasselborg River we dropped from the project,
because the water gets really high this time of year, and
we just couldn't keep the nets in, so we added Kutlaku
this year.

2002 season, just a preliminary thing is
it looks like at Falls Lake we had an escapement of about
1,000 with two to 3,000 taken in the subsistence fishery.
Gut Bay continues to be low. When we've gone in this
year, we've observed 80 to 50 fish each time we've gone
in compared to at least we had a couple hundred last
year. Kutlaku, I'm going mark/recapture. Klawock as of
September 12th had 10,000 fish through the weir. Dave
Johnson said he thinks it's up to 12 now. It's just
incredible. Sometimes it dribbles to three or four, and
then all of a sudden a thousand fish come in. We're not
really sure what's going on there. Bob Sanderson
reported 900 fish taken from Hetta, 1,001 from Eck and
1300 from Kasook this year. Very different than the
subsistence fishery last year when there large amounts of
adults returning to Hetta. So when Hetta's low like this
year, then they use the other systems. Thoms, Salmon
Bay, Luck, mark/recapture in progress.

Kanalku I'm happy to report had 200 fish
last year as an estimate, and we've seen at least 700 to
800 this year. And I'm going to talk a little bit about
why that is. It's totally due to what happened in Angoon
this year.

Kook also is showing an increase I think
to the crew that goes in there and takes out the
debris jam. Now the fish can come up. And Sitka has
always been pretty healthy, and also an on-going
mark/recapture.

Cooperative projects. What's in it for
all of us? I think the most important thing is
maintaining healthy stocks. Fish and Game has an
opportunity to go in and look at these small systems that
we've never had enough money to look at, and the tribe
gets to work with us in fresh water lakes to see what the
escapement really is. I think it has fostered better
communication between Fish and Gain and the tribes. Some
good examples are a Sitka meeting in which Kake, Angoon
and Sitka asked for some changes in the permitting of the
subsistence fishery, and they got them all. Fish and
Game said, okay, we're going to try it. Fish and Game
wanted to close Kanalku. They said it's been chronically
low for a long time. The Community of Angoon asked that
Fish and Game not close it, they would like to handle it
internally, and they did. And I think the 700 fish that
are there is a consequence of, for the most part, people
staying out. There were a few people that went in, and
apparently the rest of the community got on the CB and
said, what are you doing in there, get out of there. So
I think it's much more effective than Fish and Game trying to close it. And I think that as real positive.

My staff and I travelled to almost every community this winter to give the results from last year, and to hear what people have to say. Partnerships, I would define our partnership with STA as a partnership. Jack Lorrigan is the fisheries biologist for STA and he's done an excellent job, and we just try to stay out of his way and give him help when he needs it, and let him go with the rest. The Eek Lake proposal was put in by Hydaburg Community Association. I think you guys maybe know about our relationship with Hydaburg in the past has been very bad. Fish and Game tried to go in and do a lake enhancement project in Hetta Lake in the late 70s, and everything got stolen. All the time. No matter, you know, just leaving the camp for 20 minutes, so Fish and Game pulled out and said, okay, if you guys don't want to do this project, you know, we're leaving. So contrast that with what we see now is Tony Christianson who's head of the Hydaburg Community Association, Cooperative Association, is really gung-ho to do this research. He put this proposal in. We said we'd back him up. I can see that there might be some opportunities to do some partnerships with Hydaburg in the future on Hetta Lake. It's provided jobs all around, especially for Fish and Game and the tribes, and it's provided an opportunity to start capacity building.

Areas in which I think we need some improvement are better estimates of subsistence harvest. I don't think we're there yet. I think it's some trust things, but in terms of a stock assessment thing, we need to know how many fish are coming back to the terminal areas. I think we can do a better job of developing capacity building. I see us as just having this little project with three-month positions, and I've tried to look at on the outside looking in, is this something I'd want to base my career on is a three-month job? I don't know. For some people I think it's great. Other people might want more development. I don't think -- I don't have the time to do it, but I think we need to, you know, hire somebody to coordinate, to see whether we can combine several jobs. And I think -- and it would be great if we could have some stability in the funding, especially for long-term objectives. I spend 75 percent of my time just trying to figure out how much money we have and writing proposals to get more.

So ideas for capacity building, I'm just
going to touch on them, is combining local jobs. Say Mike's got interviewing the winter, and we've got some three-month project, there's watershed stuff going on. Could we combine all of these and make a six to eight-month job for somebody and attract some good applicants. Rotating positions. I have come to see how -- you know, fisheries work, fish just go all the time. They don't care what's going on in your life, and oftentimes that's not compatible with the tribal technicians, so maybe three people for two positions so they could rotate out and do some subsistence fishing and harvesting in the summer, which kind of precludes them from doing it in these projects. Office support for tribal governments, if we're working towards having them take over these research projects, then they need someone in the office who knows what we're doing, and we need to pay them. And so mechanisms to move technicians who have been in here for a while and have learned the jobs, moving into the crew leader position, Fish and Game. I think it's an excellent way to get them there and then they can go from that. And I've already talked to the human resource delivery anywhere in Southeast, so these guys can take these classes, and it's just perfect for our program. Central Council's interested in getting involved, and maybe some oversight from them. These are things I'm just throwing out, and, of course, I'd love to see the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring come to Southeast at some point. It's not here yet.

Future funding sources. You have in your booklets the Federal FY 03 proposals with matching funds from the Governor's fund. I've been told by Andy McGreagor, who's the regional supervisor for Southeast, that he will make them a top priority for Governor's fund. But it has to go through a process and panels. Shareholders and stakeholders and who knows what will happen, but the Kake project and the Klag project are contingent on these matching funds. And then looking in the future for more matching funds from Southeast Sustainable Salmon Funds as well as starting to work with the tribal governments on what money they might have available.

So I'm just going to leave you with a couple of shots here. This is the crew arrived at Sitka Lake, and then here's the camp life at night. Here's underwater beach boating (ph), and this is Kook Lake in
the morning. I always like to add a little plug for fisheries habitat so that our fish don't end having to do this, which occurred in Washington. The culverts got plugged, and the fish had to cross the road to get to their spawning ground. That's it.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Thank you, Meg. I don't know if you wanted to have the other two guys present before we start asking questions?

MS. CARTWRIGHT: Yes, why don't we do that? I think that would be great. So, Jack, you want to come up and.....

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: A two minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: .....presentations, Hoonah Indian Association, subsistence fish project and Sitka Tribe. Okay. And are you starting, Jack, or is Hoonah starting, or have you guys deciding? Okay.

MR. LORRIGAN: Good evening, Ms. Chair, Council. My name is Jack Lorrigan. I'm the biologist for the Sitka Tribe of Alaska. I have been at STA for about six and a half, seven years now. We had these projects last year in cooperation with Fish and Game, Douglas office, and the Fish and Game Sitka office, and the U.S. Forest Service, and in one lake in particular we also have another partner at Salmon Lake with Ensera (ph) since their facility is in such close proximity to Salmon Lake. I'll start from the North and work my way south. Klag Bay this year, we had the weir in by the middle of June, and the crew counted about 17,000 plus sockeye through. We had a little bit of problem at the beginning of the run. A lot of people came up and harvested a lot of fish, and then we had 24 fish through the weir for a long time. And based on the numbers through the weir, they ended up closing Klag Bay to try and protect the first third of the run, because we had no idea how big the run was going to be. Based on the crew's creel survey and their observations, they estimate that probably four to 6,000 fish were harvested from Klag Bay that probably won't be reported. There's some real good fishing going on. It will be interesting to see what is reported on the permits when they come back. One of the reasons for the perceived excess is that people were
fishing for a limit of 50 fish, and it was maybe being taken advantage of by some. So with that in mind, the weir passed about 17,000 fish. They were able to mark at a rate of 18.4 percent, which means that for every 1,000 fish, 184 going through had a mark on them. And they did a recapture a couple weeks ago and they found a mark/recapture rate of 18.2 percent, so that gives us pretty good confidence that our weir is tight, and they were only counting through what is in the lake. Right now we have one more year left to go on Klag Lake. We anticipate hopefully to keep this funded. It turns out that it is a very important sockeye resource for the Community of Sitka, because a lot of people come up because they couldn't go to Redoubt or Salmon Lake, so they went to the next best system which was north, which was us. And they're done with Klag Bay, they move south towards Nikla Bay.

Working our way south, we have Salmon Lake, and they had 750 sockeye return this year, and about 45,000 pinks, so the lake's getting nutrients, but they're not sockeyes. We don't know the reason for such a low number of fish this year. We don't have a creel survey going on at the mouth of the lake. We don't know if anybody fished at this time yet at down at salt water, and how well they did. We hear reports about people going in there and subsistence fishing, but we have no idea what their effort's like.

The reason I don't have a Power Point presentation for you is that my season literally -- the biggest part of it ended last week, and I haven't had time to do anything. At this time we had another crew go out to get Klag Lake one more, get a recapture done and get the camp broke out, and then send another -- we'll continue through Halloween, because we're looking at the coho run in that system.

Salmon Lake, my crew is in partnership with the Fish and Game office from Sitka, so there's a Fish and Game crew there plus two STA employees out there throughout the summer and fall for those runs. They've got about 200 coho through the system, and they've decreased the limit in that system down to one fish a day for coho just to protect that run, because those fish have to run through such a huge gauntlet in the Sitka Sound area.

And our last lake, a new project, is Red Fish Bay, Tumakof Lake, and we had 23,000 fish come
through that, and there's an estimate of another 1,000
below the weir that did not come through. They had
turned red and they were still bright fish mixed in, but
during high flows or whatever, they just stayed in salt
water for whatever reason by the time we pulled the weir
during a couple weeks ago. And from old literature back in the
1900s, they were still seeing bright fish clear through
November I think. It's a really unique system. The
reason why we're there is that in the year 2000 there was
some illegal seining that went that they harvested a very
large portion of that run, and this year was a good
baseline data gathering year. 23,000 sounds like a nice
healthy run. They've seen as many as 35,000 and 70,000
in that system, for such a small lake. There's no inlet
stream there. It's all lake spawning. We learned a lot
there, and we hope to find out just how bad it's been
impacted in the future. We're going to be doing one more
mark/recapture in Red Fish. Hopefully we can get some
fish this time. The characteristics of the lake is it's
very bowl shaped, it drops right off. And if you try to
throw a seiner (ph) on a fish, they'll dive right out of
it, so it's hard to catch them. We may have to look at
morts when they start floating, and maybe get some idea
of what's going on that way.

That's all I have for the projects right
now. You can ask me tomorrow.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: So that means you'll
be here in the morning?

MR. LORRIGAN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Uh-huh. Frederick.

MR. VAN ALEN: Okay. Good morning,
Madame Chair and Council. I'm Ben Van Alen from the
Forest Service in Juneau.

MR. GALLANT: I'm Frederick Gallant.

Thank you, Madame and Council.

MR. VAN ALEN: And what we're reporting
here is basically this is a new project that was funded
the first time this summer. I goes for the next three
summers. At least that's what we have funding for. And
it's basically a co-op project like all the others are
here in Southeast. This one is with the Hoonah Indian
Association, and they employ three people, three crew
members, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game employed
one person who ran the Neva weir, a weir on Neva Lake,
and then I was involved as well as a lady, Cindy
Langadakis from Juneau for a bit, a couple of weeks.
Let's see. Now, what I'm just going to show are
basically just slides like you would sit in your living
room and watch I hope.

But anyway, Pavlov Lake is a little dinky
lake, it has a falls and a fish pass on the outlet.
Here's a view from the other direction, basically looking
south now. And the lake is just marshy, it's frog
habitat basically. This fish pass has been there many,
many years. We put this traps at the top of it where the
will choose to come up the fish pass, basically just swim
into this trap, and then wait patiently for us to dip net
them out. There's William Saunders working the dip net,
clipping the fin, and Fred's doing it there. William's
working the tally-wacker. We boated from there across
the lake basically to the inlet stream, and we walked the
inlet stream, count fish as we go, see bears, and we saw
a fair number of fish actually. There's a beautiful
little spot in there that was right up from the lake, it
was like custom designed for us working a beach seine.
So we came back and fished the beach seine here, had no
problems catching fish. Found out that we'd marked about
42 percent of the sockeye that came into the lake, and
with that census data, it gives us an estimate of about
1,300 sockeye in the lake, so it's a pretty small run of
sockeye relatively speaking, relative to Tuntakof anyway.
We used to walk down from the tropic (ph) you can see
behind Fred in the other one there to a place where we'd
just cook meat on a stick there on the beach, kind of a
rustic camp site. This is Sam Willard in the foreground
on the left. Then we constructed basically a floating
tent which the crew lived on for the latter part of
the summer. In fact we built that the morning that a
bear visited the camp we down in the beach frontage
below, so I think our timing was pretty good. And we got
two thumbs up for that one. Now, this is what they were
worried about. This is a picture just taken at your
local dump, but that's what they didn't want to have in
their camp. This is something Fred might talk a little
about.

MR. GALLANT: Yes. Thank you. I've
received a letter from the Governor, if I may read it,
addressed to me, saying, Dear Mr. Gallant, I recently
read the Anchorage Daily News of your amazing fight to
stay alive while balancing on the edge of the cascades of
Pavlof Lake. You're admirable bravery, strength, wisdom and determination are a true inspiration to all Alaskans. Best of wishes to you and your family.

This was an unintended part of my job I wasn't expecting to be at 12:00 o'clock in the afternoon. However, we did get 10 coho and one pink that day before this happened. It was very -- he night before was thundering and lightning. The rain was very heavy all throughout the night, and all throughout that day, the 28th of August, and fortunately we had unexpected guests of about 70 people in groups of 20 off of a vessel called the Sea Lion, and they were inquiring about what we're there for, what our study's for. We explained to them who we are, who we work for, what we're there for, studying the stock assessment on sockeye salmon. And I had intended to go upstream with the boat there, or the skiff, and me and Jerome were in it going back to eat breakfast after entertaining these 70 people. And we ended up drifting back into the waterfall itself, and Jerome had jumped out. There was a shallow enough place where he thought he could jump out and hold the boat in place from going over. However, we had passed the crest. And I was going to bail out myself, but I told Jerome to get out of the way and get to safety. I was more concerned about his safety that I was mine. I was feeling very responsible for the boat, and there was nothing I could really do. I tried to bail out, but my foot got wedged in between the back seat and the stern of the boat, and I couldn't get out. It was already too late, I was already past the crest and I jump out and I went under for about a minute and a half in the water. My chest waders filled up. I did have a life preserver on though. We managed to spin out of it, and float down the fall about 10 more feet, and I landed right behind the skiff that was teetering off of the fall there. There was really no way to go either side of me, or I couldn't go back up. The only thing I felt safe doing was just standing there until I could be rescued or something. I thought that was my best bet.

Here's the Coast Guard hoisting me up, and it was a tremendous relief to be hoisted out of the position I was in. After spending two and a half hours out there on that rock out there with the water rushing, it was crazy. But I have two beautiful daughters at home that I felt that it was worth fighting for, plus my job. I didn't want to lose my job. So here's a little bit of the aftermath, which is very minor to the property of the Forest Service. It was little pin holes on the skiff.
that I was in, and I don't think it took too long to
repair that. I had one day of R&R and I was back out in
the field the following day in Hoktaheen I believe.

Here's Jerome and I. In the background
if you can notice the wall there, the water was actually
rushing over those walls right there. It was about 35
inches that day.

This is they were breaking camp in Pavlof
and I was in Neva at that time.

MR. VAN ALEN: Uh-huh. These are some of
the instant findings basically. We did operate a trap
there late June, early August, and we caught and marked
557 sockeye and 873 coho. We didn't operate the trap
actually during at least the period when half the coho or
probably I'd say three quarters of the coho were actually
passing, so we might multiply that number by quite a bit
if we wanted to know what the actual escapement of coho
was. We did do age, sex, size sampling of fish. We know
about the timing into the lake and on the spawning ground
now, which we didn't know before. We have an index of
abundance in the spawning area. We did limnology
sampling in all the lakes. We learned a little about
water safety. And actually this project was being able
to get an estimate of total escapement of sockeye is
somewhat of a bonus. It wasn't in our project plan, but
we were able to do it, and so anyway I feel good about
that piece.

We moved across now to Neva Lake, is over
in Excursion Inlet. It is another small lake, too small
to fly in and out of. Anyway we go in there, we built a
weir, and the gentleman on the left, Wayne Long, employed
by Fish and Game, he's worked for Fish and Game a lot of
years, he actually lives over there, so this is in his
back yard, and he basically -- we went in, brought the
weir, but he operated the weir for the bulk of the
summer. And this is the day after, it was raining both
days, so my camera's kind of fogged up. And it's a
fairly simple operation. We did some, like I say, lake
limnology work, took measurements. We also walked the
inlet stream there. We radio-tagged some fish at Neva,
so we learned where they go when. We got back and forth
basically driving Forest Service four-wheelers. We
clipped fins, measured length, plucked scales, pluck
another scale. That's the kind of work we do. At
Excursion they got to eat at the cannery facility. It
was hard duty.
So our basic findings there, the weir count itself is over 4,000 sockeye, which is kind of impressive. We wouldn't have thought there were that many in there. And 573 coho by the time we pulled it. We did mark/recapture studies, we evaluated the accuracy of the weir count, and actually that work is still going. Our next trip is planned in there this coming week.

Moving out to Hoktaheen out in Yakobi Island. It's another small lake, but this one we can fly in and out of. There's actually two lakes in the system. And on our second trip in there we were timed perfectly to catch fish with a seine off the mouth of the main spawning stream. Fairly successful at catching them. We had data on a stick at this point. We did stream walking, catching fish in there in this stream with dip nets, marking them. We had all kinds of water conditions. Some low, some high. We also marked fish in the stream between the lakes, and again that place we're using a beach seine. It was fairly easy to sample fish, catch fish and mark them. Each trip we'd be able to easily in a day of marking daily catch, would be able to have over half the fish marked.

These pictures, the last two, are Carl. So keeping good field notes is critical. We save a lot of money. We didn't even have an outboard. In fact we didn't even have oars or paddles. This is our first trip. We thought they were out there, so we had to improvise with plastic plates and sticks and -- but, hey, we got along. Our camp changed over time. This is our first trip. By the time of our last trip in there, we had visquine and tarps all around everything, because the wind was blowing from various directions, raining cats and dogs, and anyway, we made do as needed. This is probably one of our later trips. The last set off the mouth of the inlet stream was mostly coho. Basic results, we are doing the mark/recapture. Our next trip's planned for this weekend if the weather permits.

We got a lot of scale samples there. We did limnology sampling, and we know about timing of fish, and we'll be able to compare the index of escapement this year with last year, so this will be the second year of that. So plans for next year are basically to do the same, so continue to trap at Pavlof, and continuing operating a weir at Neva, and continue our mark/recapture indexing work at Hoktaheen, although I'm kind of interesting a weir there, maybe getting in-season information, and I would try to do that if it's a good place to operate a weir geographically as well as it won't cost us any more
money. Thanks.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: Any questions? Okay.
You guys will be here tomorrow?

MR. VAN ALEN: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN GARZA: When we're more awake
and we might have one? Okay. Recess until 9:00 a.m.

(Off record - 9:24 p.m.)

(PROCEEDINGS TO CONTINUE)
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