

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME III

7
8 Wrangell, Alaska
9 October 13, 2005
10 8:10 o'clock a.m.

11
12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

14
15 John Littlefield, Chairman

16 Bertrand Adams

17 Michael Douville

18 Dolly Garza

19 Donald Hernandez

20 Harvey Kitka

21 Floyd Kookesh

22 Patricia Phillips

23 Richard Stokes

24 Frank Wright

25

26 Regional Council Coordinator, Robert Schroeder

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 Recorded and transcribed by:

45

46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC

47 3522 West 27th Avenue

48 Anchorage, AK 99517

49 907-243-0668

50 jpk@gci.net

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Wrangell, Alaska - 10/13/2005)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call the meeting back to order. We've got still a very full agenda.

Is Doug Larsen here? I'm just wondering if you feel comfortable moving from 16.E. up to the next item, which is the update on Unit 2 Deer Subcommittee. I suspect you'll probably be up during that time, and if you have some issues under 16.E., is it all right to just go ahead and address them at that time. Okay. So we'll do that, and then.....

So we're going to start on item 10, the update of the Unite 2 Deer Subcommittee. And it says Don Hernandez, but Don is allowed to bring anybody that he wants that was on that subcommittee up to be participating on that, so at this time we'll turn it over to Mr. Hernandez to do item 10, the update on Unit 2 deer. Page number.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Our final report on the Unit 2 deer management starts on page 156 in your booklets. 156.

And I think I will stay here at my seat, and I'll switch my name tags here. I see they gave me two tags, so I'll put this one out front. Get that Petersburg off of there and become the Unit 2 Deer Subcommittee chairman.

And I might for the presentation maybe ask that possibly Doug Larsen and Dave Johnson might want to sit at the other table so they can participate. I see Dave is there.

So let me start by saying that the subcommittee has completed their work. It was kind of a long and arduous task. A lot of logistical nightmares. But we wrapped up our subcommittee in June, and now it's time to present our work to you as the Council, and hopefully you will review our work and choose to make it a report from the full Council that

1 we can submit to the Board for their use in the future.

2

3 And I guess I'd like to start by
4 acknowledging all of the support that we've had in this
5 process. It really took quite a joint effort as well
6 as the people on the subcommittee and support from the
7 full Council, we also had a lot of help from Federal
8 and State agencies and their Staff. I'll just quickly
9 run through them. We had Bob Schroeder, our
10 coordinator, also acted as coordinator for the
11 subcommittee. Jim Brainard, wildlife U.S. Forest
12 Service. Cal Casipit with the Forest Service. Steve
13 Fadden with the Forest Service. Melinda Hernandez also
14 with the Forest Service helped coordinate. Dave
15 Johnson with the Forest Service did a lot of logistical
16 support and participated on the subcommittee. And
17 Steve Kessler, Forest Service. Matt Moran with the
18 Forest Service. Jack Oien and Ken Pearson and Richard
19 Shreffler and Scott Snelson, Pat Tierney, Tom Hanley,
20 Winston Smith, all presented valuable technical
21 information. Maureen Clark, the public information
22 help with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And
23 Warren Eastland, Bureau of Indian Affairs, attended
24 many of our meetings, was a big help. And James
25 Ustasiewski as counsel also gave input to our meetings.

26

27 On the State we had Paul Converse from
28 Fish and Game, Brian Lieb, Dave Person, Boyd Porter,
29 Dale Rabe, Tom Straugh, Mike Turek, Bernard Chastain
30 with the State Troopers. All gave input and technical
31 information to us.

32

33 And the facilitator for all of our
34 meetings was Jan Calfield from Sheinberg Associates,
35 and she was invaluable to the effort as well as all the
36 other people that I mentioned.

37

38 So then if you follow along in the
39 book, I'll kind of run through and try and give you a
40 synopsis of all that we've done. And maybe I'll go to
41 Page 162, and I want to point out kind of why this
42 process got started. This was basically an effort to
43 try and resolve conflict between different users of the
44 deer in Unit 2, subsistence, non-subsistence and sport
45 hunters.

46

47 It was brought about by basically
48 changing conditions on the island. Conditions for deer
49 hunters have changed dramatically on the island. We
50 have a lot of improved access, bringing more hunters

1 onto the island, and we also are dealing with some very
2 significant changes to the habit on the island due to a
3 lot of previous logging and timber harvest on the
4 island. And that's brought about quite a bit of change
5 to the habitat with the new rapidly regenerating second
6 growth.

7
8 Part of the problem was that over the
9 last several years many of the Federally qualified
10 subsistence hunters who have been hunting on Prince of
11 Wales Island have been testifying to this Council and
12 to the Board about how there -- it's more difficult for
13 them to meet their needs in harvesting deer, mainly due
14 to this increased competition and habitat concerns.
15 There's also been some concern that the deer
16 populations have been declining over the last several
17 years.

18
19 So it was decided that this type of an
20 effort should be attempted to try and resolve all these
21 conflicts. Direction came from the Council with the
22 help of the -- encouragement from the Board to create
23 such a subcommittee to -- let's get together and try if
24 we -- see if we can't come up to some management
25 approach that would address all of these concerns by
26 the subsistence users.

27
28 So the subcommittee was formed. I'll
29 tell you the makeup of the committee. It was comprised
30 of 12 people and an alternate. We had four people that
31 were members of the Regional council. those were Mike
32 Douville, Dolly Garza, Mike Bangs and myself. We had
33 three people from Ketchikan who were not members of the
34 subcommittee, and they were Johnnie Laird who is a
35 sport hunter, and eh also runs a guiding business.
36 There was Tom Skultka, he represented the Ketchikan
37 Indian Community, and he is a sport/ subsistence hunter
38 combination. And A.J. Slagle, he represented sport
39 hunting interests for the people of Ketchikan. We had
40 two Prince of Wales residents besides myself and Mike
41 Douville, and they were Elena James who represented the
42 Craig/Klawock Tribal Organizations. And we had Tony
43 Christianson from Hydaburg representing the Hydaburg
44 Tribe. We also had a member from Wrangell, Tom Sims,
45 and Tom is the chairman of the local advisory committee
46 here in Wrangell. And we had two representatives from
47 the agencies, U.S. Forest Service and Department of
48 Fish and Game, and they were on the committee as
49 nonvoting members, but very involved in all of the
50 discussions and collaborative decisions. And they were

1 Greg Killinger was the District Ranger from Craig, and
2 Doug Larsen is the regional director for the Game
3 Division from Juneau.

4
5 So we had a real good, well rounded
6 group covering all interests.

7
8 The task of the subcommittee was to
9 make recommendations that were -- be subsistence-based,
10 publicly supported management approach for deer in Unit
11 2. And these decisions were to help to ensure long-
12 term conservation of Unit 2 deer, maintain the rural
13 subsistence priority provided by ANILCA on the Federal
14 lands, and also to minimize adverse effects on non-
15 Federally qualified hunters who also rely on Unit 2
16 deer.

17
18 We held five meetings, and the meetings
19 were held in three different communities: Craig,
20 Ketchikan -- or four different communities, excuse me.
21 Craig, Ketchikan, Thorne Bay and here in Wrangell. At
22 each of these five meetings, we took public testimony,
23 and involvement from the public was a key effort in all
24 of our subcommittee meetings.

25
26 The subcommittee's recommendations
27 which we developed are the subcommittee's
28 recommendations, and they are advisory to this Council.
29 In turn, the Council may decide to forward them as
30 recommended to the various agency managers or
31 regulatory entities. There may be recommendations from
32 this report that would be applicable to either the
33 State Board of Game or to the Federal Subsistence
34 Board.

35
36 Just some idea of the types of
37 recommendations that we've made are basically -- some
38 of them deal with the need for better data on which to
39 base deer management decisions, including harvest data,
40 deer population and information related to subsistence
41 use and need for Unit 2 deer. They may also include
42 deer harvest management approaches to manage deer under
43 current conditions and changing conditions in the
44 future. Made recommendations on young growth forest
45 management to benefit the habitat and potentially
46 enhance deer population. And also to manage some of the
47 road access issues on the island. Also have some
48 recommendations to changes to enforcement regulations.
49 We have some recommendations on how to improve public
50 understanding of ANILCA in regards to Unit 2 deer

1 management issues. And also how to improve
2 coordination between Federal, State, Tribe and local
3 agencies in Unit 2.

4
5 On Page 167 is the goal statement that
6 we developed for our subcommittee. The goal of the
7 deer management planning subcommittee for Unit 2 is to
8 recommend a subsistence-based management approach for
9 deer in this unit. The recommended approach will be
10 reported through the Council to the Federal Subsistence
11 Board. This management approach will need to ensure
12 the long-term conservation of Unit 2 deer populations,
13 allow subsistence users to meet their needs as provided
14 in ANILCA, account for the habitat and other ecological
15 changes that may affect the deer population over time,
16 recognize the changes in access and demography that may
17 change subsistence and other demands for deer, and
18 minimize adverse effects on non-subsistence hunters who
19 also rely on Unit 2 deer populations. This management
20 approach will include both public education on deer
21 management and habitat issues and on the subsistence
22 protections found in ANILCA.

23
24 I think now I'd like to -- I'd better
25 run through -- jump ahead to where we start talking
26 about some of our actual work that we undertook, and
27 maybe I'll ask you to turn to Page 172 where we start
28 our recommendations to improve the management.

29
30 The way this report is organized is we
31 kind of address each of the topics, tell you what we
32 did. Then we have some recommendations concerning what
33 each of those topics are, and then there's also a
34 status report on how those efforts are underway, which
35 some of them have been started and are underway.

36
37 In the course of our early meetings, we
38 quickly came to the conclusion that what was probably
39 the best way to address this situation, and what was
40 really lacking was a really good information basis on
41 how future decisions would be made. And we tackled
42 that right off the bat, and we developed what we called
43 the -- started calling the information triangle. And
44 that's kind of detailed on Page 174. We decided that
45 the public and particularly those who have faced and
46 may face hunting restrictions have been insistent that
47 decisions be made based on a strong base of credible
48 scientific information and analysis. And this point
49 was consistently made to our subcommittee at the -- by
50 public testimony, particularly at our Ketchikan

1 meeting.

2

3 We also recognize that subsistence
4 users also want to be listened to in their concerns,
5 and their concerns taken into consideration.

6

7 So we approached it in this manner. We
8 decided that the information needs we needed was good
9 deer harvest information for Unit 2. We also wanted to
10 get some good deer population and trend information.
11 It was also very important to know what the subsistence
12 uses were and the needs of the subsistence users. We
13 have to make a very good effort to try and determine
14 all three of these things if we're going to be able to
15 make good decisions in the future.

16

17 Just see where I am here. Okay. Well,
18 let's start with our -- what we've actually -- what our
19 recommended actions are.

20

21 The first action was funding for
22 wildlife information services in regards to Unit 2
23 deer. It was recommended that additional funding for
24 research and information gathering related to Unit 2
25 deer management data information needs be prioritized
26 related to subsistence management for Unit 2 deer
27 management. And what the status on that action is is a
28 request for project proposals for WIS funding was
29 issued by the U.S. Forest Service through the Wildlife
30 Resource Monitoring Program on June 16th of this year.
31 The program will fund projects that respond to
32 identified, high-priority information needs to manage
33 and conserve wildlife resources on the Federal public
34 lands. The Monitoring Program expects to provide about
35 \$400,000 in 2005, and the U.S. Forest Service is
36 targeting the 2005 request for proposals towards
37 information related to Unit 2 deer management.

38

39 Our second action in regards to
40 information was -- is the deer harvest reporting
41 system. This has been implemented. It's a mandatory
42 harvest reporting system developed by the Forest
43 Service and the Fish and game cooperatively. The
44 reporting system's goal was to get high harvest
45 information reporting rates of over 90 percent.
46 Community-specific harvest information. It's a unified
47 permit that will go to all deer hunters on all deer
48 hunts on all lands in Unit 2, subsistence, non-
49 subsistence, antlerless deer. System was to be --
50 meant to be convenient for the user, paperwork

1 available at existing vendors. And there was to be no
2 heavy-handed enforcement. And part of the effort was
3 to educate hunters regarding the importance of this
4 effort and getting accurate information.

5
6 And there might be some questions about
7 that, and I'm sure Dave and Doug can answer any
8 questions you have about how that effort is being
9 implemented.

10
11 The other action with regards to the
12 information triangle is getting deer population
13 estimation and trends. What was decided there was
14 multiple tools were needed. Those would include
15 implementing a program of regular, more intensive
16 monitoring of the Unit 2 deer population and their
17 trends. This would be using some existing information
18 such as the on-going pellet counts. This effort should
19 be focused on the areas that have the highest use on
20 Prince of Wales Islands.

21
22 Also it was important to integrate
23 population observation and trends that were noted by
24 local hunters. And some of this will be done through
25 the reporting forms. Other ideas were to implement a
26 voluntary log book. Other ideas also included going
27 out and doing active observation on transects, road-
28 based counts, winter mortality counts, things of that
29 nature. Another idea was possibly establishing check
30 stations to get on-site information from hunters as
31 they're in the process of hunting. All of these could
32 go towards getting better deer population and trend
33 estimates.

34
35 The deer population and trends has been
36 noted as a high priority for WIS funding. That's
37 already been acted on in June of this past year.

38
39 And the third part of the triangle, a
40 very important part is documenting subsistence use and
41 need, something that probably has been very lacking in
42 the past. We discussed ways to get better information
43 on what this subsistence use need is, and some of those
44 ideas are to -- more review of existing literature, do
45 more a more complete analysis of available quantitative
46 data from past subsistence research relevant to Unit 2.
47 Do more research into the theory and practice of
48 characterizing the use of and need for subsistence
49 resources. And conducting interviews that would allow
50 for substantial discussion and quantitative and

1 qualitative descriptions of subsistence use and needs.
2 Consultation with hunters would characterize the
3 physical, economic and cultural/ social traditional
4 values of use and need for Unit 2 deer, and would ask
5 people why they aren't getting their needs met if
6 they'd stated that they are not. Interviews would also
7 ask about a household's subsistence budget concerning
8 all species and how deer fit into that budget, and ask
9 about distribution and exchange of deer within the
10 community, ceremonial needs, all other factors relevant
11 to subsistence use and need for deer by individuals,
12 households and communities.

13
14 Also document and quantify information
15 about subsistence use of deer, which could be compared
16 with harvest report and data.

17
18 Concerning the actions regarding this,
19 the request for proposals for WIS funding issued by the
20 Forest Service in June identified gathering information
21 about the subsistence use and needs of communities with
22 customary and traditional use of this resource as a
23 high priority.

24
25 We also talked about management issues.
26 we kind of addressed this in the near-term objectives
27 and longer term objectives. Let's see.

28
29 Some of the actions which we took
30 concerning the management is action number 5 listed in
31 the book. I'm up to Page 180. This is one action that
32 we'll probably be requesting here for the near term
33 that could possibly go into effect for the next hunting
34 season, and that would be to designate three separate
35 areas of management for Unit 2. It's not envisioned
36 that these would be labeled as subunits as such, but
37 just areas where different management approaches could
38 be tried, and we'll detail what we're asking for as far
39 as a proposal in that later.

40
41 It's our recommendation to retain all
42 designated hunter, proxy hunting, and harvest for
43 cultural ceremonies. And also in the near term, we
44 don't envision the need for any significant change in
45 the next three to five years possibly. And that would
46 include retaining the four-deer harvest limit for both
47 subsistence and non-subsistence hunters, retain the
48 provision for harvest for antlerless deer for Federally
49 qualified subsistence hunters from October 15th to
50 December 31st, retain the early hunt which was

1 implemented by the Board. That gives subsistence users
2 an opportunity prior to the general hunt on July 24th
3 to the 31st, and delays the non-subsistence hunters to
4 August 15th.

5
6 And then the last thing we attempted as
7 a sub-committee in relationship to management was
8 trying to envision how these changing conditions I
9 mentioned at the start of the presentation might be
10 addressed in the future. This was all fairly
11 speculative, but what we tried to do was come up with
12 some kind of a guideline for how these changing issues
13 would be -- could be addressed by future Councils.

14
15 I guess I'll direct your attention to
16 Page 183 where there's a table kind of outlining how we
17 think, how we maybe suggest that these issues could be
18 dealt with in the future.

19
20 In column 1 we kind of list what
21 possible future conditions we could envision seeing.
22 As I say, it's speculative.

23
24 But I think more importantly, if you
25 look at column 2, we tried to list what possible
26 indicators you would look at to try and determine if
27 these changes were happening. And this all relates
28 back to that information triangle which we spent so
29 much time working on in the beginning. This would kind
30 of give the Council a way to look back and assess that
31 information and hopefully determine what's happening
32 out there. And we list for each possible condition the
33 types of indicators of change.

34
35 And then in column 3 we tried to list
36 what the management tools that could be under
37 consideration might be. These all be subject to what
38 the Council's feelings at the time based on conditions
39 would be, but these are just ideas that all the various
40 groups were able to agree on that could be implemented
41 to try and alleviate some of these possible future
42 conditions.

43
44 One of the other topics that we -- that
45 was a big part of all of our discussions in this was
46 habitat. Probably -- well, I can say definitely that
47 everybody on the subcommittee agreed that maintaining
48 healthy habitat is probably the key to long-range
49 health of the subsistence resource on the island. And
50 we did make some recommendations along those lines.

1 These are the types of recommendations that don't
2 necessarily go to manager -- or to regulatory
3 management, but more towards land use policy decisions.
4 And we heard some good presentations from Forest
5 Service and Fish and Game staff, a lot of good
6 information on what's happening out there with the
7 habitat.

8

9 And we do have some recommended
10 actions. I'm now up to Page 185, action number 9.

11

12 They should continue to expand Forest
13 Service research and implement a comprehensive program
14 to restore and rehabilitate young growth forests on
15 Unit 2 with the goal towards benefit of deer habitat.
16 These efforts should target areas that would provide
17 the greatest benefit to hunting in the region.

18

19 The subcommittee recommends that U.S.
20 Forest Service, State and private forestry office and
21 land owners work together in this effort.

22

23 We also -- along the same lines, action
24 number 10, is to implement alternative commercial
25 timber harvest methods. These could also greatly
26 benefit deer habitat in the future.

27

28 We also looked at the topic of hunter
29 access. There has been on-going efforts by the Forest
30 Service to evaluate the road network on Prince of Wales
31 Island. And action 11, we ask that in decisions
32 regarding which Forest Service roads should remain for
33 road and off-road vehicles, to consider the importance
34 of road access for deer hunting, particularly where the
35 pressure is high. We also noted that roads sometimes
36 should be closed to road traffic, but left open for
37 foot traffic in some areas.

38

39 A lot of our time in these meetings was
40 talking about enforcement. We had a lot of
41 participation from enforcement personnel. They
42 attended each subcommittee meeting.

43

44 One of the things that came out of our
45 subcommittee was the subcommittee determined that it
46 would be inappropriate to try and micromanage the
47 enforcement in Unit 2. Law enforcement officers must
48 determine how they can most efficiently and effectively
49 do the enforcement on the island.

50

1 We do have a few recommendations
2 regarding enforcement. It should work towards
3 consistency between State and Federal regulations for
4 Unit 2 deer when possible. Should encourage efficient,
5 effective and consistent enforcement of regulations for
6 Unit 2 deer. We need to improve public understanding
7 of the why behind regulations, and why it is to
8 hunters' advantage to comply with regulations.
9

10 We made the recommendation to change
11 the Federal regulation regarding evidence of sex for
12 deer hunters. And this action was acted on by the
13 Board this past session, and the new regulation now
14 puts State and Federal regulations on evidence of sex
15 in line.
16

17 We also talked about spot-lighting of
18 deer. This is always brought up in public testimony.
19 We do have a couple possible recommendations for
20 regulation change along those lines which we may want
21 to talk about later for possible proposals.
22

23 We talked a lot about public
24 involvement and awareness. In all of our public
25 testimony in Ketchikan it became evident that there was
26 a lot of misunderstanding about how ANILCA affects the
27 non-subsistence users, and we need to make more of an
28 effort to try and inform people about the provisions of
29 Title VIII of ANILCA in non-subsistence communities.
30 And there's a number of ways that were suggested on how
31 to go about doing that.
32

33 We talked about coordination in the
34 management. We have some recommendations there.
35

36 And finally we recognize that we may
37 have to have some on-going work by the subcommittee, to
38 try and monitor how the whole effort is going, and
39 we've made a suggestion there to have at least one more
40 follow-up meeting of the subcommittee after this
41 hunting season to try and get together and just see how
42 things are going. It could be face-to-face, it could
43 be a teleconference.
44

45 And one of the other actions we ask is
46 to have an annual pre-season collaborative meeting
47 between agencies, Tribes and any other affected
48 individuals.
49

50 And that pretty much runs you through

1 all of the work and actions that we tried to undertake
2 in those meetings, so thank you for bearing with me.
3 That was -- it did end up being quite a long report.
4 There's a lot of information there, and hopefully it
5 will all be useful. So now maybe.....

6
7 DR. GARZA: Did you mention action 20?

8
9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Excuse me?

10
11 DR. GARZA: Did you get the last
12 action, 20?

13
14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Did I miss something?
15 The last action you say.

16
17 Action number 20, local involvement and
18 employment in data collection and research. Oh, okay.
19 Yeah. One of the things we suggested in all of these
20 efforts is to hire local people when possible to assist
21 with all of these data collection and information
22 efforts that we've suggested here.

23
24 Sorry, I missed that one. The very
25 last action.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 Maybe now we have opportunity to answer
30 any questions you might have.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do you think --
33 or I'm going to ask you for some specific
34 recommendations that -- you know, motions that you want
35 the Council to enact, but before we do that, would you
36 like Mr. Larsen, Mr. Johnson to have an opportunity to
37 comment? But at the end of that, then we'll ask you
38 for specific actions that you request from the Council.
39 I believe it's appropriate to let them comment.

40
41 MR. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
42 and Advisory Council members.

43
44 First of all, I'd like to thank Don. I
45 thought he did an excellent job not only of chairing
46 this subcommittee, but of giving I think a very
47 thorough and -- abbreviated, yet thorough report on
48 what the committee did. And, Don, I commend you for
49 that.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 I also want to thank the committee for
4 -- the RAC for its support of this effort. You know,
5 it's interesting in that these types of efforts that
6 involve a lot of people with a lot of different
7 backgrounds costs money, a fair amount of money and
8 takes a lot of time. And there was certainly a lot of
9 volunteer time that was invested into this effort.

10

11 I guess that said, I can't think of a
12 better way to approach an issue like this than to take
13 it on in the way that this subcommittee recommended and
14 that was carried out through this interagency and
15 multi-group effort.

16

17 As I think back to some of the planning
18 efforts that have gone on around the State, I suspect
19 many of you are familiar with some of those. The
20 Kuskokwim moose, Western Arctic caribou, Kodiak brown
21 bear and Unit 4 brown bear are ones that come
22 immediately to mind. And I think that one of the neat
23 things is that we can now add Unit 2 deer to that list
24 of success stories. Of course, you know, success is in
25 the long term, not in the near term, but I think with
26 the group that was put together to do this, to come up
27 with recommendations, to the extent that we have
28 agreement among the many interests in how we can move
29 forward effectively in managing Unit 2 deer, I'm very
30 optimistic that we are on the right track. And again I
31 think it's because of the support that we've seen at
32 many levels, including here at the RAC.

33

34 The only thing I guess that I assume
35 that, Don, you'll cover in a little more detail is some
36 of the ideas associated with possible modifications to
37 regulations that we might bring forward, and so I won't
38 go into those. But I think the concept of the -- of
39 breaking Unit 2 down into these subareas, the A, B, and
40 C that you saw in the map on one of the pages there in
41 the report, I think that's a very good idea, a very
42 practical approach to alleviating some of the trade-
43 offs in terms of user groups, and also allowing for
44 subsistence priority and allowing for people most in
45 need to ensure that they are able to get the deer that
46 they need. So I think that's a very useful approach,
47 and certainly as one member among many on that group,
48 you know, the State fully supports that concept, and so
49 I suspect, Don, that you'll bring that forward as an
50 idea that can be further explored.

1 But I'll leave that as my comments, and
2 again I thank the Council and Don for all the effort
3 that has been -- and support that's been put forward in
4 making this happen and getting us to where we are at
5 this point.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 Council.

11
12 Greg Killinger who is the other
13 nonvoting agency member was unable to be here. My name
14 is Dave Johnson, I'm the subsistence coordinator,
15 filling in today for Greg Killinger.

16
17 And he expressed similar feelings that
18 Doug just provided, that he was amazed at how the
19 subcommittee was able to be facilitated through a
20 process that came to consensus on a number of very
21 contentious issues, and felt that we came forward with
22 a plan that is kind of a template for where the Forest
23 Service particularly can help direct some of its future
24 management activities in Unit 2.

25
26 I guess I would bring your attention to
27 a couple things that were really kind of key that I
28 think helped people better understand what the purpose
29 was for the planning process. There were a number of
30 press releases, Cal, if you'd send those around. You
31 should have a copy of this press release. Virtually
32 every meeting we had there was a similar press release
33 either before or after or both that Scott Bowlen
34 provided in the Ketchikan paper, and we also had
35 similar information in the Island News. And that was
36 very key to the support that we received from the
37 meetings, or from the people that attended the meetings
38 where we were holding these subcommittee meetings.

39
40 Also, the second thing had to do with
41 the importance of the radio spot that we developed with
42 Boyd Porter and myself prior to the season, giving
43 information to local hunters, both Federally qualified
44 and non-Federally qualified, and I won't get into the
45 details of the harvest reporting process that we did
46 implement, but it took a lot of additional time to
47 develop that. There were other people like Dennis
48 Chester, Melinda Hernandez, and other staff at the
49 Juneau Ranger District that spent a lot of time on
50 Father's Day weekend jut helping to put together these

1 packages to get this information out to the various
2 vendors.

3
4 And so far my feedback that I've
5 received from hunters, both subsistence hunters and
6 non-subsistence hunters, have said that the process
7 seems to be a lot simpler this year, and that they feel
8 like that they understand better about what's being
9 proposed, and why the information is needed.

10
11 So that concludes my comments.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.
14 There's no need for the Council to vote to accept this
15 report. We've received the report from you and it is
16 ours. What I would like to ask is if you are prepared
17 to make motions that the subcommittee is recommending
18 for action by the Council. In other words I know
19 there's at least one specific one that I noticed in
20 there that was a regulatory chance to reduce the area
21 of Federal public land in Unit 2 closed August 1st
22 through 15th.

23
24 So if you're prepared, or if you need a
25 few minutes to bring those forward. There may be the
26 areas A, B and C that you would like the Council to
27 take a position on, because obviously we're not just
28 going to give you carte blanche agreement on everything
29 in here. We've received the report. The report will
30 be forwarded to the Federal Subsistence Board. But
31 what I'd like to do is get action items from you.

32
33 I think I'm going to give you five
34 minutes. We'll grab a quick cup of coffee and we'll
35 come back.

36
37 But before we do that, and then, Mr.
38 Larsen, you can come back, too, for your report, I want
39 to make also my thanks to the subcommittee. Mr.
40 Hernandez was chair of the RAC members. And all of
41 those members of the public. I want to make everyone
42 aware that those members served for free as the RAC
43 members do here. They're not paid for that. And you
44 can look at all the meetings that they held, and just
45 get some idea of what's gone on there and the
46 sacrifices that they made to make this work. And I
47 applaud all of you. The Federal staff, they were
48 getting paid, but I know that's a significant burden on
49 them to do that, as well as the State. And we applaud
50 all of you that participated in this.

1 And we'll take a short break and then
2 come back with recommendations from the subcommittee
3 for action by the Council.

4
5 (Off record)

6
7 (On record)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Call the meeting
10 back to order. Let's go over the process here real
11 quickly. The subcommittee has filed their final report
12 with us, and we'll discuss extending their -- for the
13 meeting later, but on this process, what we'll do is
14 the subcommittee has several recommendations that they
15 were requesting action on from the Council on specific
16 recommendations. Those will be presented by the vice
17 chair, Dr. Garza. She will reference in the book
18 exactly where you can find that recommendation. She
19 will make a motion to adopt, and that motion to adopt
20 does not require a second, because it's coming from the
21 subcommittee, and then we will discuss the merits of
22 the motion.

23
24 So at this time I will turn it over to
25 Dr. Garza.

26
27 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, as we went
28 through the report, it was a marvelous report and a
29 marvelous body of work by the subcommittee. As you had
30 noted from Mr. Hernandez' report, actually some of the
31 work has already been done, which demonstrates I think
32 the value of the work and the response from the
33 agencies.

34
35 However, there are several action items
36 that we should probably respond to as a committee
37 member. The first is on Page 180 and 181 is the map,
38 and then 182 continues that action item 7, management
39 of current condition. It was the recommendation of the
40 subcommittee to in effect open a portion of Prince of
41 Wales Island to non-rural hunters from August 1 instead
42 of August 15th. And this area was worked out by the
43 Unit 2 subcommittee, so on page 181, and this is the
44 longest action item, the rest are quick. So it would
45 be area B and area C would not be closed to non-rural
46 hunters. And if we support this action item, I think
47 we can develop the proposal with Staff by the deadline.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is the motion to
50 accept the.....

1 DR. GARZA: The recommendation of the
2 subcommittee for action.....

3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The
5 recommendation D that's shown on Page 180?

6
7 DR. GARZA: Yes. And continues to 182.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
10 action before the Council at this time is to approve
11 action item 7.D. as shown on page 180 which includes
12 the recommendations under D and it references the map
13 on Page 180. So under discussion, I would like to call
14 on the chair of the subcommittee to add anything that
15 he would like to, and then the Council can bring up.

16
17 Mr. Hernandez.

18
19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman.

21
22 It was pointed out by residents of
23 Ketchikan in reviewing all the existing data that we
24 have on where hunting takes place and by whom, that on
25 that extremely southern portion, which is labeled as B
26 on the map of Prince of Wales Island, there's been over
27 the years very little participation from subsistence
28 hunters, and a higher level of participation from non-
29 subsistence, primarily Ketchikan hunters. None of that
30 portion labeled as B is roaded. It's completely
31 unroaded. The access by Ketchikan hunters is primarily
32 by boat, and they like being able to go there early in
33 the season when the weather's good, and some of them
34 travel in small boats.

35
36 A lot of discussion was on how to
37 delineate that area. There's a very good delineation
38 there between Cholmondeley Sound and the head end of
39 Hetta Inlet is a very clearly defined area there.
40 There's a very narrow portage between Hetta and
41 Cholmondeley. It kind of makes a natural dividing
42 line, made it very convenient to delineate that area.
43 So the subcommittee agreed that it would be justifiable
44 to do away with the closure August 1st to August 15th
45 for that particular area.

46
47 Also the labeled as C, when we
48 instituted that August 1st to 15th closure was also
49 noted that there's very little hunting activity by non-
50 subsistence hunters in area C so that area was not

1 closed from the 1st to the 15th.

2

3 So this proposal would now add that
4 very southern portion of Prince of Wales Island itself
5 to the outside islands labeled as C for areas that
6 would be opened to non-subsistence hunters on August
7 1st until August 15th.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: In effect, we
10 only need area B, is that correct? We don't need a B
11 and C? The whole area encompassed by B and C is the
12 same -- you have same request that we remove the
13 closures?

14

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman, the
16 closure is not in effect as of now in area C, so we
17 don't need to address that. It would only be area B.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Assuming
20 that we accept this, Staff can craft this
21 appropriately, the proposal that reflect what we have
22 to do, the differences between C and B, but in effect
23 they would then become one similar -- there would be no
24 closure in either of those groups.

25

26 So, discussion, Council members. And
27 Staff. Dr. Schroeder.

28

29 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, Dave Johnson
30 has prepared a draft that would reflect the wishes of
31 the subcommittee, and I believe that that would serve
32 as the purpose -- serve the purpose of the Council in
33 this respect. I would be really good if we had someone
34 to -- a Council volunteer to review that draft before
35 it's submitted.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Did you want to
38 present that now?

39

40 MR. JOHNSON: I just handed out the --
41 basically it's a draft of the proposal in the proposal
42 format process that's currently open. Each of you
43 should have been given a copy of that from Melinda here
44 at the break I believe.

45

46 MS. HERNANDEZ: It' sin your blue
47 folder, John.

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: And essentially it
50 reflects in the appropriate format the information

1 contained here from Page 180 through 182.

2

3 DR. SCHROEDER: I believe that's item 7
4 in the blue folder.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Item 7. Mr.
7 Douville.

8

9 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm not sure where we're
10 at, whether we can offer amendments or ask for change,
11 but there is one change I would like to make.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Amendments are
14 in order. This is a motion. This is a motion before
15 the Council at this time.

16

17 MR. DOUVILLE: If I could make an
18 amendment to the.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mike.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: I would like to make an
23 amendment to this map. I would like to remove Suemez
24 Island from C and include it into A.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. For the
27 benefit of the Council, could you show us where that
28 is? Okay. For the benefit of the public, the
29 amendment as I understand it, would include Suemez
30 Island, which is shown in the outer island, it kind of
31 looks like to the southeast. Is that correct, Mike,
32 southeast of Craig?

33

34 MR. DOUVILLE: That's correct.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It would
37 be the island, the larger island to the southeast of
38 Craig, adding that into section A, is that your
39 amendment?

40

41 MR. DOUVILLE: That's correct.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
44 second to that amendment?

45

46 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
49 motion before you at this time is an amendment to add
50 Suemez Island to section A.

1 Discussion. Mr. Douville.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE: Than you, Mr. Chairman.
4 Suemez is used heavily by hunters from Craig. I'm not
5 sure about Hydaburg, Tony could answer that, but I do
6 know a lot of Craig hunters do utilize Suemez Island.
7 And that would be my reasoning for asking for the
8 change. And they use it in the early part, early hunt
9 also.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Further
12 discussion. Mr. Johnson.

13

14 MR. JOHNSON: Just a clarification, Mr.
15 Chairman. Under existing regulations for Unit 2,
16 Suemez does have the requirement for non-Federally
17 qualified to be allowed to hunt there. In other words,
18 the Federal lands in the area marked as C does
19 currently permit non-Federally qualified to hunt on
20 Federal lands, so it would require a change in the
21 existing regulation, rather than just an amendment to
22 this proposal.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I understand
25 that. Does everyone understand that, that we're asking
26 for a closure in that area? And we would hope that
27 you'll craft that appropriately if this amendment
28 should be accepted.

29

30 Is there any other discussion on the
31 amendment to add Suemez Island to what we'll call
32 subdistrict A.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you aware
37 for the question on the amendment. The action before
38 the Council at this time is to amend the motion to add
39 Suemez Island to subdistrict A. All in favor signify
40 by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
45 same sign.

46

47 (No opposing votes)

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is
50 adopted.

1 Is there any further discussion on the
2 motion before the Council to create these three units.
3 Dr. Garza.

4
5 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I would speak
6 in favor of the motion. I think it was a good
7 compromise that U-2 subcommittee came up with, and I
8 think it will meet some of the needs of Ketchikan, and
9 will not -- while having very minimal impact on the
10 rural residents on the island.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any
13 other discussion on the main motion as amended. Mr.
14 Hernandez. Ms. Phillips.

15
16 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.
17 Thank you to the subcommittee for -- the Unit 2
18 subcommittee on deer for your exemplary work on
19 together all the issues and alternatives for deer
20 management on POW.

21
22 I'm curious to know, similar to the
23 motion just passed on Suemez Island, and I recognize
24 the distinguished body of volunteers that were involved
25 in the Unit 2 subcommittee, however, I'm reflecting
26 upon the concerns of Hydaburg and their testimony
27 before us that their deer subsistence needs were not
28 being met, and I am not one to tell POW how to hunt,
29 but I'm looking at the way that we hunt in our areas,
30 and it's -- we have a lot of maritime environment. And
31 I recognize Hydaburg's on the road system, but is there
32 going out in your boat and going -- you know, I don't
33 know what this island is across from Hydaburg, those
34 two islands there, but, you know, it seems like that
35 would be part of Hydaburg's traditional area, and you
36 might want to -- I don't know if it would be
37 appropriate to carve that out and put that into 2 or A
38 or whatever.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just a matter of
41 process, what we're doing here is we're making a
42 recommendation that the Council will generate a
43 proposal to do what we're asking here. That's step 1.
44 The Staff is going to prepare that proposal to capture
45 what we've done. That proposal will be returned to us
46 at the next wildlife time, which is probably when we
47 should debate the merits. I don't know if we want to
48 get into carving this up at this time. It's just to
49 bring this proposal before us, and I would think that
50 the next wildlife cycle would be when we would discuss

1 any amendments, because we'll have a full analysis at
2 that time. Hydaburg should have weighed in, because it
3 will be a public thing.

4
5 That's my opinion.

6
7 Is there others? Dr. Garza and then
8 Mr. Douville.

9
10 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
11 did miss the meeting where this area was carved out;
12 however, the Hydaburg representative was there and at
13 the next meeting he said that it was okay, and so I had
14 to accept his rec -- I know. I know. But he has a
15 strong voice for that community, and if the rest of the
16 community is opposed to it, then they will speak out.
17 But that area is already -- already exists as an area
18 where non-rural residents can hunt, and so that area
19 was not created by this Unit 2 subcommittee. The only
20 real recommendation in here is creating that area B,
21 which is on the non-road system.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mike.

24
25 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 When we're done with this recommendation, then it comes
27 back to -- at our game meeting. We can still add to,
28 modify and so on as all other proposals.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, you're
31 correct. It will come back to us. The only change to
32 it now from the subcommittee's recommendation is we're
33 going to include Suemez Island in that original
34 analysis. That it can be amended further, disapproved.
35 We haven't done anything except saying we want that
36 proposal generated and brought before us.

37
38 Mr. Douville.

39
40 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
41 And to answer some of your concern, Sukkwan Island and
42 Dall Island traditionally are not hunted by non-rural
43 hunters, but the deer stocks there are also very
44 depressed. In my mind, that's probably why it wasn't
45 an issue. There is quite a few deer on Long (ph)
46 Island, however, that's -- almost all of that is
47 private land.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

50

1 MR. ADAMS: Yeah, I think that through
2 the process, you know, getting this in as an amendment,
3 you know, to this proposal, I'm assuming, you know,
4 that it would go out to the Hydaburg people, or other
5 people concerned, you know, so that we would have real
6 good information, you know, when it comes before us at
7 the next wildlife meeting.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's correct.
10 It will be in proposal format, and as we're going to do
11 with the Pelican and Elfin Cove areas, you know, on
12 this proposal, we'll also make sure that all the
13 affected communities receive notice.

14
15 Any other -- Mr. Douville.

16
17 MR. DOUVILLE: You can aim me in the
18 right direction, but there's a couple other concerns
19 that have come up, and I don't know if this is the
20 appropriate time to discuss them. And one would be
21 using the tags in sequential order and having to carry
22 them all when you're hunting has raised the ire of
23 almost every hunter in Unit 2 that I talked to, and
24 they don't grasp the reason that they have to do this.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would say that
27 right now we don't want to add it to this proposal, but
28 it's certainly something we will discuss.

29
30 Are you ready for the vote. Ms.
31 Phillips.

32
33 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
34 Littlefield. I didn't a clarification on process. If
35 we don't include this island or this island which is
36 across from Hydaburg, if we don't include it in
37 amendment, then how can we amend the proposal later on
38 if it hasn't been put out for review? Because the
39 proposal later on will be based on area A, including
40 Suemez, is closed to non-Federally qualified from such
41 and such a date.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder,
44 would you clarify the process, please.

45
46 DR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Phillips, I was
47 thinking much the same thing, and really when you stand
48 back and look at what's going on with Unit 2, it took a
49 long while before some relief was provided to
50 subsistence users on Prince of Wales through closure

1 action. And the subcommittee has -- and the Council
2 have recommended reducing the closure areas to limit
3 impact on Ketchikan. So I think we're in the fine-
4 tuning phase. I'd suggest that rather than spend a
5 whole lot of time right now that you ask Staff to
6 include in the proposal a review of these island areas
7 on the east side. And there are data that would help
8 out there to show who hunts there, and to make sure
9 that that is on the table for our discussion, because I
10 do think that it would be difficult to expand a closed
11 area without proper notification.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

14

15 DR. GARZA: Yeah, I had those same
16 concerns as I was thinking about it, Patricia, and I
17 think what we could also do is ask Staff, Mr. Johnson
18 -- ask Staff, Mr. Johnson.

19

20 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry.

21

22 DR. GARZA: What we will do is ask
23 Staff to contact Hydaburg Cooperative and let them know
24 we are making the amendment for Suemez, and if they
25 wish to make any further amendments, that they can
26 submit a proposal by the deadline so that it is brought
27 up properly and is not snuck in, and people have
28 comment to comment on it, if that's their wish.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: This will be a
31 SERAC generated proposal, and there's nothing that
32 prevents any member of the public or Federal or State
33 Staff or whoever or Hydaburg or any community from
34 submitting another proposal in the wildlife period to
35 address this concern, if it's a concern of them. They
36 certainly have the time, and I would encourage that Mr.
37 Larsen does contact them, and if they have the concern
38 to get it in and we'll get the analysis done before the
39 next meeting.

40

41 Are we ready for the question.

42

43 DR. GARZA: Question.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
46 action before the Council is to recommend a SERAC-
47 generated proposal, and it would be to include the
48 language under action 7.D. on page 180 and 181,
49 including the handout information under number 7 in the
50 blue book, and as amended to include Suemez Island.

1 All those in favor of that please signify by saying
2 aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And those
7 opposed same sign.

8

9 (No opposing votes)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. SERAC
12 will generate this proposal. Staff will create that.
13 What I'd like to do is make sure that at least Mr.
14 Hernandez and myself get to review that and we can
15 share that with the other Council for review, too.
16 Perhaps Dr. Garza and Mr. Adams as officers should all
17 get a copy as well as the subcommittee chair. And make
18 sure that it's reviewed for accuracy to capture what
19 we've decided.

20

21 Mr. Johnson.

22

23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Then for
24 clarification, the draft that you have in front of you,
25 the mock-up that you have in front of you that takes
26 the information directly from here, the only proposed
27 change that the Council took action on was the
28 inclusion of Suemez Island in this new area.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm happy with
31 that. Does everybody understand what -- that the
32 number 7 is going to be pretty much what it looks like
33 when it goes before the proposal stage with the
34 additional of Suemez Island so that we're all on --
35 everybody should know the same thing right now.

36

37 Okay. That's one recommendation. Dr.
38 Garza has three more, and we don't have the rest of the
39 day, but we will try to go through these. And a lot of
40 these are not final action, just remember. We're not
41 taking final action on any of these. We're just
42 proposing additional action.

43

44 Dr. Garza.

45

46 DR. GARZA: Thank you, and I will bring
47 the three other action items before us, but I do want
48 to mention that Dick Stokes did bring some red seaweed
49 and some dry fish that are back there if you need to
50 get up and snack before everybody else hogs it down.

1 The next action item is on Page 187,
2 the very bottom, and continued over to Page 188. It is
3 action item 16 regarding spotlighting.

4
5 And so the intent of it is actually the
6 two bullet points on the top of Page 188, to make
7 Federal regulation consistent with State regulation
8 that prohibits intentionally shining a light on deer
9 from a vehicle; and allow hunting for Unit 2 deer only
10 during the time period from one hour before sunrise to
11 one hour after sunset.

12
13 Mr. Chairman, I would move that we
14 develop a SERAC game proposal that meets these two
15 needs, and work with Staff as well as enforcement to
16 get that proposal before us.

17
18 Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
21 motion before the Council is on the top of Page 188,
22 and this will be subcommittee recommendation motion
23 number 2, which is to take the top two bullets, make
24 Federal regulation consistent with the State
25 regulation.

26
27 And this in my understanding is not
28 Unit 2, this is everywhere, is that correct? Mr.
29 Knauer, can you help us on -- this is a regulatory
30 change. Could you help us.

31
32 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, I will not
33 address the issue relative to one hour before sunset,
34 one hour after -- or, excuse me, one hour before
35 sunrise, one hour sunset, but I will mention that on
36 the intentionally shining a light from -- on a deer
37 from a vehicle, the existing Federal regulations do
38 cover that, that prohibit the taking of game with an
39 artificial light. This adds nothing to the regulations
40 that is not already in place as far as enforcement
41 goes. We did look at the State regulations, and the
42 State, although they have that statement in there, did
43 not add anything additional to the State regulations
44 that were already in place at the time.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Dr.
47 Garza, state -- yeah, just stick with us for a second,
48 please. Dr. Garza.

49
50 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In

1 my recollection of the subcommittee deliberation on
2 this, these ideas came from enforcement in terms of
3 trying to clarify it well enough so that they have
4 enough ammunition to do something. There was
5 substantial debate on this, and this was as close as we
6 could get to something that is an attempt. And so
7 whatever we have that's in our regulation is enough of
8 a gray area that the enforcement people that presented
9 to us, which was not Marty, and so he should speak,
10 felt that this language would be beneficial.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Mr.
13 Larsen, please, any comment on this.

14

15 MR. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 Yeah, I'm not interested in debating this particularly,
17 but I will offer that the State regulations did not
18 have the specific reference that's made here about
19 prohibiting intentionally shining a light from a
20 vehicle. And it specifically is vehicle, like a road
21 vehicle. And that was done after a lot of
22 deliberation. The Board of Game heard a lot of
23 testimony about spotlighting issues, and they at least
24 felt that with enforcement's input, that this was
25 enough of an additional tool that enforcement could use
26 that they went ahead and passed it, and that's why it
27 exists, as I understand it, in our State codified. And
28 so my understanding was again, as Dr. Garza said, that
29 when we had testimony from Ken Pearson, that this in
30 his mind would also be something that would add to his
31 toolbox, and that was the impetus behind this
32 recommendation coming forward.

33

34 So, you know, whether or not it's
35 duplicative, you know, I guess I'm not in a good
36 position to say. But what I can say is that there's
37 been a lot of discussion on the State side before that
38 was implemented there, and so I assume that those kinds
39 of details were considered at that time.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I have a
42 problem with the word intentionally, but I'll let --
43 Mr. Myers, of you could comment on this, please.

44

45 MR. MYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 Marty Myers with Forest Service Law Enforcement.

47

48 Basically Mr. Knauer and I looked at
49 those regulations, and in general terms the use of an
50 artificial light to hunt is unlawful, therefore in

1 general terms that fits. I think if people have a lack
2 of understanding as far as the public goes of how that
3 fits, you know, it doesn't hurt anything to make it
4 more specific, such as the State did as far as use of a
5 light from a vehicle on deer. What that does is
6 specify a particular use, or unlawful use of light, but
7 in general terms if someone were to walk alongside the
8 road using a spotlight, the other regulation would
9 still apply. So in a sense either way would be fine.
10 If the public requires better specificity, then I think
11 that's okay.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Does
14 Staff wish to add anything more. Mr. Knauer. Any
15 further clarification before we go back to Council.

16
17 MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr.
18 Larsen indicated that he felt that if they just shined
19 the light on a deer from a vehicle, that they're
20 illegal, but you have to read the entire regulation
21 that says it's a prohibition to take an animal using --
22 intentionally shining a light on a deer from a vehicle
23 in Units 1 to 5. It doesn't -- in the construction of
24 the regulation, the way the State has it, the taking or
25 attempting to take is the violation, not just shining a
26 light on a deer.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Final comments.
29 Mr. Larsen.

30
31 MR. LARSEN: Yeah, I really don't want
32 to debate this, because I'm not in a good position to
33 do so, but I do recall in one waterfowl clinic, we had
34 enforcement there, and they said that under the
35 definition of take, it includes even the pursuit of,
36 so, you know, it seems to me that if that's the case,
37 there's some innuendoes here that again I have to
38 reference back to all the discussion and work that was
39 done to get it in there originally. And, you know, I'm
40 in no position to speak effectively to the pros and
41 cons, but I think that those were considered, and
42 therefore it seems to me that if our intent is to try
43 to coordinate regulations, that putting this in there
44 has some applicability and makes some sense.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Mr.
47 Hernandez.

48
49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
50 Chairman.

1 I think it's kind of important to point
2 out that what these two suggested regulations are is a
3 best attempt from the subcommittee to deal with a very
4 strong outcry from public testimony to do something in
5 regards to spotlighting. We could have spent a lot of
6 time in the subcommittee trying to come up with
7 alternative means to deal with it. This was the best
8 suggestions we had.

9
10 The intent of the subcommittee was for
11 these two suggestions to be put out as proposals, gives
12 it an opportunity to get a lot more analysis and public
13 comment, and hopefully through that process we will be
14 able to maybe craft some kind of a regulations which
15 will satisfy the concerns of the people who have been
16 testifying before us. So that's really what we're
17 trying to do is just get this level of analysis and
18 public comment that's really necessary to deal with
19 this. And these are just some suggestions to get us
20 started along that path I guess.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We could have
23 generated a lot of discussion by making it apply only
24 to non-rural people.

25
26 Mr. Kookesh.

27
28 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. Mine was
29 just a question asking this request is for use of a
30 vehicle, and I'm assuming already that there is one for
31 spotlighting from a boat that pertains to Federal
32 lands, is that correct? The proposal is only for -- it
33 sounds to me like you're only worried about the road
34 system in Unit 2, that you're not -- but there are
35 other lands involved, and I was wondering if shooting
36 -- if spotlighting from a boat is also in there.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Let's --
39 I'm going to go with -- even though I'm opposed to
40 this, I'm going to go with what Mr. Hernandez just
41 said. We're going to generate debate on this, and we
42 can either throw -- we can accept or throw it out next
43 time. Let's not debate all the issues right now. I
44 don't like this either. I think number 2's adequate
45 for doing what you say, but let's just debate that
46 later. I don't have any problem putting this on the
47 floor. We'll discuss it at the appropriate time in the
48 wildlife meeting. All the comments will come in.
49 We'll hear everybody's side of the story, whether to
50 apply it, and I -- my interpretation of this is making

1 that regulation, you can't just have that on Unit 2,
2 that has to be areawide that you can't shine a light.
3 Is that your interpretation of how this regulation
4 change will come before us.

5
6 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Chairman, my
7 understanding was that this would apply to Unit 2, so I
8 was not aware that this would be regionwide. And if it
9 was proposed regionwide, I think then certainly when --
10 if that is the way the proposal is crafted, then there
11 will be input that will come in from the State as well
12 as others, as you said, that will, you know, weigh the
13 pros and cons associated with that.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay The reason
16 I say it's regionwide is we have it on the law already,
17 you can't use an artificial light to take deer and all
18 that other stuff, but now you're saying, in addition,
19 on Unit 2, you can't intentionally shine one. It
20 doesn't make any sense. It should be regionwide.

21
22 Is there.....

23
24 DR. SCHROEDER: (indiscernible,
25 microphone not turned on) statewide.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's in the
28 book. Let's go. Mr. Adams.

29
30 MR. ADAMS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman,
31 but I don't think Mr. Kookesh's question was answered.
32 You know, does this include shooting vessel -- I mean,
33 shooting deer from a boat, you know, and shining lights
34 on it as well. If so, then I think it needs to be
35 addressed and maybe we need to amend it to address
36 that.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If Mr. Kookesh
39 would like to amend that to include a boat, that's
40 acceptable at this time. And then if you would answer
41 the question, please.

42
43 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Chairman. There are a
44 couple of other regulations, there's regulations
45 concerning shooting from boats. As Mr. Knauer pointed
46 out, there are regulations under State regulations, I
47 can't speak to the Federal ones, perhaps Mr. Myers can,
48 about spotlighting, you know, illuminating from a boat.

49
50 But this particular language as you see

1 in the first bullet that's presented in the report was
2 put forward specifically for land vehicles as a result
3 of sort of additional level, because of the concerns
4 that have come up time and time again associated with
5 road-based spotlighting. So it was put in as an
6 additional thing. It's not that it may or may not
7 occur from the water, it's just that that's really --
8 the concern was identified and it was limited to that,
9 because that was where the big concern was.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. If you
12 want to make an amendment, I -- to me it was clear.
13 You can't change that regulation just for Unit 2, and
14 that's not what that bullet says. The page before it
15 says changes to Federal and State regulations. It says
16 nothing about Unit 2. So I would hope that you would
17 include in the analysis all of that. Everywhere. Mr.
18 Larson.

19

20 MR. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21

22 And again, the first bullet is already
23 -- to clarify what I said earlier, is already in State
24 regulation regionwide. So that would not -- it would
25 not affect anything on the State side. The other one,
26 though, the daylight hours, if that was again proposed
27 regionwide, which is -- as you're assuming it is going
28 to be proposed that way, then there would be feedback.
29 Because we did, frankly, hear from State enforcement
30 officers about that particular bullet, and they had
31 some issues with it that weren't at least for me well
32 articulated or identified to where I could fully
33 understand them. But I would anticipate that if that
34 proposal goes forward, that there would be input that
35 would explain what the concerns might be associated
36 with that.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
39 amendments, additions, discussion. Mr. Douville and
40 then Dr. Garza.

41

42 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

43

44 There was some issue, I remember a
45 discussion on what you just said, because in some
46 places in the State it doesn't get dark, the sun
47 doesn't go down, so like an hour before, an hour after,
48 whatever this is, doesn't -- you know, it -- I don't
49 like it for one. If you can see it without the light,
50 you should be able to take it in my opinion.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.
2
3 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I support
4 your position. I mean, let's just take it forward. If
5 it needs to be fleshed out more, it will be. It will
6 go through the public review process. It will go
7 through State and Federal scrutiny, and if we're lucky,
8 maybe we'll come out with something that's a little
9 better.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Stokes.
12
13 MR. STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14
15 It seems to me that that if you just
16 say no spotlighting, regardless of where it's from,
17 would cover it. I think it's covered.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All right. Are
20 we ready to move on this? It's just a recommendation.
21 I mean, we're not supposed to be taking final action or
22 debating this, and we've got a lot of stuff to do,
23 folks. I know I don't want to -- if you want to kill
24 this or amend it, let's do it and move on.
25
26 Mr. Kookesh.
27
28 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman, a little
29 while ago we allowed the inclusion of an island.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's in order
32 now to amend it anyway you want.
33
34 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: But let's not
37 discuss it to death. Let's amend it like Mr. Douville,
38 and we'd then discuss the amendment. So if you have an
39 amendment, let's amend it.
40
41 MR. KOOKESH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
42 really like what Mr. Stokes just -- his comment, if we
43 can amend it in that regard, that was the perfect.....
44
45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If you wish to
46 make an amendment, now's the time.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready

1 for the question.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: What is the question?

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
6 before you is on the top of Page 188, subcommittee
7 recommendation number 2 is to make the appropriate
8 action to accomplish bullets number 1 and 2. In other
9 words, Staff is going to craft the regulation change to
10 be presented to us at the next meeting, at which time
11 we will debate all the merits, where it's supposed to
12 be, who it's applied to and all that. That's the
13 motion before us at this time.

14

15 Are you ready for the question. Okay.
16 The question before the Council at this time is to
17 adopt subcommittee recommendation number 2, which is to
18 adopt the bullets at the top of Page 188, the two
19 bullets making Federal regulation consistent, allowing
20 the hunting in Unit 2 to sunset. In other words, Staff
21 will craft the appropriate language for the next
22 meeting. All those in favor please signify by saying
23 aye.

24

25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
28 same sign.

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: Aye.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Aye. Okay. The
33 motion is adopted. So we will prepare that for the
34 next meeting.

35

36 Dr. Garza. Just a second, Dr. Garza.

37

38 These are only recommendations. So I'm
39 not trying to -- I hate to seem like I'm trying to
40 stifle debate on these, but we don't need to be
41 debating this issues at this time. The proper time to
42 debate these issues is at the next meeting. All we're
43 doing is being asked by the subcommittee to forward
44 these recommendations. If you want to amend them, I'm
45 all in favor of that, because I don't have -- we could
46 have made that spotlighting, I don't have any problem
47 with that, but let's not debate whether the
48 spotlighting is okay Let's just put it on there, amend
49 it, and we'll just say whether that's good or bad, or
50 if there's any amendment to your next one. We've got a

1 full schedule yet.

2

3 Dr. Garza.

4

5 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. The next two
6 do not require developing proposals, so they should be
7 fairly quick.

8

9 At the bottom of Page 188, which we
10 were just at, action item 17 for public outreach. The
11 recommendation is that we as a Council support
12 additional funds and directed Staff effort to
13 accomplish this action.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just
16 clarification. Didn't we do this at the last meeting?

17

18 DR. GARZA: I don't think that the
19 effort that's incurred so far is adequate for
20 Ketchikan.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So your
23 action -- your request would be specifically to carry
24 out action item 17?

25

26 DR. GARZA: Yes.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
29 motion before the Council is to encourage completion by
30 the appropriate agencies of action item 17. This is
31 number 3. Discussion.

32

33 DR. GARZA: And the intent is to
34 provide adequate funding and staff time so that they
35 understand that it's part of their marching orders.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is that clear?
38 Is there any further discussion.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready
43 for the question on subcommittee recommendation number
44 3.

45

46 MR. KITKA: Question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Subcommittee
49 recommendation number 3 is before the Council at this
50 time. It's to endorse the action item 17, public

1 outreach as well as the status and encourage the Staff
2 to do whatever is possible to accomplish that. All
3 those in favor please signify by saying aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
8 same sign.

9
10 (No opposing votes)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion --
13 the recommendation is adopted.

14
15 Dr. Garza, number 4.

16
17 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Just flip
18 one page over, Page 190, action item 19. The annual
19 preseason collaborative meeting with agencies, Tribes
20 and others. I would move that we recommend the
21 creation of such a preseason collaborative meeting, and
22 direct Staff to develop such a process.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
25 motion before the Council is to endorse action number
26 17, subcommittee recommendation number 4, shown on Page
27 190.

28
29 Discussion. Are you ready for the
30 question.

31
32 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

35
36 MR. ADAMS: I think this is a no-
37 brainer, so I'm going to call for the question. Thank
38 you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You're ready for
41 the question. Apparently so. Okay. Good.

42
43 Subcommittee recommendation number 4 is
44 before the Council at this time, which is to endorse
45 action item 19 as shown on Page 190. All in favor
46 please signify by saying aye.

47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed

1 same sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is
6 adopted. Are there any further.....

7

8 DR. GARZA: And the motion was to
9 direct Staff.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The Staff will
12 be -- has been directed. Are there any further
13 recommendations from the subcommittee. Dr. Schroeder.

14

15 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the
16 subcommittee included its intention and desire to meet
17 prior to our winter meeting, and it would be if the
18 Council was on record supporting that. The objectives
19 are shown in action item 18 on Page 190.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right. This is
22 something also requires Council action. The
23 subcommittee basically ceases to exist upon publish of
24 its final report, and we've received it, so we need to
25 recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board that the
26 subcommittee be allowed to meet in February 2006. So a
27 motion is in order to adopt action item 18.

28

29 Mr. Hernandez.

30

31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chairman. I move that we adopt action 18 which would
33 provide some funding for the subcommittee to have one
34 meeting prior to our winter meeting to review how this
35 past hunting season has progressed.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. This is a
38 subcommittee recommendation, does not require a second.
39 The motion before the body is to accept action item 18
40 on Page 190, subcommittee recommendation number 5.

41

42 Is there any discussion. Dr. Garza.

43

44 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I guess the
45 concern I have there is, one, is February. We did
46 recommend that as part of our next Council meeting.
47 However, I'm not sure if we would have tags and data
48 and all that sort of stuff back from hunters so that we
49 could adequately say this is how the season went. And
50 so I would suggest we leave the date open, but just

1 support the final meeting.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. You move
4 to strike the word February, so it says in 2006 before
5 the meeting?

6

7 DR. GARZA: The February, yeah.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. There's
10 an amendment to strike February. Is there a second?

11

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any discussion
15 on this. We already know the reason why. Okay. The
16 amendment before you is to strike the word February,
17 action item 18. All those in favor please signify by
18 saying aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed,
23 same sign.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion
28 before you as amended is to adopt action item 17
29 requiring a meeting of the subcommittee in 2006 before
30 our meeting.

31

32 Any further discussion. Dr. Garza.

33

34 DR. GARZA: Just two corrections. It's
35 action item 18, and we would also strike prior to the
36 February Federal Regional Advisory Council. So the
37 data may not be available until after it.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is everybody
40 clear on that. Anybody have any objection to what
41 we're doing here. Dr. Schroeder.

42

43 DR. SCHROEDER: I'd just like a
44 clarification for Staff. Dr. Garza, are you suggesting
45 that the subcommittee does not meet at that time, or
46 are you leaving that open to be decided, and if so, how
47 do we decide whether to schedule that meeting, because
48 that's something that really -- the scheduling
49 arrangements need to take place basically just after
50 this meeting if we're going to do that.

1 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, if you read
2 the purpose of the meeting would be to update the
3 subcommittee on the results of the harvest report
4 system and other data information collection efforts,
5 any enforcement issues. so I guess when that kind of
6 data is available is when we would meet. and so the
7 February, I mean it's just -- I mean, we've gotten data
8 like nine months later, and so we may get together in
9 February and have everybody say, well, we don't really
10 have anything to look at, and that's my only concern.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are we ready for
13 this. I'll just give you my thoughts. I won't vote
14 unless there's a tie, but I would against this.
15 There's no need to it. This information could be
16 presented to the Council, and the Council can then take
17 action. I don't see any need to have another
18 recommendation come out of this at this time.

19
20 Are you reading for action item 18.
21 Okay. The motion before the Council is subcommittee
22 number 5, which is to adopt action item 18 with the
23 amendment to strike the requirement for February. All
24 in favor please signify by saying aye.

25
26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
29 same sign.

30
31 (No opposing votes)

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think -- I
34 don't know what happened there. I didn't hear much
35 happening. So all those in favor of action item 18
36 please raise your right hand, and, Secretary, count the
37 numbers.

38
39 IN UNISON: (Raise hands)

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Cool. All those
42 opposed, same sign.

43
44 (No opposing votes)

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is
47 adopted. Next time say aye a little louder. I only
48 heard one aye, I'm sorry. There were two ayes? Okay.

49
50

1 We'll do that. Staff hopefully will
2 have all this stuff for us. And concurrent with that,
3 we need to ask the Federal Board to continue that,
4 because like I said, a subcommittee dissolves upon
5 submission of its final report, so this is something
6 that the Federal Board needs to concur into.

7
8 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman. Council.
9 One other action that relates to both correspondence
10 from the Council to the Forest Supervisor from the
11 previous meeting, and also pertains to action item
12 number 9, rehabilitation of young growth forests. I
13 don't know if the Council wants to take action on that
14 or not. But I would like to provide and read into the
15 record if I may a letter from Forrest Cole that is a
16 follow up and part of the Unit 2 subcommittee process.
17 This is dated October the 7th.

18
19 Dear Chairman Littlefield, please
20 convey my gratitude to the rest of the Southeast
21 Regional Advisory Council for the Council's June 1,
22 2005 letter expressing appreciation to me and my staff
23 for our involvement in resolving the mandatory deer
24 harvest report issue for Unit 2. I also want to thank
25 you and the SERAC for coming forth with a Cooperative
26 Deer Management Plan for GMU 2.

27
28 SERAC's recommendation for setting a
29 goal of restoring and rehabilitating clear cut areas
30 for increased biological productivity in GMU 2 is a
31 goal I share and is quite consistent with the Tongass
32 Land Management Plan.

33
34 TLMP calls for treating 8,000 acres of
35 wildlife habitat annually and an additional 2,130 acres
36 of thinning for timber intensification forest-wide. Of
37 the 205,000 acres of young growth in GMU 2,
38 approximately 23,000 acres have been pre-commercially
39 thinned. There are 44,000 acres that are too young to
40 pre-commercially thin, and 96,000 acres that are too
41 old. At present, the remaining 42,000 acres are
42 eligible for pre-commercial thinning. For fiscal years
43 2003 through 2005, an average of 2,135 of pre-
44 commercial thinning in GMU 2 has been accomplished per
45 year.

46
47 I have already provided direction to my
48 Staff to begin and/or continue several young growth
49 activities:

50

1 One, Tongass-wide young growth studies.
2 Four large scale modules testing alder planting,
3 pruning, girdling and thinning.

4
5 Secondly, Heceta Island young growth thinning.
6 Small sawlog thinning on 188 acres.

7
8 Young growth wood properties study.
9 Determining recovery, log value and strength of young
10 growth.

11
12 Mybeso experimental forest management
13 plan. The objective of the plan is o develop the
14 strategy and projects for managing the experimental
15 forest.

16
17 Stand exams of 3,000 acres of small
18 sawlog size young growth. Objective, to determine
19 treatment needs and opportunities.

20
21 And winter harbor thinning. This is a
22 wildlife thin with a small sawlog byproduct.

23
24 I support the development of a Young
25 Growth Management Plan for GMU 2 and have directed my
26 staff to facilitate development of a plan by the end of
27 2006. There are already several planned and ongoing
28 activities that will help this become a reality. For
29 example, data entry and analysis of stand inventories
30 for approximately 30,000 acres previously harvested in
31 GMU 2 are expected to be complete by late January of
32 2006. This information will allow us to target
33 substantial treatment of second growth stands for deer
34 habitat improvement in critical subsistence use areas
35 in the very near future.

36
37 Because the SERAC and the Tongass
38 National Forest have a mutual interest in improving
39 deer habitat in GMU 2 and because we have been so
40 pleased working together with the GMU 2 SERAC deer
41 subcommittee, I would be pleased if we can work very
42 closely together in developing the GMU 2 Young Growth
43 Management Plan. Sincerely, Forrest Cole, forest
44 supervisor.

45
46 And I guess I would just emphasize, Mr.
47 Chairman, that the intent of the forest supervisor here
48 is to have a similar process with participation from
49 the Southeast Regional Advisory Council.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank
2 you. Is there any discussion or questions for Mr.
3 Johnson on Mr. Cole's report.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We appreciate
8 that. Let's move along here. Is there anything else
9 from the subcommittee.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Johnson, did
14 you have anything else, because I'm going to let Mr.
15 Larsen go ahead and he has some additional comments on
16 wildlife conservation.

17
18 Go ahead.

19
20 MR. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
21 and thank you for the opportunity to just offer just a
22 few comments about what the Division of Wildlife
23 Conservation is involved in. I'm going to make this
24 quick. I know you've got a big agenda and a lot to get
25 done in one day, so I'm just going to bullet these
26 things, and if you have questions, I'm happy to answer
27 those or try to, and if not here, I'm happy to talk
28 with people during breaks to further elaborate on any
29 of the details that I bring up.

30
31 One of the first things that I'd like
32 to comment on is our involvement with an interagency
33 monitoring evaluation group, which is hosted primarily
34 by the Forest Service. Recently we went to Yakutat.
35 I'd like to thank Mr. Adams for hosting that and being
36 a real kind and generous host to us as we visited
37 Yakutat where we had an opportunity to discuss several
38 items, including moose management in the Yakutat area.
39 And several things are going on with that in a
40 cooperative effort between Fish and Game and the Forest
41 Service, and again I'd be happy to elaborate on those
42 if you have questions, or during breaks.

43
44 We're working with the Forest Service
45 on review -- soon we'll be working with them on the
46 review of the conservation strategy. This certainly
47 has implications for Unit 2 deer as well as other
48 wildlife across the region. Old growth reserves will
49 be a part of that, as well as Mr. Johnson read into the
50 record the second growth management concepts

1 In terms of research that the Division
2 of Wildlife Conservation is currently involved in, we
3 have brown bear research ongoing on the mainland in the
4 Bradfield Canal and Unuk River areas. This involves
5 GPS radio collaring, some hair snaring to get some DNA
6 information and distribution of brown bears and
7 population estimates of brown bears in areas that
8 really we don't have very good information at this
9 point.

10
11 We've got moose efforts going on in
12 Gustavus associated with a very high level of moose and
13 a lot of indications that there's certainly limited
14 habitat there, and trying to manage that so that we
15 have maximum use by public members as well as
16 conservation of that resource. So we've got research
17 looking into browse in that area as well as the health
18 and condition of the moose that are there.

19
20 I mentioned that we have moose work in
21 Yakutat, and that mostly is looking at moose and
22 relationships with ORV use in the Yakutat Forelands, as
23 well as an opportunity to get a sightability index
24 where we can then during moose surveys, we can, you
25 know, get a fairly good sense for what proportion of
26 the moose were actually seen, and use that as we
27 develop our population estimates, and then, of course
28 our regulatory actions in association with those.

29
30 We have recently become involved in
31 some mountain goat research, and that's up in the
32 Kensington Mine area and the Juneau access of Lynn
33 Canal. And that's in conjunction with the mining
34 efforts, and implications and impacts from that effort,
35 as well as the proposed Juneau road system that would
36 go out of Juneau up to Skagway, or at least most of the
37 way. And we've currently radio collared 15 goats. We
38 will be working on that throughout the rest of this
39 fall to the extent we have weather, and then again next
40 year.

41
42 We will also -- we expect to have some
43 funding from DOT to look at moose and brown bears in
44 the Berners Bay area, again associated with the road
45 access that's being proposed.

46
47 The Unit 2 work as we've already heard
48 a lot about, we continue to be involved in that. Of
49 course, the joint harvest reporting we're involved
50 with, and we'll be working with the Forest Service to

1 collect those harvest data and reporting back to the
2 Council at the next meeting with how that went and what
3 kind of information we able actually to get through
4 that effort.

5
6 We also -- and Mr. Chester I believe
7 will be talking about some of the WIS projects that
8 have been or are proposed to be funded through the
9 Forest Service, and one of those will deal with
10 population estimation of deer in Unit 2, so that has
11 been moved forward, and he'll elaborate on that I
12 suspect. But we -- as I understand it, that will be an
13 effort that will be cooperative between Forest Service,
14 Fish and Game and the University of Alaska in
15 Fairbanks. So I think that we can get some good
16 information that will address again one of those
17 triangular pieces that Mr. Hernandez identified in the
18 report.

19
20 We have a small grouse research effort
21 being conducted in the region, and it's primarily to
22 get a sense for the distribution of spruce grouse,
23 which are fairly limited in Southeast as most I think
24 everybody knows, but also to get a sense for other
25 grouse and ptarmigan species across the region. A very
26 poorly understood group of bird, and yet highly sought
27 after in many parts of the region, and so to get some
28 information about their distribution and relatedness we
29 think is fairly important, and we've initiated that.

30
31 The only other thing I would mention is
32 that in Sitka we recently radio collared a local brown
33 bear, and Mr. Littlefield I suspect is familiar with
34 this, and it's being done -- it's a GPS collar that
35 Phil Mooney captured and put a collar on, and he'll be
36 working with the school system there in Sitka to plot
37 the locations of where this bear goes and get a little
38 information and make it into an educational learning
39 opportunity.

40
41 And that said, you know, our division
42 continues to put a fairly high amount of effort into
43 educational efforts. We have a full-time educational
44 specialist that works with us, and has assisted with
45 efforts down on Prince of Wales with deer in
46 association with an expansion of the Unit 2 deer work,
47 try to get information out, and other efforts across
48 the region, and including the Mendenhall wetlands up
49 near Juneau.

50

1 Beyond that, we continue to do our
2 normal survey and inventory work where we survey
3 populations, deer through our ongoing pellet group work
4 with the Forest Service, and goats is another example
5 with aerial surveys.

6
7 And I guess at this point, the only
8 result that I'm able to report at this time is that
9 mountain goat populations appear to be stable or
10 increasing, and relatively high numbers counted on
11 Baranof Island this fall, I believe. And I can't
12 remember the exact number, but it was pushing about 12
13 to 1500 goats. And I think everybody here is aware
14 that those were goats that were introduced to Baranof
15 several years ago. So they've done extremely well, and
16 continue to provide an opportunity for subsistence, as
17 well as other users to harvest goats.

18
19 Deer populations across the region
20 based on our April pellet group work, not unlike past
21 years, we have some areas that are up somewhat from
22 what they were in the past, and others that are down
23 somewhat, and then others that are relatively stable.
24 But all across the region, all things considered, deer
25 populations at this time appear to be in good shape,
26 and I think that's just primarily a reflection of the
27 relatively mild winters that we've had.

28
29 Mr. Chairman, that's all I wanted to
30 give you. It's probably more than you needed, but I
31 just wanted to give you that as a sense for what the
32 Division's working on, and if you have any questions,
33 I'd be happy to try and answer those, or as I said,
34 I'll be around for the rest of the day.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank
37 you. Are there any questions from the Council on ADF&G
38 wildlife conservation activity.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank
43 you. You're right, we will get Mr. Chester here
44 shortly to discuss those WIS.

45
46 At this time we're going to -- Dr.
47 Schroeder has an announcement, and then after that I'd
48 like to know if Ms. Ramsey wishes to claim her time and
49 testify. We'll have testimony by Ms. Ramsey.

50

1 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman.
2 Yesterday we talked about going to take a short field
3 trip over lunch to visit Shakes' Island. And Mr.
4 Stokes, I think you have some transport worked out for
5 us? So we'll be attempting to leave at about -- at
6 noon, and we'll have two hours for that.

7
8 For those of you who want some lunch,
9 about the only way to fit lunch in and a field trip is
10 to get a sandwich carry-out from the place across the
11 street. Melinda Hernandez has a sign-up for that. We
12 could get the Bob's, again no relation, IGA to make
13 sandwiches up for us, and just pick them up and pay for
14 them. So there's a list going around, please put your
15 name and what you want, and we'll get that done. And
16 that will also serve as a list of how many people want
17 to go on the field trip.

18
19 Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: He didn't say we
22 couldn't go on the field trip, so we're -- we've still
23 got a little bit of work to do.

24
25 Anyway, at this time Ms. Ramsey, Sue
26 Ramsey, would like to testify before the Council on
27 loss of salmon, and we'll allow her to do that at this
28 time.

29
30 And when we're done with that, we'll
31 take a short break. Mr. McBride will get his material
32 ready for presentation on item 11.

33
34 Ms. Ramsey.

35
36 MS. RAMSEY: Greetings to the Council.
37 And I also wanted to say some of you may know my
38 brother, John Feller, and he wanted to say his
39 greetings to you also, because he lives in Salem,
40 Oregon now.

41
42 I started college almost 30 years ago
43 in the State of Washington, and at that time the native
44 people there were fighting bitterly for their fishing
45 rights. Many lost their lives. And I was -- my son
46 lives in Seattle now, and he was telling me that
47 there's no salmon left down there, and that, you know,
48 if I had my fish processing license, I'd be able to
49 make a lot of money down there.

50

1 And so I'm -- my concern is now did
2 that happen, and they're not that far away from us.
3 And when I was going to college there, they talked a
4 lot about the dams having an affect on the salmon
5 return, and I think I heard a little bit about
6 mismanagement. But I just want to make sure that
7 doesn't happen here in Alaska, because we're -- our
8 spiritual interconnection with the land has a lot to do
9 with our salmon and our well being.

10
11 So that's all I wanted to say today.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any Council have
14 any comments or questions. Mr. Adams.

15
16 MR. ADAMS: Sue, is your sister, Lou,
17 going to come here today and -- I know she had a
18 concern about the elk. And if so, maybe you can
19 address that a little bit.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 MS. RAMSEY: My sister, Louellen Knapp,
24 her and her husband have a boat so they do a lot of
25 subsistence. And she had a comment about the -- when
26 the crab fisher -- the commercial crab fishery goes on
27 here in the summer, so she says they make sure they get
28 their crab before June 15th, because that's when the
29 commercial fishermen come, and the commercial fishermen
30 don't have any respect for subsistence, so they like
31 just take the whole crab pot that they found that
32 belong to subsistence fishermen.

33
34 And her other question was -- and she
35 actually hopes it isn't a stupid question, but I guess
36 out on Etolin Island there's elk, and she was wondering
37 if it was possible to get elk with a subsistence
38 permit, because there's a lot of elk out there.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Can you address
41 that, Dr. Schroeder, whether we can subsistence hunt
42 elk on Etolin Island.

43
44 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. to my
45 knowledge we don't have an elk regulation in -- excuse
46 me, we don't have a Federal subsistence regulation
47 covering elk on Etolin Island. This would be something
48 that would require Council action. I haven't thought
49 about this much, but that's my first response.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What you could
2 do is submit a proposal on it I guess to create that if
3 you were doing that, and Mr. Dave Johnson, of course,
4 helps on the wildlife proposals in Southeast and he
5 could help you craft that. It might be good to
6 generate that discussion. I guess we don't have one
7 right now is what Dr. Schroeder's saying, but maybe we
8 should. Dr. Schroeder.

9
10 DR. SCHROEDER: Just, you know, elk are
11 an introduced species in Southeast Alaska. However, in
12 Alaska, as everyone knows, the species that are present
13 change. Moose move into an area or move out. Caribou
14 are present in areas where they haven't been found for
15 50 or 75 years. And the Federal Subsistence Board
16 regularly deals with those questions of establishing
17 Federal subsistence hunts on species that are now
18 present. Also the Federal Subsistence Board has worked
19 through these issues with musk oxen, which were
20 reintroduced in areas in northern Alaska where they had
21 died out perhaps 150 or 200 years ago. So it's
22 something that you could pursue if you're interested.

23
24 MS. RAMSEY: Okay.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

27
28 MR. ADAMS: Okay. Now that you have
29 some guidelines on how to go about this, I would
30 strongly suggest that when you do have a proposal, you
31 know, prepared that you take it through the public
32 comment process, and maybe even have, you know, one of
33 the organizations here in the community, you know, put
34 their stamp of approval on it. That way we will know
35 when this proposal comes before us that it
36 has gone through public process and that you're getting
37 community support from it, so keep that in mind when
38 you do this.

39
40 Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just a second.
43 Mr. Stokes. Just stick with us a minute.

44
45 MR. STOKES: Thank you. Other than
46 designing areas, like if you wanted to hunt elk on
47 Wrangell Island, you can either take a cow or a bull,
48 and you don't have to have any prior permits or
49 anything. So you're able to hunt.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council
2 comments. Ms. Phillips.

3
4 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Elk were
5 reintroduced into Kodiak, and they have a C&T use
6 determination for elk there. That's Unit 8.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's correct.
9 As Dr. Schroeder and Ms Phillips indicate, introduced
10 species, they're fair game, too, I'll put it that way.
11 No pun intended. We have goats on Unit 4 which are
12 C&T. We have those marten which have -- if Doug Larsen
13 wants to know what happened to all the grouse, I have
14 my idea of what happened to them. We have an
15 introduced species of marten that likes to eat grouse.
16 Red squirrels. All kinds of goofy things. Pigeons.
17 They're not indigenous to this country. So if you want
18 a -- if you would like an opportunity for a Federal
19 property, I would encourage you to go ahead and submit
20 that proposal, and Mr. Johnson can help you do that.
21 And thanks for your testimony, I appreciate it.

22
23 Okay. We're going to take a short
24 break. We're really running into time. I don't want
25 Dr. Schroeder to tell us we can't go at noon. So let's
26 take a short break. We'll get prepared for Mr. McBride
27 to come up and do the Fisheries Resource Monitoring.
28 We're also going to move the Forest Service, 16.B. up
29 to immediately follow that and concurrent with it. A
30 short break.

31
32 (Off record)

33
34 (On record)

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza as the
37 chair.

38
39 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So we will have
40 Mr. McBride talk with us about the Fisheries Research
41 Monitoring Program. In our booklet it follows the Unit
42 2 Deer Management final report, so it starts on Page
43 191, if you want to get to that page. I think all the
44 Council members that are in the room are seated, so
45 we'll get started.

46
47 MR. McBRIDE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman.
48 Members of the Council. My name is Doug McBride. I'm
49 with the Office of Subsistence Management, Fisheries
50 Information Services, and I'm here to talk to you and

1 discuss with you issues related to the Fisheries
2 Resource Monitoring Program, which is item 11 in your
3 agenda.

4
5 It's actually -- there's several pieces
6 to this, so I just want to very briefly go through the
7 three pieces that we're going to be discussing today.

8
9 First what I'll be doing is talking to
10 you about the 2006 monitoring plan. These are new
11 projects, new project proposals. There's been a lot of
12 work that's gone into preparing those proposals.
13 That's in your book, that's what Dr. Garza referred to
14 that starts on Page 191. And I'll be discussing with
15 you here in a minute.

16
17 But in addition to that, I think most
18 of you are aware that there are some questions about
19 the level of funding that's available, so as part of
20 that discussion, Mr. Steve Kessler with the Forest
21 Service will be discussing with you about how much
22 funding is actually available, and where that leaves us
23 for 2006.

24
25 Then the second piece of the
26 presentation will have to do with strategic planning.
27 You've all received a packet, it's packet number 5 on
28 the back table. And this has to do with strategic
29 planning for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program,
30 but in addition there's also a strategic planning
31 effort going on for the wildlife program, which you
32 talked about earlier, the Wildlife Information
33 Services, and Mr. Dennis Chester with the Forest
34 Service, he'll be discussing that basically at the same
35 time.

36
37 And then the third piece has to do with
38 some project reports. These are reports from
39 cooperators about existing fisheries projects and the
40 cooperators for the Prince of Wales steelhead project,
41 they're here and prepared to make a short presentation
42 about the first year of results from that project. And
43 in addition Ben VanAlen with the Forest Service has a
44 very brief update about the results of the escapement
45 work that's been done the sockeye projects around the
46 region.

47
48 So with that introduction, I'll get
49 started here, because I know time's of the essence.
50

1 If you'll refer in your book to the
2 information that starts on Page 192, this is the 2006
3 draft Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. And that
4 report starts with an introduction, and I'm not going
5 to spend a lot of time with that. There's really just
6 two things that I want to call to your attention in the
7 introductory material.

8
9 On Page 194 there's table 1 at the top
10 of that page, which are the budget guidelines by region
11 and data type for the 2006 monitoring program. And I
12 think most of you are aware that we start with some
13 budget guidelines. This is how much money we think is
14 available for new projects in 2006. And if you look at
15 the middle part of that table, there's the Department
16 of Agriculture. That's basically the Forest Service.
17 And at the bottom in bold there, there's a figure there
18 of 149. That's \$149,000. That was our best guess
19 going into this entire process of how much money was
20 available for new projects that could be funded by the
21 Forest Service. And that money has historically been
22 used to fund all the projects in Southeast and
23 virtually all the projects in Southcentral, and that's
24 done because of the locations of the two national
25 forests in the State, the Tongass and the Chugach
26 Forest.

27
28 The other thing I think I'll must
29 really briefly go through, and I know most of you have
30 been through this before, but I know Mr. Wright is new
31 I think to this process, is just the process we go
32 through in terms of how we get to where we're at today.

33
34 And to date what has happened, we put
35 out a call for proposals back last November, so almost
36 a year ago, for new work to start in 2006.
37 Investigators had until February to give us, and us
38 being Fisheries Information Services, proposals to
39 examine. We evaluated those proposals based on some
40 criteria, and that criteria is in this introductory
41 material, and we utilized what we call an Interagency
42 Technical Review Committee. That's a team of technical
43 experts from Federal and State agencies, and that --
44 and we call it the TRC. That TRC in combination with
45 the staff from Fisheries Information Services
46 evaluates those proposals, and then a subset of those
47 proposals is forwarded for developing full
48 investigation plans. And those investigation plans are
49 detailed documents that examine, you know, why we want
50 to study whatever it is that's being proposed, how it's

1 going to be done, who's going to do it, how the data's
2 going to be analyzed, the reporting, all of that.

3
4 Those investigation plans were due this
5 past summer, basically about June 1. Those
6 investigation plans were again evaluated by the FIS
7 staff and the TRC, and the results of that evaluation
8 are what's in the book here today. And it's a funding
9 recommendation. It's a recommendation of which ones of
10 those projects can be funded, and it's based on the
11 evaluation criteria and how much money is available.

12
13 So to date most of the work that's --
14 virtually all the work that's been done has been Staff
15 work and work by the investigators. But now what we're
16 starting is the public review process so that
17 recommendation comes to each one of the Councils, so
18 very similar presentation is going on in front of all
19 the Regional Councils for what's being recommended in
20 their respective regions. We actively solicit Council
21 review and comment on the recommendations that are
22 presented, and then those recommendations are further
23 reviewed by the Interagency Staff Committee, and then
24 this entire package of the TRC plan, the Council
25 recommendations, the Staff committee recommendations
26 are then presented to the full Federal Subsistence
27 Board at their winter meeting, and then they'll finally
28 approve a 2006 plan. So we're just at the start of the
29 public review process basically, but there's been a lot
30 of work to date.

31
32 With that, let's get right into the
33 Southeast regional plan. The Southeast regional
34 overview starts on Page 197, but -- and actually we
35 need to look at some information right there on Page
36 197, right at the top. What we look at in terms of
37 deciding strategic priorities are the strategic
38 priorities that have been worked through with this
39 Council, and those are right at the top of the page of
40 197. And that's what we used to tell investigators
41 what's important to the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
42 Program, that this is the kind of information that we
43 want to look at, and that's what we give them is
44 basically those four items right at the top of 197.

45
46 If you turn to the very busy table on
47 Page 198, I think that bears very brief mentioning,
48 because what that is, that's everything that we have
49 funded and are funding to date. And so that just gives
50 a one-page summary if you will of the history of what

1 has been and is being funded through this program.

2

3 And the way to read that table, if you
4 look on the far left, I mean, there's basically just a
5 project number, and that just identifies the number in
6 our sys -- or the project in our system.

7

8 The next column says data type and
9 there's some acronyms there. We look at two kinds of
10 information in our program. SST stands for stock
11 status and trends information. That's information
12 about fish populations basically. So a lot of the work
13 that, for instance Mr. VanAlen presented yesterday
14 about sockeye, those were SST projects.

15

16 And then the other acronym that's in
17 here is HM/TEK. That stands for harvest monitoring and
18 traditional ecological knowledge. And there are a
19 series of projects that fall under that data type. and
20 those are projects that look at harvest assessment and
21 information about subsistence fisheries.

22

23 Then the next column, the project
24 title. Those are just the titles of the project.

25

26 Then the investigators, that's who does
27 the project.

28

29 And then all the information on the far
30 right-hand side is the financial information. That's
31 how much money that projects costs in each year of its
32 existing. So if you want to see what is being funded
33 right now, you would look at the column under 2005,
34 which is the third from the end on the far right-hand
35 side, so any project that has a number under 2005 is
36 something that is ongoing right now.

37

38 And what I'm going to give you here are
39 recommendations for new work in 2006. So you'd have to
40 look under the column labeled 2006, which is the second
41 to last from the right, and you'll see there's a whole
42 bunch of basically sockeye projects that have numbers
43 over there, and then there's also some harvest
44 monitoring/ TEK projects that have some numbers there.
45 So basically what that tells us is we have prior
46 funding commitments from this process back in 2004 and
47 2005, and some of these projects can go out to three
48 years. Those are funding commitments that have already
49 been made. So you take the total amount of money, you
50 subtract these funding commitments, and that's how we

1 came up with that 149,000 as our original estimate of
2 what was available for new work in 2006.

3
4 So what's on the table for new projects
5 in 2006. Well, we have three projects that were
6 submitted for consideration and then forwarded for
7 investigation plans. And you can see a summary of
8 those three projects in the tables on page 200. There
9 were like I say three projects being looked at for
10 funding consideration. And actually I think the
11 Council is probably pretty familiar with all three
12 projects under consideration.

13
14 The first project is a harvest
15 monitoring TEK project, that's project 06-651, survey
16 of customary trade in seafood projects in Southeast
17 Alaska. We spent a lot of time on that project at the
18 fall meeting a year ago, and that was actually
19 originally submitted for funding consideration this
20 year, in 2005. Both the Staff and subsequently the
21 Council ended up not recommending that project for
22 funding in last years monitoring plan because of some
23 technical concerns and -- well, it was largely
24 technical concerns, but it was also concerns with how
25 the project was structured in terms of capacity
26 building.

27
28 We made a commitment as a Staff to go
29 work with those investigators and address those
30 concerns. And those concerns were completely
31 addressed. What we have now is a project that we are
32 very comfortable both in FIS and the TRC in
33 recommending for funding. It addresses the technical
34 concerns. It addresses how the project was structured,
35 and I'll get into that in a minute. But that project
36 is basically ready to be funded in our view, and it is
37 recommended for funding.

38
39 The other two projects are SST
40 projects. They are sockeye projects which you have
41 seen before, which we have funded before. The first
42 one is project 06-601, Neva Lake sockeye stock
43 assessment. Neva Lake is a small sockeye system in
44 northern Southeast. It's a tributary into Icy Straits.
45 It's across basically from Hoonah. And it's a small
46 sockeye system that has been looked at before, and is
47 being proposed to continue to be looked at, and really
48 the strong part of that project is how efficient of a
49 project it is. You'll notice the dollar amount is
50 pretty modest. It's only about \$28,000. That's

1 because of some very unique logistic considerations.
2 It's a project where the investigators, who's the
3 Forest Service and Hoonah Indian Association could put
4 a weir for a very modest amount of money. they can
5 staff it with one person, because they can stay at
6 Excursion Inlet Packers. It's got a lot of unique
7 circumstances going for it that makes it a very
8 efficient project, and therefore a very modest amount
9 of money to the monitoring program.

10

11 The other project is 06-602, Kutlaku
12 Lake sockeye stock assessment. We discussed Kutlaku
13 Lake yesterday as a regulatory proposal. That is
14 exactly why this is being proposed again for further
15 study. Basically through the Council and through the
16 Board, it's been made very clear through the regulatory
17 process, that some additional stock assessment work
18 should be done to look at whether -- basically the
19 management of that system. And specifically to look at
20 whether that system has reached a stage where the
21 closure to non-Federally qualified subsistence users is
22 an appropriate thing to do or not. And so that's
23 assessment work being done by the Alaska Department of
24 Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries in
25 cooperation with the Organized Village of Kake.

26

27 So those are the three projects that
28 are on the table. And at least through the technical
29 review process all three of these projects are
30 recommended for funding. And that was based on the
31 evaluation criteria and on what was believed to be the
32 available amount of money. And actually I had thought
33 this was probably going to be the easiest presentation
34 I ever made to this Council, because we've never been
35 in a position where all of the projects on the table
36 were recommended for funding. And the reason for that
37 is these are three very strong projects, and the other
38 part of the Technical Review Committee recommendation
39 is that they recommended that all the Forest Service
40 money, they were in a position to recommend all the
41 Forest Service money be utilized in Southeast. And
42 there was also a very strong project in Southcentral,
43 but there was enough Department of Interior money to
44 use to fund that project. So I know myself and I know,
45 Cal who's also on the TRC, thought this was going to be
46 a piece of cake presentation. We've got the money,
47 we've got the projects, let's go. But unfortunately
48 that's not the case.

49

50 Let me just take just a brief moment

1 though to kind of run through those evaluation criteria
2 and explain to you why these three projects were all
3 recommended for funding. We have four evaluation
4 criteria. First is strategic priority. We've got the
5 customary trade proposal that was identified by the
6 Council and by the Board as something of very high
7 strategic value. The Board wants regionalized
8 customary trade information. The Council reiterated
9 that. That's clearly a strategic priority. In
10 addition, the Council's identified sockeye assessment
11 work as of high strategic value. We have two sockeye
12 projects, one of which, the Kutlaku Lake project,
13 directly addresses an on-going regulatory issue in
14 front of the Council, in front of the Board. I mean, I
15 think it's pretty clear those projects are all of high
16 strategic value.

17
18 The next evaluation criteria is
19 technical merit. And all three of these projects are
20 of very high technical merit. I spoke a little bit ago
21 about some of the concerns with the customary trade
22 proposal. Those have been addressed. We've got a very
23 strong technical project to go look at the objectives
24 that were outlined for that project. Kutlaku Lake,
25 that's a mark/recapture program. We've done this in
26 the past. We know it works. Neva Lake is probably the
27 most straight forward of the three. It's a weir. I
28 mean, we get very good escapement information for Neva
29 Lake. So we can say with a lot of confidence that what
30 is being proposed in those projects has an incredibly
31 high probability of being able to address the
32 objectives that were laid out in that project. That's
33 why they're of high technical merit.

34
35 The third evaluation criteria is the
36 administrative expertise of the proposers. And again
37 we feel very confident that all three of these projects
38 are being proposed by organizations and by people that
39 will deliver what they've said they'll deliver. The
40 customary trade proposal, this program doesn't have a
41 lot of history with the proposers, but certainly
42 outside of this program, Dr. Steve Langdon is a
43 recognized expert in the field. This is being done in
44 cooperation with the Central Council of the
45 Tlingit/Haida. And they've got a lot of background
46 with other programs, so that project we're real
47 comfortable as rating highly in terms of their
48 administrative expertise. Kutlaku Lake, that's being
49 proposed by Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
50 Division of Commercial Fisheries in cooperation with

1 the Organized Village of Kake. they've been doing the
2 Falls Lake project. ADF&G Com Fish has been doing most
3 of the sockeye work. They have delivered again and
4 again for this program. And then the Neva Lake
5 project, that's USDA Forest Service, the investigator
6 is Mr. Ben VanAlen. I mean, you've heard him in the
7 past. That's done in cooperation with the Hoonah
8 Indian Association. Again, these are people who
9 deliver, so we've got good administrative expertise.

10
11 And then finally, the final evaluation
12 criteria is capacity building. In the course of doing
13 their work, are they promoting capacity building, and
14 all three of these projects rate real highly in that.
15 In fact, if you look at the tables on page 200, table 2
16 and table 3 look at some measures that we look at that
17 indicate whether there's meaningful capacity building
18 going on. Table 2 looks at how the total project
19 budget is broken down between State agencies, Federal
20 agencies, Alaska native and other rural organizations,
21 and as you can see, all three of those projects have a
22 strong Alaska native component to the budget, and then
23 table 3 looks at local hire. Again all three projects
24 have a significant of their project that goes towards
25 local hire, either being by in the Alaska native
26 organization or the State or Federal agencies which are
27 doing the project.

28
29 So as I say, that's why you've got the
30 recommendation that you have. But, again, that
31 recommendation is based on the full USDA funding which
32 is certainly not the case in 2006. So at this point I
33 think it would be appropriate -- I think Mr. Steve
34 Kessler's here who is prepared to give you just a brief
35 update as to where the Forest Service is on funding for
36 2006.

37
38 Mr. Chairman, while Mr. Kessler's
39 coming up, I'm prepared to take any questions about the
40 TRC recommendation.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Looking at table
45 4 on page 200, we do go over the three proposals,
46 basically for Alaska native participation, local hire,
47 and then requested budget over time on table 4 only
48 covers the SST. Is there a similar table for the TEK?

49
50 MR. McBRIDE: Yes. Mr. Chairman. Dr.

1 Garza, table 5 on the next page, it's right in the
2 middle of the page. It's the one project for the
3 customary, and it has all the same information about
4 the total budget, the TRC recommendation. It's on Page
5 201, just the next page.

6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So before we
8 start with Kessler, do we need to take a motion on the
9 recommendation for the fishery projects, since I'm
10 assuming, Mr. Kessler, you're doing wildlife.

11
12 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair. Dr. Garza.
13 Actually I'm going to talk about the funding situation,
14 and we will not be able to totally fund all of these
15 projects, although as we'll discuss, what we would like
16 still is your recommendation to move forward with these
17 projects, and then we'll probably essentially put the
18 start date in abeyance, and plan on moving forward when
19 the funds are available. So we can discuss that
20 further. But we will want an action by the Council to
21 recommend moving forward with all these projects.

22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. If you
24 just want to start your report then.

25
26 MR. LITTLEFIELD: It's Madam Chair.
27 Dr. Garza is chairing this portion of the meeting.

28
29 MR. KESSLER: Excuse me, Madam Chair.
30 Madam Chair. Members of the Council. I'm Steve
31 Kessler with the Forest Service.

32
33 I'm going to talk a little bit about
34 the funding situation for the Forest Service for
35 subsistence management, and the effect on that on both
36 the fisheries projects and wildlife projects that
37 Dennis Chester will be talking about shortly.

38
39 As you may recall, in fiscal year,
40 which just ended here in September, we received an
41 additional \$500,000 from Congress in dollars that the
42 Forest Service receives. And just maybe as a reminder,
43 the Forest Service receives money as a line item in the
44 Congressional budget under the Interior, Environment
45 and Related Agencies budget bill. So we received a
46 \$500,000 increase in fiscal year '05. And with that we
47 decided the most effective use of that would be to
48 start a complementary program to the Fisheries
49 Monitoring Program with a Wildlife Monitoring Program.
50 And so we've been working with you on that, and we've

1 made considerable progress.

2

3 For fiscal year '06 things didn't come
4 out quite so well. First of all, the President's
5 budget which is submitted to Congress had deducted
6 essentially that same \$500,000 increase that we got --
7 we received in fiscal year '05. And deducted that in
8 the recommendation to Congress in fiscal year '06. And
9 so that -- so the President's budget was \$500,000 less.
10 Then the Congress decided to take another \$400,000 off
11 of that. So in fact the bill that was passed and
12 signed by the President has a \$900,000 reduction in the
13 funds that the Forest Service receives, which is
14 approximately a 15 percent reduction. \$900,000 is a
15 substantial change, and so we've had to look very
16 carefully at our budget numbers to figure out how to
17 deal with that.

18

19 You may recall for wildlife we
20 anticipated spending \$500,000 on wildlife projects in
21 fiscal year '05. We have not spent all of that money.
22 We've actually committed about \$150,000 of those
23 dollars, and we anticipate another project which will
24 be \$200,000 which we've done some holding of the funds
25 from fiscal year '05 so we could spend them in fiscal
26 year '06, which started October 1st. And so in the
27 long run, we will be spending 350,000 of those dollars
28 rather than 500,000 as anticipated.

29

30 So we have \$150,000 left over of that
31 that was unspent which we anticipate having available
32 for this year. We also have savings in other places.
33 But the bottom line is we still, because of this large
34 decrease in funding that has come to us, we do not have
35 sufficient funding to fund all of the fisheries
36 program, and to maintain at least a very minimal level
37 of a wildlife program.

38

39 So what's the -- what our plan is, is
40 to at this point, what we -- and what we would suggest
41 to you would be the best approach, would be to not fund
42 the customary trade project, the new start this year.
43 As I mentioned before, we would like your -- we would
44 like you to embrace this project and say that, yes, it
45 is a high priority, and that we would move forward with
46 that project in the funding cycle when actually there's
47 a lot more funds available because of the retirement of
48 a number of commitments that end this fiscal year.

49

50 And then we also intend on the Neva

1 project to hopefully be able to fund that with other
2 Forest Service funds, not subsistence dollars. We
3 believe that we can do that legally, and that that
4 money will be available through other Forest Service
5 funds.

6
7 And with the Kutlaku project, to move
8 forward with that this fiscal year. That's a very high
9 priority of the Regional Forester. The Regional
10 Forester, who's the Federal Board member for the Forest
11 Service, definitely wants to see that project funded,
12 so we've been looking at how we can go about continuing
13 moving forward with that.

14
15 That would free up about \$100,000 from
16 the fisheries commitments, and that would be our
17 minimum commitment to the wildlife monitoring program
18 then. We think we can make this budget work, and keep
19 a wildlife complementary program moving forward.

20
21 Dennis will be talking a little bit
22 more about the projects that we have funded, a little
23 bit about the process that we have gone through, the
24 request for proposals that has moved forward, about the
25 strategic planning that we are doing for wildlife. We
26 have maintained a small amount of funds for that. And
27 then he'll be able to answer any questions associated
28 with that program.

29
30 So if you have any questions for me
31 about Forest Service funding for this fiscal year that
32 we are currently in, I'm ready for those. Madam Chair.

33
34 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

35
36 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madam
37 Chair.

38
39 On Page 202, the recommendation from
40 the TRC, and I believe Mr. McBride is that we fund
41 those in that order, 51, 602 and 601. And I believe --
42 this is a question for you, Mr. Kessler, looking at
43 that, your recommendation is that we fund them in a
44 different order. In other words, the order would 602
45 would be number 1, 601 would be number 2 and 651 would
46 then go to 3. Is that the difference between what
47 you're asking us to do here? Or did I make myself
48 clear.

49
50 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Littlefield, you

1 certainly made yourself clear, and maybe the answer
2 isn't quite so easy, but in essence that is correct,
3 that the Kutlaku project would be number 1 for funding
4 through the FIS dollars. And I suggested that be the
5 priority, because it is a very big and large concern of
6 our Federal Board member, and I would suggest that when
7 it gets to the Federal Board level, I would suspect
8 that that would be how the funding would result.

9
10 We're trying to make roughly \$100,000
11 available as a minimum program on the wildlife side.
12 And by not funding the other two projects, we could do
13 that at this point.

14
15 As I said though, the Neva Lake stock
16 assessment I believe we can fund out of other funds.
17 The customary trade, there is no way we can fund that
18 out of other funds. If we were to fund that out of
19 other funds, I believe that we would be
20 misappropriating funds.

21
22 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

23
24 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I guess my question
25 was, because we'll be asked to make a recommendation,
26 and vote on this, and if we were to do what I'm asking,
27 make number 602 number 1, number 602 number 2, that
28 would fall within the available funding guidelines.
29 And if we were to make 651 number 3, we could just say
30 subject to available funding and let you guys work it
31 out. That would be our recommendation would be fund
32 those, all three in that order and you come up with the
33 money. That was -- I didn't want to get us too deep in
34 where all the monies coming from.

35
36 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Littlefield, I think
37 that would work.

38
39 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Any further
40 comments on the order the suggested funding as listed
41 on Page 202. Mr. Adams.

42
43 MR. ADAMS: Yeah, I think the way that
44 John outlined it, you know, is something that I would
45 support.

46
47 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Why don't you make a
48 motion?

49
50 MR. ADAMS: And I make a motion to that

1 effect, Madam Chairman.

2

3 MR. KOOKESH: I'll second that.

4

5 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: For the record,
6 could you clarify the motion.

7

8 MR. ADAMS: For the record, Madam
9 Chairman, the motion would be to fund 0602, 0601, and
10 0651 in that order.

11

12 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: And that's what
13 you seconded.

14

15 MR. KOOKESH: I seconded that, yeah.

16

17 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you. So
18 the intent of the motion does change the order of
19 priorities as listed on Page 202. And the intent is
20 that that would be funding available for the last one,
21 which may roll it over one year, but it would still
22 stay an issue.

23

24 Mr. Littlefield.

25

26 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madam Chair. I'm
27 going to support this. The reason being is we normally
28 follow the Technical Review Committee recommendations,
29 but we have in the past, I know like on Salmon Lake and
30 others where there were sustainable salmon funds, we
31 just left it up to your discretion where to get the
32 funds. And so if you can miraculously come up with
33 some funds from Katrina or Rita, that's more power to
34 you. I'll be supporting the motion.

35

36 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Adams.

37

38 MR. ADAMS: Madam Chairman. Just
39 because I made that motion, I'm going to support it.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Call for the
44 question.

45

46 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Douville.

47

48 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
49 On number 3, some of this study hinges on knowledge
50 from the old timers, and as I mentioned last year, that

1 it was a very big concern of mine that this knowledge
2 be gathered before it goes away, and it's still a
3 concern of mine. Even if it could be funded to a small
4 degree where that portion of it could be worked on, you
5 know, while it's still available, because if you wait
6 another four or five years or whatever, it's not going
7 to be there, and you can't get it back. So that's --
8 I'm not asking for a change or anything. It's just
9 something that concerns me.

10

11 MR. McBRIDE: Madam Chair. Mr.
12 Douville. Yeah we share that concern, and basically
13 what we're going to do is if no additional funds are
14 available this year in 2006, we're going to treat this
15 project as a funding commitment to start in 2007. So,
16 I mean, the worst case scenario that we see is instead
17 of starting it this year, it would start in 2007, and
18 so, you know, if you go back to that table, the first
19 one we talked about, the busy table on Page 198, we're
20 going to treat the first year of funding which would
21 have started in 2006, if we can't -- if the Forest
22 Service can't find the money to do this, we will treat
23 that as a funding commitment in 2007, so it will come
24 off the top, and so money available for new work in
25 2007 will be the total minus any funding commitments,
26 which will include the first year of that project, so
27 the latest it will start would be next year, Madam
28 Chair.

29

30 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Any further
31 comments.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Call for the
36 question.

37

38 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Question.

39

40 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: The question has
41 been called. The motion before us is to support the
42 three projects in the order as listed as amended, on
43 Page 202, so Neva Lake -- no, Kutlaku is first, Neva
44 Lake is second, survey of customary trade in seafood
45 products is third, but committed at whatever time
46 available, the funding available. All in favor signify
47 by saying aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Opposed.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: The motion
6 passes. Thank you.

7

8 Strategic planning.

9

10 MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
11 Members of the Council.

12

13 That concludes the first item, which
14 was the 2006 monitoring plan.

15

16 The second item on the agenda has to do
17 with strategic planning. Each of you, except Mr.
18 Kitka, received in the mail a packet of information,
19 and then we also put fresh copies in front of you here
20 early this morning. This is packet number 5 on the
21 back table. And there are three pieces to this packet
22 that I would like to briefly discuss with you.

23

24 The first is a letter, a September 29th
25 letter addressed to Chairman Littlefield that explains
26 this information. And this is really a follow up to
27 the reply to the 2004 annual report, which you
28 discussed the first day of this meeting. And there was
29 information that came to back from the Chairman of the
30 Federal Board regarding strategic planning for both
31 Fisheries Information Services and for Wildlife
32 Information Services, and so this letter is a follow up
33 to that. It builds upon what was in that response to
34 the annual report.

35

36 And so what I'd like to very briefly --
37 well, I guess let me cut to the chase. What we're
38 planning on doing is conducting a rigorous strategic
39 planning exercise for the Fisheries Information
40 Services' program, and we would like to start that
41 process this coming spring. And by that -- and we've
42 started this elsewhere in the State. And the first
43 thing, the first stapled part of your three pieces is
44 the strategic plan for the Fisheries Resource
45 Monitoring Program Southcentral Region executive
46 summary. And we included this because we thought it
47 would be easier to show you what we're talking about
48 than to just endlessly talk about it.

49

50 In addition to this, I don't know if

1 anybody had the opportunity to do it, but the chart on
2 my immediate right there, that was a poster that was
3 presented at the recent meeting of the -- national
4 meeting of the American Fisheries Society in Anchorage,
5 and that was a poster presentation of the process that
6 we've used for this program, and it's been done to date
7 in both Southcentral and in Bristol Bay.

8

9 And so I want to just take a couple of
10 minutes to show you the kind of product that we
11 envision that will come out of the strategic planning
12 exercise, and the best example I can give you is
13 something that we already did in Southcentral. The
14 first thing I'd like to call your attention to is just
15 the chart of information at the bottom of Page 1.
16 That's the timeline that was used to do this product.
17 And it's on a fairly rigorous and time consuming
18 product -- or process. And basically what we did in
19 Southcentral took a year. We had a meeting in April of
20 2004, that was a three-day meeting of a work group.
21 Then Staff summarized those -- what was done at that
22 work group. That was then put into an interim report.
23 That report was presented to the full Southcentral
24 Council. Then a year ago, September 2004, we solicited
25 and received comments from the full Council. Then
26 there was a follow-up meeting where those comments were
27 addressed, some additional work was done. Then the
28 final strategic plan if you will was written. That was
29 again presented to the full Council last -- at their
30 winter meeting last year and then finalized.

31

32 So what was in that strategic plan.
33 Well, there are a couple things that I think would have
34 a lot of relevance to helping to really fine-tune
35 strategic priorities for Southeast. And like I say,
36 this whole discussion we had about reduced funding, I
37 mean, that's the reason why we think some careful
38 strategic planning is a really good idea. The money is
39 getting tighter, and even if it stays flat, it's going
40 to be tight. If it goes down, it's going to get worse.
41 So for this program to very clearly articulate what is
42 important to fund is something that at least in our
43 mind makes a lot of sense.

44

45 If you look at the chart at the top of
46 Page 3, one of the things that that work group did was
47 they looked at subsistence fisheries within
48 Southcentral, and that's basically the fisheries in the
49 Copper River and the fisheries in Prince William Sound.
50 They split it up by species, and they prioritized them

1 in terms of the need for information. This is not a
2 statement of the importance of the fisheries to the
3 users. It's a statement of the importance of the
4 fisheries for information for Federal subsistence
5 management. And what you can see is the one on the
6 top, Copper River salmon was, you know, kind of by
7 leaps and bounds the most important fishery for
8 information, and then you can step down in terms of
9 what fisheries -- you know, how they ranked in terms of
10 their importance for information to Federal subsistence
11 management.

12
13 And again, in Southeast I think having
14 a process where we could very clearly boil this down to
15 a picture, not only for ourselves but for potential
16 investigators in terms of what's important for
17 information would make a lot of sense. I mean, for
18 instance, how does sockeye relate to steelhead. How
19 does steelhead relate to trout. In southeast we may
20 want to get more fine tuned than that. Maybe we're
21 going to look at Prince of Wales versus other places,
22 or northern Southeast versus southern Southeast. But
23 having a statement of which fisheries are important for
24 information would be something that I think would
25 really help fine tune what we get for proposals, and
26 what's strategically important to the program.

27
28 The next thing that the work group did
29 in Southcentral was they looked at that top one, that
30 Copper River salmon, and then they spent a lot of time,
31 and if you turn to Page 5, you'll see a pretty busy
32 figure there. But they framed out for Copper River
33 salmon broad goals, research objectives, and then very
34 specific information needs to achieve those research
35 objectives. So, in other words, for Copper River
36 Salmon, what the heck are we talking about?
37 Specifically what information needs do we think we need
38 for Federal subsistence management for Copper River
39 salmon.

40
41 And they not only articulated those
42 information needs, but then they went through a pretty
43 laborious process to decide which ones were more
44 important than others. And all those little numbers
45 there, those are the scores that they ended up being
46 given. Now, that's a pretty busy table, and it's
47 pretty hard to sort it out.

48
49 So if you just turn the page to Page 6,
50 you'll see another graph that lays out all identified

1 28 -- all 28 identified information needs, and they are
2 put in order of importance. So what they were able to
3 do is they said, okay, Copper River salmon was their
4 number 1 priority, and then for Copper River salmon
5 they identified 28 information needs and they put those
6 in order of priority.

7
8 But they went beyond that, because for
9 each one of those information needs, it's not like we
10 don't know anything about some of those information
11 needs. Now, that is true for some of them, but for
12 some of them we know information, and they ranked that
13 as to whether they thought it was partially known or
14 well known. And they also looked at -- across the
15 entire region, they looked at the Fisheries Resource
16 Monitoring Program, they looked at what ADF&G was
17 doing, they looked at what the Park Service is doing,
18 they look at what the Forest Service was doing, they
19 looked at what other organizations and agencies were
20 doing. They did what they called a gap analysis. And
21 they looked at each one of those information needs.

22
23 And so if you turn the page to Page 7,
24 they categorized each one of those information needs in
25 terms of what was known and what wasn't known for the
26 up-coming year. And then they said, okay, do we need
27 to consider proposals for this information need or not.
28 And so after they went through that process, if you
29 turn to Page 8, you'll see a very similar look graph,
30 it's all 28 information needs, and it's in the same
31 order or priority, but those bars, there's solid bars
32 and checkered bars. Well, the difference between a
33 solid bar and a checkered bar is the solid bar are
34 those information needs for the upcoming call for
35 proposals for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
36 that they highlighted as information needs that they
37 wanted proposals on. And the checkered ones were ones
38 at least for that call for proposals that they wanted
39 to hold back and say, no, we're not looking for
40 proposals on those information needs.

41
42 And what this did was this provided a
43 really clear statement, a very specific statement of
44 strategic priorities for Copper River salmon for the
45 Southcentral region in terms of over-all what's
46 important, and then very specifically what information
47 needs were they -- did we want proposals for.

48
49 A very similar process then was gone
50 through for the remaining fishery unit. In other

1 words, that was for Copper River salmon. They did a
2 very similar thing for Copper River fresh water
3 species. They look at salmon in the Sound, they look
4 at freshwater species in the Sound. They split out
5 Prince William Sound from the Delta. Like I say, those
6 are details about Southcentral.

7
8 But it was a pretty laborious process
9 that was done by that work group, and reviewed by that
10 Council, and I guess I can tell you that I think it
11 served them very, very well.

12
13 What we would like to do is do a very
14 similar process for Southeast. We would like to start
15 that this coming spring, most likely in April of 2006.
16 Form a work group comprised of regional professionals
17 from the various agencies, both on the State side and
18 the Federal side, and from appropriate non-government
19 organizations, and from this Regional Council. The way
20 that work group was constructed in Southcentral was we
21 specifically had two Southcentral Council
22 representatives on the work group. We're looking for a
23 total work group of about 15 people. I mean, it's kind
24 of similar to what was done for the U-2 deer. I mean,
25 you start getting much beyond 15, you end up with a
26 work group that becomes logistically difficult to deal
27 with it just becomes ponderous.

28
29 But what we'd like to do is initiate
30 that process for Southeast, have their first meeting
31 this coming spring, and bring back to you a year from
32 now their first interim report on starting down a
33 process similar to this.

34
35 Madam Chair, I'm going to stop for a
36 minute and ask for questions before we get into the
37 next part of this, which has to do with the sockeye
38 synthesis.

39
40 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Any questions
41 regarding the process that was used in terms of
42 determining priorities for FIS projects.

43
44 I have a quick question. On the
45 process that was used for the Copper River area, so did
46 the final information needs recommended for proposals
47 on Page 8, did that go back for review and approval by
48 the Council?

49
50 MR. McBRIDE: Yes. Yeah, we brought

1 the interim report a year ago, and then the final
2 report this last winter, both times to the full
3 Council. That was presented to the full Council, and,
4 you know, we asked for review and comment and final
5 approval, and that was done on both stages.

6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

8
9 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madam Chair. I have
10 a question for Mr. McBride, and that's at this time you
11 would recommend that we select two members to serve on
12 the strategic plan. Is that your recommendation?

13
14 MR. McBRIDE: Correct, sir.

15
16 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: And perhaps as we
17 did with Unit 2 we should have a back up. An
18 alternate.

19
20 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madam Chair. Let's
21 see, I'm trying to think of the assignments that we
22 need to have this year just so the Council -- if I can
23 remember them. We'll two of them and an alternate for
24 the strategic plan. We also have the subsistence use
25 amounts that I believe is two. And we're -- Forrest
26 Cole's letter which we received earlier in the program,
27 he's requesting that we have two Council members on
28 that, so I guess there will probably a total of nine
29 Council, if we have alternates that will be asked to
30 serve, if they want to volunteer for this unpaid
31 position. Do you have anything other on that, Dr.
32 Schroeder?

33
34 That's what my guess was.

35
36 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Ms. Phillips.

37
38 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair,
39 Dr. Garza.

40
41 Mr. McBride, would this meeting be in
42 Anchorage, and would it be two meetings only with
43 reading in between or could you maybe -- and would it
44 be also more condensed since you've already been
45 through this process once with Southcentral, and
46 possibly the way has been paved a little bit. You
47 don't have to reinvent the wheel so much?

48
49 MR. McBRIDE: Let me do the easy one
50 first. No, I don't see this as being in Anchorage. I

1 mean, this will be somewhere in the region. You know,
2 Juneau, Sitka. I mean, it wouldn't make any sense to
3 have the Southeast meeting up in Anchorage. It will be
4 here in the region somewhere.

5
6 As far as, you know, what we
7 anticipate, I would say there's going to be at least
8 two meetings.

9
10 And the other thing about this kind of
11 a process is the product of it becomes the product of
12 the work group which subsequently goes out for review.
13 And so -- I mean, we have a model that we've used, but
14 the work group has to embrace whatever model is
15 utilized. So I don't want to, you know, presuppose
16 that everything we give the work group, they're going
17 to go, oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, you know, that's the way
18 it's going to be. So on some of that, it's a little
19 hard to say.

20
21 And I guess the other thing in my view,
22 I think Southeast is going to be a little more
23 complicated than Southcentral was. In Southcentral, I
24 mean, you've got a lot of intricacy in the region, but,
25 you know, you've kind of got the 800-pound gorilla, if
26 you will, you know, the Copper River. I mean, that was
27 pretty obvious that that was the priority for
28 information, and it just kind of fell right to the top.
29 And Southeast I think is going to be a little -- I
30 think there will be more views on that, and so I think
31 it will be a little harder to deal with.

32
33 But at least at this point for planning
34 purposes, but I would anticipate a meeting, probably a
35 three-day meeting this coming spring, and then at least
36 one other I would say three-day meeting either late
37 fall, early winter, you know, a year plus from now with
38 some -- obviously some work in between.

39
40 Madam Chair.

41
42 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

43
44 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Madam Chair, now that
45 I'm retired, I will fill the last position if we can't
46 -- if we're having trouble filing these for others, but
47 I would encourage the other Council to be involved.
48 And if we're having trouble, I'll fill in.

49
50 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So you're

1 volunteering for the alternate.

2

3 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes.

4

5 MS. PHILLIPS: I'll volunteer.

6

7 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So for the
8 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program strategic plan
9 subcommittee we have Patricia Phillips.

10

11 MR. KITKA: I have a question.

12

13 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Kitka has a
14 question.

15

16 MR. KITKA: I have a question that's
17 been kind of bothering me for some time on this
18 subsistence stocks and assessments. Is there any
19 overlays with the commercial fishing and the openings
20 in the areas that affect the escapement that gets to
21 the places where we can do subsistence? Do you have
22 any charts or anything available for the people to
23 study along with whatever is being studied to see
24 whether we can get an idea of what is escaping to the
25 spawning grounds. I don't know if you got that clear
26 or not.

27

28 MR. McBRIDE: Madam Chair. Mr. Kitka.
29 I'll take a shot at it. We have some information on
30 that. I mean, I'm not prepared to lay that out right
31 now, but I mean, yesterday evening Mr. Ben VanAlen, you
32 know, provided some information looking at the timing
33 of, you know, selected commercial openings in the
34 region and how that related to, you know, sockeye
35 harvest in those fisheries, and then he also presented
36 at least some of the information that we have about
37 levels of escapement in the systems that we've studied.
38 And one of the things that we'll end all this
39 discussion with today is he has the complete update of
40 that escapement information, and when we do the
41 strategic planning, we're going to try to provide the
42 work with some summaries of that kind of information.
43 In fact, the next thing I want to go over is this
44 synthesis of sockeye information that Federal Staff has
45 worked on. So we're going to provide the work group
46 with some summaries of data that we think is pertinent
47 to the discussion, including escapement information,
48 and that kind of data.

49

50 Mr. Chair. Madam Chair.

1 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Doug. That
2 would be very interesting. I know there was some of
3 the guys doing the TEK down in -- oh, out of Ketchikan
4 and those other areas that were very interested in that
5 type of study.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. Do we have
10 one more committee member for this, or are we going to
11 bump John up to the second committee member. Okay.
12 The strategic planning for the Fisheries Resource
13 Monitoring Planning is Patricia Phillips and John
14 Littlefield. We are missing two Council members. Mr.
15 Jordan.

16
17 MR. LITTLEFIELD: We have two that are
18 not -- or one that is not reapplying here.

19
20 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Would this be Mr.
21 Jordan's meeting?

22
23 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan's last
24 meeting.

25
26 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So we
27 could ask Mr. Bangs if he's interested in being the
28 alternate, or serving on some committee as we go
29 through.

30
31 Mr. Kookesh.

32
33 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Adams and Mr.
34 Hernandez and I don't mean any disrespect by not
35 participating, but we are up for renomination, so we're
36 kind of on the fence there. So that's why we're not --
37 why I'm not participating, and Burt probably doing the
38 same thing.

39
40 MR. ADAMS: Speak for yourself.

41
42 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: I think that
43 you're up for renomination doesn't matter, because this
44 work would be done before -- I mean, I'm up before
45 you're up, and even if I were not reappointed, this
46 committee would be done before my last meeting.

47
48 Okay. So you have two committee
49 members.

50

1 Mr. Adams.

2

3 MR. ADAMS: I'll volunteer as an
4 alternate.

5

6 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Thank you.

7

8 MR. McBRIDE: Madam Chair. Members of
9 the Council. Thank you very much. I think that will
10 be a good group, and I think that will work well.

11

12 What we'll do at your next meeting is
13 we'll come back with a much more fleshed out plans in
14 terms of, you know, a suggested work group, and, you
15 know, a time for the meeting, place for the meeting and
16 all the details.

17

18 The final part of the strategic
19 planning for the fisheries program that I want to just
20 briefly go through is a draft document which is this
21 synthesis document that was a third part of that. You
22 had the letter, you had the executive summary, and you
23 had this.

24

25 And this was an effort on the part of
26 Federal Staff to really answer just one strategic
27 planning question, and that question is which sockeye
28 stocks do we think are important? It's not putting
29 sockeye -- the relative importance of sockeye in
30 relations to anything else, but I mean, you can't look
31 at the history of what we've done and come to any other
32 conclusion than sockeye's a pretty important thing to
33 look at. We've spent most of our money trying to
34 assess sockeye stocks here since 2001 in this program.

35

36 So one of the things that we wanted to
37 do, and which we did was we simply drafted a document
38 that tried to put together a framework that's kind of
39 like a strategic planning framework to look at what
40 we've done, and, you know, which sockeye stocks do we
41 think are important to look at. And there's I guess a
42 couple things about this document. First of all, it is
43 in draft form. So I'd like to just briefly go through
44 this with the Council. And I guess -- I know there's a
45 lot of information here, and what I would ask is if you
46 have specific comments on this, you can either give
47 them to me here now, or subsequent to this meeting.

48

49 But we really see two uses for this
50 document. First, we're going to have a call for

1 proposals in 2007 that's going to come up in November,
2 this coming November, next month. And so we're going
3 to be putting out a big call for proposals prior to any
4 of the strategic planning that we're going to do that's
5 going to start in the spring, so there's a timeliness
6 factor, and we think it would be a good idea to tell
7 potential investigators which sockeye stocks do we
8 think are strategically important to look at as part of
9 our 2007 monitoring plan.

10

11 And then the second thing we'd see
12 using this document for is as input to the strategic
13 planning work group. In other words, give them a
14 starting point for subsequent strategic planning to
15 answer this question, which seems like an obvious
16 question to answer.

17

18 And so like I say, I'd just like to
19 very briefly go through this with you. If you -- I
20 don't think there's really anything in the introduction
21 that we need to go through.

22

23 If you turn to Page 3 on the
24 methodology, we tried to briefly list all the
25 information that we looked at, I'm not going to go
26 through it here, but there's a fair body of information
27 in terms of the reports that have been generated out of
28 this program, reports and data bases primarily held by
29 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and Subsistence
30 Divisions that we looked at. And the process that we
31 went through was we sat down and we tried to make a
32 very -- a fairly complete list, and it's not a total
33 list, but I think a pretty complete list of sockeye
34 stocks that are utilized by subsistence users
35 throughout Southeast and Yakutat, and the first thing
36 we did was we actually compared it to that map over
37 there which is the Federal lands, because the first
38 thing for our program is a system has to have nexus to
39 a Federal public land. That includes most of Southeast
40 and Yakutat, but not all of it. And the obvious places
41 that drop out for consideration in our program would be
42 places like Glacier Bay and the Chilkat and Chilkoot
43 Rivers that have no connection to a Federal land that
44 is part of the ANILCA program.

45

46 And then the second thing we looked at
47 was we looked at existing assessment programs. The
48 whole idea of the monitoring program is its supposed to
49 supplement and add to existing assessment work. We're
50 not trying to duplicate assessment work, nor do we want

1 existing assessment work to come to us for funding if
2 they're getting funding from somewhere else. So
3 systems like -- well, like a lot of the Yakutat systems
4 already have -- I mean, like the weir on the Setuk.
5 You know, we don't really need to add assessment work
6 for sockeye when there's an existing weir on the Setuk.
7 Or the program at Redoubt Lake by Sitka. There's a
8 weir there and an assessment program there. So we
9 tried to take those systems then off the list, because
10 they already have an assessment program.

11
12 And then what we did was we came up
13 with I think a pretty simple framework that tried to
14 assign importance then to the remaining systems. So if
15 you turn to Page 4, you'll see some bullets at the top
16 of the page, and for each one of those systems, we
17 asked a series of questions, and then gave it a little
18 simple grade to try to articulate the relative
19 importance of that sockeye stock in relation to the
20 others.

21
22 And just real briefly, the questions
23 that we came up with was we asked is there a history of
24 assessment for that system. And we thought there was
25 value in if we'd been there before in a lot of regards.
26 In other words for a lot of these sockeye systems it
27 makes sense to study them over a period of years, so if
28 a system -- and we also think there was probably some
29 wisdom in some of the decisions we've made in the past.
30 So if there's a history of assessment, we tended to
31 grade that -- we gave some value to that.

32
33 The second question we asked was what
34 is the magnitude of the subsistence harvest by
35 Federally qualified subsistence users. And so what
36 we're trying to get at there is we want to put value on
37 systems that have a relatively high subsistence
38 harvest. We put more value on a system that has a
39 larger harvest than say a smaller harvest.

40
41 The third question we asked was does
42 the stock sustain significant exploitation by the
43 subsistence fishery, because you've got to be a little
44 careful about just looking at the magnitude of the
45 harvest. Some of the systems have a fair number of
46 fish in them, so even though there's a lot of harvest,
47 the actual exploitation is low, because there's a lot
48 of fish. And some of the systems that have a
49 relatively small harvest might represent a significant
50 fraction of what's there, so the exploitation would be

1 high. So we tried to look at the exploitation for
2 those systems.

3
4 Then the fourth question we asked was
5 is management or regulatory action required to manage
6 the subsistence harvest. So what we got at there is --
7 it's places like Kutlaku. Are -- is there regulatory
8 significance, and we looked at the Federal system, but
9 we also looked at the State system, but is there
10 regulatory significance for that sockeye stock.

11
12 And then the final question that we
13 asked is, is any part of the subsistence fishery under
14 Federal jurisdiction. And most of the fisheries occur
15 outside of Federal jurisdiction, because they occur in
16 marine waters. But there are systems where some of the
17 fishery, or in some cases all of the fishery occur
18 within the confines of particularly the Tongass
19 National Forest and would be under direct jurisdiction
20 of this program.

21
22 So we looked at all of that, and to see
23 where we ended up, if you page forward to the graphs on
24 Page 12, I'll just briefly kind of go through some of
25 the conclusions that we reached. If you look at the
26 first figure there, figure 2, what you'll see there is
27 a summary of that harvest, subsistence harvest and
28 exploitation information that I talked about. And the
29 way to read that graph is obviously across the bottom
30 were all the systems that we looked at, and the bars
31 are the measured exploitation in 2002, which was the
32 year for which we had the most recent information, and
33 then the lines are the 2002 subsistence harvest.

34
35 And so you can see for some of those
36 systems, probably a good one to look at perhaps is
37 Hetta, which is the second bar, Hetta has had a very
38 high subsistence harvest, that's the line, it was about
39 -- excuse me. Am I looking at this right? No, I'm
40 sorry, that's Necker. Necker would be the second one,
41 had a very high subsistence harvest, and it also at
42 least in that year had a high exploitation, so that
43 would kind of, you know, raise that as a system that we
44 might want to consider, at least looking at those
45 evaluation criteria.

46
47 Some of them have a high harvest and a
48 low exploitation. A good example of that, if you go
49 over to the right, would be Yes Bay. It's got a pretty
50 large subsistence harvest, but a pretty low

1 exploitation, because there's a lot of fish there.

2

3 All those systems on the left-hand side
4 for which there are no bars, are systems where we have
5 estimates of harvest, but we have no estimates of
6 exploitation. And some of those systems we think are
7 systems that would rank pretty highly, because we know
8 what the harvest is, but we don't know what the
9 exploitation is, and some of those system, I would say
10 probably particularly Gut Bay and Hatchery Creek, are
11 systems that we might want to get some estimate of
12 abundance so that we can compute what the exploitation
13 is.

14

15 We took this list, we looked at all of
16 our evaluation criteria, which included harvest, it
17 included exploitation, and it looked at jurisdiction,
18 all those things I talked about a few minutes ago, we
19 scored them all, and if you look at the figure right
20 below it, figure 3, what you'll see is all those
21 systems in what we think is rank order priority for
22 stock status information. And they seem to cluster
23 into three general categories. We had about a half
24 dozen systems that kind of had a high score. Then we
25 had a whole bunch of systems that basically had a score
26 of between about 10 and 15 that we categorize as
27 medium. And then we had a whole series of systems on
28 the far right that we categorized as low.

29

30 And so what this is, is at least the
31 Federal Staff's shot at sockeye systems across the
32 region in terms of how they rank out, we think, in
33 priority for information.

34

35 And then the final thing that we did
36 was we basically did kind of what I call a simple gap
37 analysis if you remember back to that Southcentral
38 example I gave you, and that's what the figure is on
39 Page 13, figure 4 where we said, well some of these
40 systems we either have information for, we have maybe
41 an existing funding commitment, or some of them were
42 just a low priority and just don't really rise to the
43 top in terms of what's likely to be available funding
44 in 2007, and so for all of those systems, we basically
45 didn't -- we took the bar away, and what's left are
46 those systems in order of priority that we want to tell
47 -- or we think we should tell potential investigators
48 in our 2007 call for proposals, these are the systems
49 that we think we're looking for information for. This
50 would be our statement of strategic priority for

1 sockeye systems for the 2007 call for proposals. So
2 all of those high priority systems would be on there,
3 some of the mediums, and just a couple of the lows.

4
5 And really the reason why some of those
6 low priority systems are on there, I think there's only
7 one, I think it's Kah Sheets, is because any
8 subsistence fishery that would happen there would be
9 under direct Federal jurisdiction. It would be
10 basically a fresh water fishery.

11
12 So with that, Madam Chair, like I say,
13 that's just a brief summary of some Staff work that has
14 gone on trying to look at just one strategic planning
15 question. We did this because of the timeliness. We
16 think it would be important to tell investigators
17 what's important for the sockeye work in the 2007 call
18 for proposals, and we would then use this as input into
19 our strategic planning work group in April of 2006.
20 Madam Chair.

21
22 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So this is a
23 document that would be made available to someone who
24 would be submitting a proposal for this next round.

25
26 MR. McBRIDE: Yes. Correct. And in
27 our call, what we would do is we'd basically summarize
28 it. We'd probably just use those graphs, but, yeah, in
29 essence we would make this available to anybody that
30 was submitting proposals.

31
32 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So didn't that in
33 effect do the strategic planning for Southeast?

34
35 MR. McBRIDE: Madam Chair. No, I don't
36 think so for a couple reasons. This just looks at --
37 it looks at an important question, but it only looks at
38 one question. It only looks at sockeye stocks. I
39 mean, you know, we do steelhead work, we do customary
40 trade work. I mean, we do a lot of things that are
41 under consideration. This is just one piece of it,
42 albeit an important piece. And it also does not get at
43 if, for instance, we want information say about Patrick
44 Creek or Klawock. The other thing the strategic
45 planning work group will be looking at is what kinds of
46 information do we want to look at, and, I mean, I think
47 it will get beyond just basic escapement information.
48 I mean, for instance, the strategic planning work group
49 may want to consider a strategy that gets at trying to
50 look at, you know, commercial fishing harvest patterns

1 in Chatham Strait or something like that. I mean,
2 there may be some other -- a lot of other things that
3 ultimately build into this. But this is at least a
4 good shoot for 2007.

5
6 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Littlefield.

7
8 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Madam
9 Chair.

10
11 Before we get off this subject, we had
12 Mr. Larsen up -- excuse me, Mr. Johnson up there at the
13 same time, and I suspect we probably should take care
14 of those two appointments to the -- Forrest Cole has a
15 request. Maybe we could cover that before we go to Mr.
16 VanAlen.

17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Well, we also
19 have the wildlife information, so we still have Kessler
20 in front of us.

21
22 Mr. Johnson.

23
24 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Madam Chairman.
25 Council. If we could get an action from the Council to
26 appoint two members for the young growth, that would be
27 good.

28
29 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Hernandez is
30 one. I'll be the second.

31
32 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Put me down as
33 alternate.

34
35 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam
36 Chairman.

37
38 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So I think -- so
39 do you need any action on the sockeye priority list
40 there, or is that just going out?

41
42 MR. McBRIDE: Madam Chair. I think
43 probably the best way to leave that, I mean, there's a
44 fair amount of information there. If the Council has
45 any comments on it, we'd certainly take them now, or --
46 I mean, if you want the opportunity, you know, to read
47 it and just get back to us. I mean, our call for
48 proposals is not going to go out for another month, so
49 if you have you know, comments or advice on that, we're
50 certainly very open to it. It's a draft document.

1 We're going to update it with the -- all the recent
2 sockeye escapement information that Mr. VanAlen has
3 summarized. So, I mean, this is a work in progress.
4 So if you have comments on it now or later would be
5 fine.

6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So considering
8 the time restraints, I would say look it over. If you
9 have comments, get to Mr. McBride on them. And then
10 it's my impression that this would also go to this new
11 strategic planning committee for their review. So are
12 we ready for Mr. Kessler and wildlife information.

13
14 So one more question on the strategic
15 planning for FIS. Will part of that be looking at
16 what's the purpose of collecting the data, how will it
17 be used or how will it be useful in terms of future
18 management?

19
20 MR. McBRIDE: Madam Chair. Absolutely.
21 Yeah. I mean, what we're going to want is a strategic
22 plan for information for Federal subsistence
23 management, so the utilization of the information will
24 I'm sure be a very important point that the work group
25 would address.

26
27 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

28
29 We can do a lot of counting, get really
30 good numbers, but somewhere we need to -- then we would
31 know if these streams which we know of already have
32 some problems. And hopefully with this information we
33 would determine how to deal with them, whether
34 enhancement or some other thing like that, or, you
35 know, fisheries affecting them. This information would
36 be helpful in determining what to do next, if you were
37 going to do something, and I would hope something would
38 come of it, or some action would come of it to make
39 these streams more healthy.

40
41 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Patty will take
42 it to the strategic meeting.

43
44 Okay. We'll move on the wildlife.
45 Thank you, Mr. McBride.

46
47 And before you guys start, it is five
48 to noon, so what are the plans here. Does somebody out
49 there know or somebody here know. Say again? Keep
50 going? Keep going.

1 MR. KESSLER: Madam Chair. Members of
2 the Council. I'm Steve Kessler with the Forest
3 Service.

4
5 And with me is Dennis Chester who's
6 leading up our Wildlife Information Services program.
7 We put Dennis on, he's in a temporary position. He's
8 been working for us for six months or so I think, and
9 will be for at least another four months. He's going
10 to make a presentation to you, because he has the
11 greatest knowledge and most details of the program.

12
13 MR. CHESTER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 Members of the Council.

15
16 I'm just going to give you a pretty
17 brief update on the Wildlife Information Services
18 program. Corresponding with the level of staffing and
19 budget, it should be quite a bit briefer than FIS.

20
21 Like Steve mentioned, I was brought on
22 in late April after the funding -- I guess we got
23 around February, about the time of your last meeting.
24 My first duty was to get out a request for proposals.
25 To do that, I did some calling around to find out what
26 issues we wanted to address, and I liked the fact that
27 Southeast Council had already addressed this, and
28 pretty much all I had to do was refer to the last
29 meeting minutes.

30
31 The request for proposals identified
32 four priority issues. Two of those were directly from
33 the Unit 2 subcommittee recommendations, which were
34 Prince of Wales deer populations and trend information,
35 and Prince of Wales deer traditional ecological
36 knowledge, subsistence use and needs information. We
37 also requested information, or proposals for bear
38 traditional ecological knowledge and Prince William
39 Sound black bear, and methods for tracking non-edible
40 bear parts used in handicrafts.

41
42 That went out in June 2004. We
43 received eight proposals in response addressing three
44 of those issues. The next step in the process is we
45 sent these out for independent peer review outside of
46 the WIS program, to academicians and agency folks with
47 specialized knowledge addressing these issues. We also
48 formed a reviewing committee consisting of Forest
49 Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish and Wildlife
50 Service, Office of Subsistence Management, and Alaska

1 Department of Fish and Game personnel.

2

3 The independent reviews came back. We
4 used those as well as the same criteria that the FIS
5 program uses to evaluate their proposals, and those
6 again, just to reiterate, are technical merit, how well
7 the proposals met the priority issues, and proven
8 performance of the principal investigators, as well as
9 partnerships and capacity building.

10

11 And the review committee went over the
12 eight proposals and made recommendations to the
13 Regional Forester who -- since this is a Forest Service
14 only program, he is the deciding official on these.
15 The review committee made the recommendations and the
16 Regional Forester accepted them with no changes. So we
17 decided to go -- he recommended going forward, or
18 decided to go forward with the recommendations.

19

20 What those recommendations were, we're
21 -- so far we have -- basically it was three studies.
22 Two are currently fully funded through the process.
23 One of those studies was Prince William Sound black
24 bear study. The contract is specifically to the Alaska
25 Department of Fish and Game's Subsistence Division, and
26 a subcontract to the Chugach Regional Resource
27 Commission. And that project is about \$57,000.

28

29 The second proposal that is funded and
30 contracted at this point is Prince of Wales deer
31 population and trends study Doug Larsen mentioned
32 earlier. Basically it's studying different methods for
33 coming up with better population and trend information.
34 That is -- the principal on that one is Alaska
35 Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife
36 Conservation, with subcontracts to the University of
37 Alaska-Fairbanks Institute of Arctic Biology, and the
38 Hydaburg Cooperative Association. So far that one is
39 funded for approximately \$81,000 with contingency for
40 the following year at about \$90,000.

41

42 We're also working on a final project.
43 Bob Schroeder is kind of doing the coordinating on this
44 one. We had a couple of proposals that kind of
45 complemented each other, and so we're working with the
46 principal investigators to work together, and so far
47 they appear to be willing to do that, and we're just
48 waiting for the final proposal to come back and be
49 reviewed and go through a little bit more review and
50 decision-making, but it's the Prince of Wales deer

1 subsistence uses and needs study. And apparently the
2 principal investigator on that will be the Craig
3 Community Association with a subcontract to a private
4 contractor out of Anchorage.

5
6 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: What was
7 ((indiscernible, microphone off)).

8
9 MR. CHESTER: Craig Community
10 Association. Like I say, we're still waiting on that,
11 and as Steve mentioned earlier, we're holding back
12 funding of about \$200,000 for that proposal, contingent
13 on final review.

14
15 And so that's pretty much the stuff
16 that was done for -- pardon?

17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: A quick question.
19 Are those funds secure.

20
21 MR. KESSLER: Madam Chair. Yes, those
22 funds right now are in place.

23
24 MR. CHESTER: So that's pretty much
25 what I've been doing to date.

26
27 Just starting in the new fiscal year,
28 October 1st, I've been putting in place the strategic
29 -- what we're calling the strategic planning effort.
30 Again, it's not as rigorous as the FIS program. It's
31 going to be done on a much shorter scale, so maybe we
32 could call it the mini-strategic planning, or strategic
33 planning light. Again, we're looking at a group of
34 about 15 to 20 people from Southeast and Southcentral,
35 because this is going to involve all of the Forest
36 Service lands in Alaska, so it's not just Southeast.
37 It's for the whole area that we deal with. And we're
38 going -- you know, it will be the similar cast of
39 characters, Forest Service, Fish and Game, University
40 of Alaska, representatives of the Southeast and
41 Southcentral Councils, and representatives from
42 Southeast and Southcentral tribes.

43
44 We're in the process of identifying
45 people. Some people have been identified. We're
46 looking for folks with knowledge, of course, of the
47 subsistence issues as well as to some degree what
48 information's already available and what has been done.

49
50 The process we're using will pretty

1 much occur between now and about mid-January of 2006,
2 and so the plan right now is to have some interviews
3 with the people we have identified in late October, and
4 then in late November we'll have a two-day meeting in
5 Juneau to do the face-to-face. And we've contracted
6 with Sheinberg Associates to do the actual interviews
7 and meeting facilitation, as well as writing up the
8 final report.

9
10 Similar to FIS, we'll be using this
11 information to -- the most immediate thing we'll be
12 using the information for is to put out a request for
13 proposals for 2006. I hope to have that out in about
14 mid-December, and have proposals back in time to at
15 least present preliminary information at the February
16 Regional Council meetings.

17
18 I guess the last thing I wanted to
19 mention is, I don't know if John included us in his
20 numbers of additional volunteers, but from the last
21 Council meeting there were four folks that were
22 identified to work with the WIS program, and
23 unfortunately we only have a couple of slots in our
24 strategic planning effort. So rather than me trying to
25 decide which ones to invite, I would request that the
26 Council either come up with two out of those four or
27 whatever two that you so desire to include in that
28 process.

29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So we need two
31 volunteers for wildlife planning for how to spend the
32 money, so if you have black bear, brown bear, moose,
33 deer, whatever concerns in your regions, this would be
34 a good committee to be on.

35
36 MR. CHESTER: And I guess one thing I
37 would add is it would be nice to have some geographical
38 variation in that. In other words, we probably don't
39 want necessarily two folks from the same general area.

40
41 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Volunteers.

42
43 DR. SCHROEDER: Dennis, I think just --
44 were there some Staff suggestions on who might work
45 best on that committee? It's obviously up to the
46 Council to make a recommendation, do you remember who
47 the people identified earlier were, and we could see if
48 they're willing to continue.

49
50 MR. CHESTER: I personally didn't have

1 any recommendations. I believe the four that were
2 identified before were the four that were on the Unit 2
3 subcommittee, and I believe that was Don Hernandez and
4 Dolly Garza and Michael Bangs and the fourth person is
5 Mike Douville.

6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: So if Michael
8 Bangs was recommended before and he didn't object,
9 we'll stick his name on there now. Anybody care to
10 defend him? Okay. He's on. There is at least one
11 more subcommittee, so don't plan on escaping from
12 everything. You'd better think about what you would
13 like to be on, or you might end up with something that
14 you have to be on. So we need someone else for the
15 Wildlife Information Services proposal review for
16 strategic planning, short process. Dennis.

17
18 MR. CHESTER: You might also -- we'd
19 request that you might also identify an alternate.

20
21 MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'll be alternate.

22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Mr. Wright is
24 number 2. Michael Bangs, Mr. Wright. John Littlefield
25 alternate.

26
27 DR. SCHROEDER: And, Madam Chair, the
28 two members who graciously volunteered, Mr. Bangs in
29 absentia and Mr. Wright will be available for a meeting
30 -- do you know when that meeting is in December to see
31 if Frank Wright, Jr. is free at that time?

32
33 MR. CHESTER: Madam Chair, yes, the
34 meeting is scheduled right now for November 29th and
35 30th in Juneau.

36
37 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay. So that's
38 November 29th and 30th, not December.

39
40 MR. CHESTER: Correct.

41
42 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: Okay-doke. So do
43 we need to do anything with WIS?

44
45 MR. CHESTER: Madam Chair. That's all
46 I have.

47
48 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA: We're glad to
49 have the program. Okay. I'm getting ordered here.
50 Okay. We will break until 2:00 o'clock. We have some

1 kind of sack lunch that we can purchase, or we've
2 ordered. We need to figure out how to pay. Melinda
3 will come over and tell us before we all escape. The
4 plan is to go to Shakes, possibly to petroglyphs. Be
5 back here and prepared to finish up at 2:00 o'clock.
6 Don't straggle in at 2:10 please.

7
8 (Off record discussion re logistics for
9 lunch and field trip)

10
11 (Off record)

12
13 (On record)

14
15 VICE CHAIRMAN GARZA:on the
16 agenda. We will have a presentation by what's his real
17 name? Kevin? Is Kevin out there? Okay.

18
19 We do have a presentation by OVK on
20 their steelhead project, but they were not sure where
21 we were going to fit them in, so they may not be here
22 right now.

23
24 And if they're not, then we will go
25 back to the agenda, and the annual report. And that's
26 one where we may skip over briefly, touch it briefly
27 and give some general comments to Dr. Schroeder and
28 have him pull together our letter.

29
30 DR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Chair. The annual
31 report is something that we submit every year. We
32 usually submit the annual report in May, and I take
33 items that have been mentioned by Council members in
34 their opening reports or during the Council meeting.
35 It appears as an agenda item here, because this would
36 be an opportune time if there is an issue that a
37 Council member is concerned with, they could bring it
38 up and that would facilitate preparation of some draft
39 material for the annual report for your next meeting.
40 So we could just open it up. If there are no comments,
41 that's okay. We've got another shot at this at our
42 next meeting in February/ March.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
45 members of the Council that have items that they would
46 like to bring up in this year's annual report on any
47 subject covering subsistence in our region.

48
49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What I'd say we
2 should do here is let's hold this discussion on the
3 topics for the annual report until a little later in
4 the meeting. There are some things that I know we
5 discussed. We'll see if we can put together a list at
6 our next break, and bring those forward after that. Is
7 there any objection to doing that, because I don't
8 think we're prepared to do that at this time. Okay.

9
10 Let's do the petition to the Secretary
11 concerning State of Alaska hunting license
12 requirements. A presentation by Staff.

13
14 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. This was
15 an item that we brought up in our annual report, and we
16 received a report from the Federal -- from the
17 Secretaries through the Federal Subsistence Board.

18
19 Our task at this time, if we wish to
20 pursue this is to begin to prepare a petition to the
21 Secretaries asking for the Secretaries to change the
22 current requirement. The requirement at the present
23 time is for anyone who's hunting Federal subsistence
24 regulations, that person needs to have a State hunting
25 license. This is not the case for people who are
26 fishing under Federal fishing licenses.

27
28 The background on this was provided in
29 an email which I circulated to you from Bill Knauer,
30 and perhaps we should address some questions to Bill.
31 He is our resident expert on this.

32
33 My understanding is that decisions were
34 made at the inception of the Federal program to require
35 a Federal -- to require Federal hunters to have a State
36 hunting license, but I'll turn it back to the Chair and
37 perhaps questions to Bill.

38
39 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

40
41 Just a real quick background. As Dr.
42 Schroeder indicated, that this issue was examined back
43 in 1990 at the start of the program when it was still a
44 temporary program, and at that time the intent was to
45 maximize the use of the State license system and permit
46 system consistent with sound management of fish and
47 wildlife. And it was reexamined in 1992 and in 1996
48 and in 1999 also.

49
50 And Dr. Schroeder referred to the fact

1 that there's not a requirement for a State fishing
2 license. That's because the State does not have -- the
3 state fishing license is a sport fishing license, and,
4 of course, you folks and your constituents aren't doing
5 sport fishing. You're doing subsistence fishing.

6
7 The license for hunting is a general
8 hunting license. There is no such thing in the State
9 of Alaska as a sport hunting license.

10
11 And in a 1996 document that addressed
12 residency and licensing requirements, there was a
13 statement that the requirement for an individual to
14 possess a hunting license is consistent with sound
15 management principles. The information obtained from
16 the issuance of licenses allow managers to estimate the
17 hunting pressure likely to be directed at wildlife
18 populations in certain areas.

19
20 The revenues obtained from licenses
21 directly support the Alaska Department of Fish and
22 Game, providing for wildlife surveys, research, habitat
23 improvement, education and information among other
24 things. License sales also result in millions of
25 dollars in matching funds coming from the Federal
26 Government for the specific purpose of habitat
27 acquisition, improvement and wildlife management.

28
29 At the present time the cost of a
30 hunting license is \$25 or \$5 in the case of a low
31 income license. Residents 15 years of age are not
32 required to have a license to hunt. Individuals 65
33 years or older may hunt with a free identification
34 card.

35
36 And the monies collected from license
37 fees by the State go into the ADF&G budget. They do
38 not go into the general State treasury.

39
40 And overall, through the Federal Aid to
41 Wildlife Restoration Program, the State receives
42 anywhere from eight and a half million to nine and a
43 half million dollars annually for their budget and
44 acquisition and habitat management program.

45
46 So with that, I would be more than
47 happy to answer any questions.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it possible
50 to just address what the State calls big game? In

1 other words, you can say it's not sport, but big game
2 is where our guides come in and we have a guiding
3 system there, and it's something that most of us would
4 look at as a sport when you have a guided, and it's
5 called big game. Is it possible to craft a request
6 where you didn't have to have a license for big game
7 species? In other words, in Southeast that would
8 address most of the problems.

9
10 You're going to hear I think some
11 discussions on licensing regulations enacted by the
12 State and changes to the deer program which affects the
13 majority of our people. Is it possible to craft a
14 licensing requirement only to address -- it just --
15 deer, for example, in Southeast.

16
17 MR. KNAUER: You could certainly
18 address anything in a petition that you would so
19 desire. In doing so, you should indicate whether your
20 desire is to have it apply to a certain class of game,
21 such as large mammals or small game only, Southeast
22 only, statewide. That's your prerogative.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do we have
25 questions for Mr. Knauer on regulatory. Mr. Wright.

26
27 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

28
29 What is, you know, low income license,
30 you know, \$5. Does a person have to bring in proof
31 about their income and stuff like that? I have no --
32 excuse my ignorance, but.....

33
34 MR. KNAUER: Under the State program, a
35 low income license -- an individual is eligible for a
36 low income license if they're family income is below
37 \$8200 for a year, or if they have obtained any State or
38 Federal assistance, welfare assistance, during the
39 previous six months.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do you want to
42 follow up on that?

43
44 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Mr.
47 Kookesh.

48
49 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Knauer, you mentioned
50 habitat and what else?

1 MR. KNAUER: Some of the things include
2 habitat acquisition, habitat improvement, wildlife
3 management, surveys, hunter education, and in these --
4 the State projects that involve the Federal matching
5 funds, 25 percent of the project must involve State
6 generated dollars. So it's not just a Federal grant.
7 It's a 25/75 percent funding, cost sharing program.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Knauer, I
10 think you're aware of what triggered the latest round
11 of requesting this. It was that the State had intended
12 to double the resident licenses while applying a
13 graduated scale to the non-residents, increasing them
14 never to double like they were on State residents, and
15 to use that money to put in things like shooting ranges
16 in urban areas. So it -- recognizing that there's very
17 little cash economies in the rural communities in many
18 cases, doubling the hunting license is pretty tough. I
19 mean, when you've only -- when you have to pay 50 or
20 \$75 for a hunting license, because they were going to
21 split them up into sections, and that will buy you like
22 five gallons of gas nowadays in the villages -- I mean,
23 you have to make these choices. And we want to make
24 sure that the rural residents still have the
25 opportunity to hunt, and a license could be, and in my
26 opinion are an unnecessary burden for rural residents.
27 At least on deer.

28
29 We don't use deer data for anything,
30 and I see no reason why we need to have tags, and I
31 also see no reason why we have to have a license. I
32 mean, the data is just not used. As far as I know,
33 it's just, yeah, you guys took a bunch of deer, but we
34 don't use that. We manage deer by the snowfall. When
35 we have a bad winter, we lose deer. and it's not based
36 on hunter success or anything like that for deer as far
37 as I know. And maybe the biologists could talk on
38 that.

39
40 But I don't see any reason for this.
41 And there's no benefit -- all the benefits you're
42 talking about accrue to other than rural users as I can
43 see.

44 Other Council.

45 (No comments)

46
47
48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I guess what we
50 need from you, Mr. Knauer, is how to -- I think I would

1 like to submit a petition to the Secretary, just to see
2 where this goes, to eliminate the license fee for rural
3 residents. And that may be crafted in the form of
4 deer, it might be big game. I don't know what the
5 Council's wishes are, whether to even do it.

6
7 What I would like from you is to give
8 us the process of how we could do that and do it
9 correctly, because we want to make sure that if the
10 Regional Advisory Council was to submit a petition at a
11 later date on some other thing, they should follow this
12 procedure, and we should make sure that it's correct.
13 If you could help us out with the procedure.

14
15 MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

16
17 There is no set format for a petition
18 to the Secretaries for rule making. However, a
19 petition should contain the specific changes that you
20 would seek. In other words, what is in existence now,
21 what changes you desire to have made, the rationale for
22 making the changes, and the anticipated impacts of
23 either making or not making the changes, both on the
24 subsistence user and in this case also on the -- for
25 example, the loss of income, and if you can estimate
26 how many users, rural users in Southeast Alaska are
27 purchasing a license, and from that you can extrapolate
28 the difference in funding.

29
30 And this petition should be forwarded
31 to the Federal Subsistence Board for processing. They
32 will examine it, and then they will make a
33 recommendation to the Secretaries on it.

34
35 And your Council coordinator can help
36 you put this into -- and it can be in a letter or it
37 can be a resolution format. That makes no difference.
38 For example, on the Area M process, we had some of the
39 petitions were in letter format and some were in the
40 more formal resolution style. And both were acceptable
41 and satisfactory.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. And then
44 the resolution would be forwarded to the Federal
45 Subsistence Board for review, but addressed to the
46 Secretary of Interior and Secretary of Agriculture,
47 both in the address.

48
49 MR. KNAUER: That is correct.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

2

3 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4

5 I'm just wondering how much of an
6 outreach, you know, was made to the communities on this
7 idea. You know, I'm a strong supporter of community
8 support on any type of thing that is going to affect
9 their lives, so was there any type of information
10 sharing with the communities.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 MR. KNAUER: When the Federal
15 Subsistence Board does hold their -- a review session
16 on it, if they choose to do so, there will be a public
17 news release that will go out requesting comments on
18 it. But to date, since there's not been anything
19 formally submitted, there has been no outreach efforts.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

22

23 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah. Mr. Knauer, we're
24 seeing -- in this process we're seeing that proposals
25 are coming across to us without community support, and
26 I was kind of bouncing off of what Mr. Adams is saying,
27 do we have community support when we're going to ask
28 for -- to remove the license fee. And I was just
29 wondering if we're going to be having -- are we just
30 making it off of this body and carrying it forward, or
31 are we basing it on what somebody has requested of us.
32 I know everybody would like to get a free car and a
33 free home and a free license, but it doesn't always
34 work like that.

35

36 One of my questions that I have of the
37 money, for myself, I don't have any problem paying \$25,
38 but it has to be justified. I know the issue came up
39 last year when we dealt with the fee that was being
40 raised that would benefit hatcheries in some other city
41 and rifle ranges. I'm just wondering -- I don't mind
42 paying the fee. I've dealt with issues as a mayor
43 where they said, well, your community doesn't
44 contribute enough money into the -- I forget what the
45 account was, FRED, or something. I said, we paid
46 enough license, enough of our sport fish licenses, why
47 can't we get a new boat launch ramp? They said, because
48 you didn't -- your community doesn't really contribute.

49

50

1 If there's parity, then I'd support the
2 \$25 fee. Is there a way to know if we benefit
3 personally as a community or is it the larger
4 communities are the ones that benefit from the \$25 fee?
5

6 MR. KNAUER: We would need to get the
7 information on that from the State of Alaska,
8 Department of Fish and Game, how their budgets are
9 allocated and where the money goes. And, of course, if
10 there is an increase, and those dollars -- whether
11 they're specifically earmarked for a special project or
12 whether they go into a general pot and then it all
13 divides. It's sort of like in a household. If you've
14 got a piggy bank that you're saving for we'll say a
15 vacation trip, and all of a sudden you decide that,
16 well, my car just bit the dust, you know, that fund
17 gets moved over to replacing the car and you start your
18 vacation fund again. Whether it's a situation like
19 that where there's a shifting. So the State of Alaska
20 would have to answer that.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. As far as
23 community involvement, like I said, what triggered this
24 was the license, the doubling of the fees as well as
25 the sport fish fees. In Sitka I know the Fish and Game
26 personnel came to Sitka and made a presentation to the
27 local fish and game advisory committee. And at the
28 last meeting I reported they were almost run out of
29 town, because the -- at Sitka they were offering to
30 double our fees, and when you looked at what the Fish
31 Division gave to Sitka, it was a trout derby in Swan
32 Lake. That's where our dollars went to.

33
34 When you looked -- and then the Game
35 Department said, well, if you don't fund us, we won't
36 be able to manage deer or manage goats. Well, the
37 response was, you don't need to manage the deer,
38 because what manages the deer is the winters. And the
39 goats kind of take care of themselves, because they're
40 like at 3,000 feet high, and I don't know if there's
41 1800 of them, but they kind of take care of themselves.
42 So we get very limited amount in my opinion for the
43 \$25.

44
45 But the State of Alaska did last year
46 go around to most of the communities in Southeast, and
47 probably in Alaska, throughout Alaska they did the same
48 thing. And they were proposing new fish hatcheries in
49 Fairbanks, new fish hatcheries in Anchorage at Fort
50 Richardson, new shooting ranges, and everything was in

1 urban areas. And they attempted to say they would do
2 some things in the rural areas, like one of them said
3 they would put some money into a hatchery here, but
4 very limited on the hunting license part. They did
5 agree to make some changes on the fishing.

6

7 Mr. Schroeder.

8

9 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. The
10 reason why this is on the agenda doesn't -- it has to
11 do with a follow up for our annual report, and in the
12 annual report the Council said that it wanted to pursue
13 this, and to raise the issue of the hunting license
14 requirement, and asked how should we do this. And the
15 response from the Federal Subsistence Board was the way
16 to do this is through a petition to the Secretaries.

17

18 So I think our action item right now
19 is, one, to decide whether that continues to be the
20 Council interest, to petition the Secretaries
21 concerning the hunting requirement. And if yes, to
22 provide what Bill was saying, part of what would need
23 to be in the petition would be a rationale explaining
24 why this is an action that we believe the Secretary
25 should take. So just to kind of bring us back to the
26 item at hand here.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.
29 What's the Council's wishes. Does anybody feel the
30 same way? They want to just let it die, or do you feel
31 happy with.....

32

33 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm not going to
36 sit here and propose it. If you guys don't want to go
37 there, I don't want to go there.

38

39 Mr. Kookesh.

40

41 MR. KOOKESH: I don't think it's a
42 matter of letting it die. I believe that maybe we
43 should just follow a process and go ask the State of
44 Alaska if it's justified for them to charge us for our
45 license fees, and if it isn't, then maybe it should
46 just go away, instead of us just bypassing process and
47 just jumping up to the Secretary or whoever we're going
48 to do this -- we don't have any paper in front of us to
49 follow off of the issues, so -- but if it's justified,
50 if the State of Alaska can justify, then I'd support

1 it. If they can't, then maybe it should go away.
2 That's where I'd like to see the issue go. I don't
3 think we should just like just drop this. If we pursue
4 the issue about why you're building a hatchery
5 somewhere else and charging us for it, where we're not
6 even going to benefit, then that's something else.
7 That's an issue. But if I benefit from my fee, paying
8 my fee, then I buy into it. But if I don't, why? Why
9 should I? It's an unnecessary tax that I don't ever
10 see any benefit from.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

13
14 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.
15 Why don't we just take the next step, which is, you
16 know, prepare the rulemaking petition, prepare the
17 petition for rulemaking. And, you know, the FSB said
18 they'd, you know, provide Staff with the technical
19 support to prepare that petition.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: A good question.
22 What's the Council's wishes. That's my wish, but I
23 want to hear from the Council.

24
25 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

28
29 MS. PHILLIPS: I move that the SERAC
30 with Staff assistance prepare a petition for rulemaking
31 that contains justifications for the change in license
32 requirements for Alaska resident hunting license for
33 Federal subsistence regulations. I don't know, what am
34 I not saying? Okay. I want -- I move that the SERAC
35 with Staff assistance file a petition for rulemaking
36 for a change in license requirements, so we don't have
37 to buy a hunting license.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
40 second.

41
42 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
45 and seconded. The motion before you is to petition the
46 Secretary -- prepare a letter to petition the Secretary
47 with Staff assistance to remove the requirements for a
48 hunting license. Under discussion. Mr. Kitka.

49
50 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Just a question. Would that be just
2 for Federal subsistence.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's all we
5 can deal with is the subsistence program. We can't do
6 anything at all about those who are not able to
7 participate in this program.

8
9 Is that -- Mr. Knauer, probably you
10 should answer that.

11
12 MR. KNAUER: That is correct. And it
13 would also not apply to anyone hunting on non-Federal
14 lands.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So if you hunted
17 on State lands, you would still need a hunting license.
18 But if you kept your hunting just to Federal lands,
19 this is what this would address.

20
21 Any other Council. Mr. Kessler, do you
22 have something you can add.

23
24 MR. KESSLER: Yeah, this is Steve
25 Kessler.

26
27 Chairman Littlefield. I'm not sure
28 whether you talked about whether that would be as a
29 statewide request or a Southeast region request only.
30 And that probably needs to be identified.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't believe
33 it was in the motion. I guess -- Ms. Phillips, what
34 was your intent.

35
36 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.
37 What is your recommendation?

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would say that
40 if we make it statewide, we're going to bring everybody
41 into this. It's a discussion that every community
42 should have, rural, in the State. That would be my
43 opinion. And probably the rationale is all the same.
44 And it would flesh out the various opinions throughout
45 the State.

46
47 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield. I
48 move that be a statewide issue.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You're already

1 moved, you're just clarifying that it's statewide.
2 Does that second say okay? Does he have any problem
3 with that, Mr. Hernandez, is that it's statewide okay?

4

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: (Nods affirmative)

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

8

9 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10

11 I have the idea for reasons that you
12 stated of submitting a proposal for a Federal
13 subsistence permit to get deer, as we do for fish. You
14 would not need a hunting license, and I was going to do
15 this for Unit 2. Because there was the proposed raise
16 of fees. I didn't feel that somebody that just wants
17 to get deer meat, that he does not participate in other
18 big game. Deer is considered big game, I don't know
19 why. But they don't hunt -- they don't get anything
20 else. All they want is meat. And I didn't feel that
21 they should have to pay a fee like that for something
22 that they use to eat. And I may have discussed it with
23 you in the past. And that would have been my idea of
24 non-requirement for a hunting license, for just
25 specific to deer in a specific area, rural users. I
26 would support something like that as it may have a
27 possibility of going forward. I don't think anything
28 other than for a lot of different reasons would have
29 any possibility of going anywhere.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

32 I know that for many years now we've been able to
33 secure Federal subsistence permits for our camp to take
34 deer on Federal land during our camps. One of the
35 requirements is that we have to have a hunting license,
36 and I really think that's inconsistent with hunting a
37 deer on rural lands that we have to have that hunting
38 license.

39

40 So I hope that the information here if
41 we were to accept this will flesh out all of that.
42 There's many things that the ADF&G has done in the
43 Wildlife Division that I personally find objectionable.
44 And this last round, requiring me to carry my tags in
45 sequential order. I don't think that serves any
46 purpose. And some other things like that, requiring --
47 you know, disabling our designated hunter program a few
48 years ago by not allowing kids under 10 to get tags.

49

50 All those things I think deserve

1 review, and I hope that Staff will put this together so
2 that we'll have a -- and I don't know whether we're
3 going to get this back or not. We need to review the
4 letter, and maybe Dr. Schroeder could give us -- if we
5 were to approve this, what would be the process of how
6 we would get the information in that letter.

7
8 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. Clearly
9 this is a big issue that could use quite a bit of
10 discussion. I think the first step is to decide
11 whether you want to go this route, and then the Council
12 needs sufficient time to direct a rationale if this is
13 something that is going out and will be reviewed very
14 carefully, which I'm sure it will be. And Staff would
15 definitely assist with writing up a petition. The
16 rationale should essentially come from the Council's
17 thoughts and the subsistence users' thoughts on this.

18
19 We may consider, if we're far enough
20 along, a petition could be submitted following this
21 meeting. If not, it would be under development, and
22 we'd have to do it as a hold-over for a later meeting.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So my
25 recommendation would be if we accept this that at the
26 next meeting we would have the draft from Staff that
27 carries all the evidence at the next meeting, and then
28 we would review it at that time and submit it in next
29 time. Time is not of the essence. We don't have to
30 react to this immediately right now. And that would --
31 if we can direct Staff through this motion to gather
32 all this information and in this format, and then when
33 we meet in Saxman, we can decide whether we want to
34 submit that or not. Would that be -- timing-wise, I
35 don't think that's a problem with anybody, is it?

36
37 MR. KOOKESH: May I say something.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

40
41 MR. KOOKESH: You mentioned gathering
42 information. Does that also include -- does that also
43 include like I was requesting earlier, what the benefit
44 is for -- you know, use for example Angoon in terms of
45 what happens to the \$9 million. Is that part of the
46 information you're going to gather? Because I'd like
47 to see the numbers if we're going to -- I don't want to
48 impose it must to impose it because they did something
49 else we didn't like about something else, you know.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: How about if we
2 direct Staff to contact all of the communities in
3 Southeast Alaska, as well as all of the tribal
4 entities. Would that be sufficient? And, of course,
5 we would want to make sure we do that before the next
6 meeting. I mean, send a letter out saying we're
7 considering doing this, and if they have concern, we'd
8 certainly want to -- we'd want to consider those before
9 we made a decision. Is that too onerous, Dr.
10 Schroeder?

11
12 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, we could --
13 if we followed your suggestion, there would be a
14 petition prepared for the next Council meeting. That
15 would need to be circulated before the Council meeting,
16 either if it made the cut for the Council book or
17 through a separate mailing, that would be possible to
18 do.

19
20 If I could add, part of the discussion
21 today went to -- has been on whether or not or what the
22 benefit is from the license fees that are paid. And
23 I'm assuming that Mr. Kookesh wished for Staff to
24 discuss how Wildlife Conservation and the State spends
25 its license money so that you could evaluate whether
26 this was a good use of your tax dollars. Is that
27 correct?

28
29 MR. KOOKESH: (Nods affirmative)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's the
32 intent. Can you do that?

33
34 DR. SCHROEDER: Yes, we can do that.
35 Perhaps I'm -- I'm looking at Marianne and Doug and
36 seeing if they're nodding to provide assistance on
37 this.

38
39 MR. McBRIDE: You bet.

40
41 DR. SCHROEDER: That sounds like an
42 affirmative.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So that
45 would be what would happen if we were to accept this
46 would be that at the next meeting we'll have everybody
47 putting some data in, the State as well as the Federal
48 Staff. Appropriate notice to people to comment if they
49 wish to at the next meeting. And then we can either
50 take action or not. This is just to put it -- we're

1 not writing the petition now, we're just authorizing
2 that it be prepared in a format and with substantial
3 data that we can review at the next meeting.

4
5 Is there further discussion on that.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready
10 for the question. All those in favor signify by saying
11 aye.

12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And those
16 opposed, same sign.

17
18 (No opposing votes)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So I think our
21 intentions are clear there what we want.

22
23 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

26
27 DR. GARZA: We do have a tribal member,
28 Kevin Kristovich -- did he give up on us again? No,
29 he's here. With OVK who wants to present.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: OVK? I think of
32 it as -- anyway, come forward and you have the floor.

33
34 MR. KRISTOVICH: Thank you, Mr.
35 Chairman. Good afternoon. Members of the Board. My
36 name is Kevin Kristovich, and I'm a tribal council
37 member and the subsistence coordinator for the
38 Organized Village of Kasaan.

39
40 Today we are going to have a
41 presentation on adult steelhead population assessments
42 on Prince of Wales Island. And this was a
43 collaborative project between many agencies as you can
44 see on the screen there. We have the Bureau of Indian
45 Affairs, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, U.S.
46 Forest Service, the Organized Village of Kasaan, and
47 the Hydaburg Cooperative Association.

48
49 The Organized Village of Kasaan
50 provided a major role in this by providing employment

1 to local native residents, and they were solely
2 responsible for supervising and operating this project.

3
4 Next slide, please. The purpose of the
5 project is to collect data on adult spawning
6 populations, run timing, and age, sex, length
7 characteristics within a subset of Prince of Wales
8 Island streams that support steelhead harvest by local
9 subsistence users.

10
11 Next slide, please. Study objectives.
12 Traditional local knowledge was used in selecting these
13 sites. The study objectives are to estimate the
14 abundance of returning adult spring steelhead in seven
15 Prince of Wales Island streams. Quantitatively
16 estimate the age, sex and length composition of each
17 steelhead run. Evaluate the effectiveness of snorkel
18 surveying versus weir studies.

19
20 Next slide. There is a shot of snorkel
21 surveys being done. These were done under normal or
22 excellent visibility conditions.

23
24 Next slide, please. That is the Harris
25 River weir in that shot.

26
27 Next slide. The results of the 2005
28 Harris River project was between March.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a
31 question on that. Can you field the question of Mr.
32 Kookesh.

33
34 MR. KOOKESH: Can I ask you a question?

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go for it.

37
38 MR. KOOKESH: Can we ask questions
39 while they're doing this?

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yeah.

42
43 MR. KOOKESH: What was that snorkeling?
44 What are they doing? The snorkel. That one.

45
46 MR. KRISTOVICH: Yeah, I was not part
47 of this, but they just go in the water I guess and look
48 around. Glenn will have the answer for that.

49
50 DR. CHEN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Kookesh.

1 Snorkel surveys as you heard yesterday are being used
2 widely throughout the region to try to estimate numbers
3 of steelhead in streams. And the idea is you send in
4 teams of people with snorkel gear to visually count
5 fish. And these are done at periodic intervals
6 throughout the run.

7
8 And so one of the things that we were
9 trying to do in project was to see how accurate these
10 visual snorkel counts were by putting a weir on the
11 system and then somewhat hastily doing snorkel counts
12 throughout the run. So then we could see how accurate
13 the snorkel counts turn out to be.

14
15 But it's basically just a method where
16 people again don dry suits and masks and snorkel and
17 just swim the stream and count fish that they see.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And your name
20 is?

21
22 DR. CHEN: For the record, my name is
23 Glenn Chen. I'm with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

24
25 MR. KOOKESH: Is that like a common
26 thing, or is it like a test kind of a project or --
27 snorkeling? Experiment?

28
29 DR. CHEN: Snorkel visual surveys are
30 employed in a variety of systems throughout the country
31 to count fish in streams, and this has proven to be a
32 useful method, particularly because the fish aren't
33 harmed. So, for example, a lot of biologists have
34 tried electroshocking where an electrical current is
35 induced in the water. Studies have shown that
36 electroshocking can harm fish, especially juvenile
37 fish. And so in many systems snorkeling was developed
38 as an alternative method for trying to count fish in
39 streams that is less lethal.

40
41 MR. KRISTOVICH: Okay. As you can see
42 here on the screen, the results of the 2005 project in
43 the Harris River between March 17th and May 25, 2005.
44 The minimum spawning escapement was estimated at 171
45 steelhead. Age, sex and length data is still being
46 analyzed at this time. On the average, 76 percent of
47 the weir count was observed during snorkel surveys
48 under normal to excellent visibility conditions.

49
50 Here we have a graph of the Harris

1 River steelhead weir upstream migration. The blue
2 line, which would be like the dots, represents the
3 cumulative amount of fish coming into the Harris River.
4 The red bars are the daily counts of fish.

5
6 Next slide. This is the Ratz Creek
7 weir that you're looking at. It's on the east side of
8 Prince of Wales Island, Clarence Strait area.

9
10 Next slide. The 2005 results of Big
11 Ratz Creek, between March 11th and May 31st, 2005, the
12 minimum spawning escapement was estimated at 399 fish.
13 Age, sex and length data is still being analyzed at
14 this time. On the average, 28 percent of the weir
15 count was observed during the snorkel surveys under
16 poor to normal visibility conditions.

17
18 And here you have a bar graph and dot
19 chart of the Ratz Creek steelhead weir upstream
20 migration. The blue line indicates the cumulative
21 number of steelhead coming into the system over time.
22 The red bars indicate the daily steelhead counts over
23 time.

24
25 Next slide. Potential 2006 study sites
26 are Eagle Creek, Salmon Bay Creek, Klawak River, Cable
27 Creek, Thorne River, 12-Mile Creek, Shaheen Cove and
28 Natzahuni (ph) Creek. Potential sites for multi-year
29 data: Harris River, Big Ratz Creek and Carter River.

30
31 That's it. One more thing before I
32 leave, I'd like to thank the Council for supporting
33 this, and without your support, this project probably
34 would have never happened.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you for
39 that. I have a question for you. The 399 fish like
40 from Ratz Creek, how does that compare with the
41 previous figures or the data? Do we have any data on
42 those streams that we can compare that to at this time?

43
44 DR. CHEN: Mr. Chairman. I'm glad you
45 asked that question about Ratz Creek. That was an eye
46 opener for us in the study, because Ratz Creek was
47 considered for management purposes to be a small
48 population stream, i.e. having 100 or so or less of
49 adult steelhead. When we put the weir in, as you
50 noticed, we counted 399 fish, and the fish were

1 entering the weir right up until the time that we
2 pulled the weir out. So this certainly points to the
3 value of having weirs as a method of assessing
4 populations of steelhead on the island. Again, it
5 definitely contrasted with what we thought originally
6 would be the population for Big Ratz Creek.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. And
9 then a question for perhaps Mr. Johnson or Mr. Casipit.
10 Was Ratz Creek on the areas receiving special permit
11 conditions on POW?

12
13 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair. Just give me
14 a second to look at that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Hernandez.

17
18 MR. HERNANDEZ: While Cal's looking
19 that up, I was just going to ask, wasn't Harris River
20 also considered one of the major steelhead producers on
21 the island, and that turned out to be a good bit less
22 of a count than Ratz in the weirs. Is that -- am I
23 correct about Harris River?

24
25 DR. CHEN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Hernandez.
26 That's correct. Again, we initially thought that
27 Harris had what we considered a large population of
28 fish, maybe on the order of three to 500 fish. But
29 again as the weir count showed us, we counted 171 fish.
30 And so it again points to the value of putting actual
31 weirs in these streams and actually getting accurate
32 counts.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I guess we could
35 do this later, Mr. Casipit. It's just that I think it
36 shows the importance of this. You know, we had a
37 stream that we thought had under 100, so in my
38 recollection, it was one that deserved special
39 consideration, and now we show it as four or 500, so I
40 think this is pretty valuable work you're doing. The
41 rest of these streams, I think it's really an important
42 number that we'll be able to maybe either deflect some
43 criticism, or correct some things that we had
44 misconceptions on.

45
46 Are there any other comments for the
47 presenters. Dr. Garza.

48
49 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

1 And thank you, Mr. Kristovich and Mr.
2 Chen for the presentation. It's excellent. And I
3 think it shows -- it's an excellent work of
4 cooperation. I know that ADF&G was involved with it.
5 And it involved training locals to conduct research,
6 and so for me, I mean, it was an all-around success.
7 And to have data that we can look at so quickly is much
8 more exciting than to have to wait several years and
9 almost forget what your concern was before you can look
10 at the data. So congratulations.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
13 Kristovich, and Dr. Chen, thank you.

14
15 MR. KRISTOVICH: Thank you, Mr.
16 Littlefield and members of the board.

17
18 One thing I'd like to add before we
19 leave. Traditional local knowledge was used in
20 selecting these sites, and it will be used to select
21 other sites in the program.

22
23 Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

26
27 MR. ADAMS: Now that you mention that,
28 Mr. Kristovich, could you just share with me how you
29 conducted those TEK projects? Or that -- you know,
30 what did you do? I'm curious.

31
32 MR. KRISTOVICH: Mr. Adams, that was
33 all done before I came on board with the tribe. Maybe
34 Glenn would have that answer for you.

35
36 DR. CHEN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Adams.

37
38 A key part of our selection of study
39 sites was based on the work that Mike Turek did with
40 the Subsistence Division, and so as you know he
41 interviewed a lot of the high harvesting communities
42 and got some specific location data where people
43 harvested steelhead in the past and where they still
44 harvest. And so that local knowledge that Mr. Turek
45 was able to gather was really key for helping us select
46 study sites. And as Mr. Kristovich mentioned, we're
47 going to continue to use that information to select
48 sites in both 2006 and 2007.

49
50 MR. ADAMS: All right. I just have a

1 comment to make about that. I'm, you know, a real big
2 supporter of TEK projects. And when we did our Dry Bay
3 one several years ago the purpose for that was to have
4 in documentation form, you know, how our native people,
5 you know, managed their resources, because we did have
6 ways and means of managing our resources long before
7 the Western society came in. And so we were able to
8 document that. And the purpose for that was to be able
9 to have that documented so that when we do any
10 management schemes, you know, for our systems, then we
11 can bridge it with Western science and use TEK project
12 and come up with a real good, you know, management
13 scheme. So that's why I was curious, you know.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank
18 you.

19

20 The next item on the agenda will be
21 12.C. subsistence use amounts, Dr. Schroeder.

22

23 DR. GARZA: And before we jump on that,
24 I also do want to mention on this steelhead project
25 that this is the second time that we have used
26 information that Mike Turek gathered from the TEK
27 project on steelhead for Prince of Wales. The first
28 one was when we changed the gear to allow traditional
29 gear types to be used on Prince of Wales. That was
30 based on the information he pulled together from local
31 uses and then using that information to get a feel for
32 what streams we should be working on now. So we need
33 to keep in mind how important TEK is.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder.

36

37 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, item
38 12.C. is another response to Council action. The -- to
39 Federal Board action. The Council requested the
40 Federal Subsistence Board allow the Council to form a
41 subcommittee to examine subsistence use amounts in
42 Southeast communities. What I suggest we do with that
43 item is similar to what we did with the petition item
44 is hold that over until our Saxman meeting when Staff
45 will be able to come up with a plan for how to approach
46 subsistence -- the formation of a subsistence use
47 amount subcommittee.

48

49 The Federal Board in its response to
50 our annual report received in August said that they'd

1 consider our request for a subcommittee if we told them
2 much more specifically what we wanted to do, how it
3 would be formed and what would come out of it. We're
4 not in a position to do that right now, or to develop
5 that in the short amount of time that we have available
6 today.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Until Saxman or
9 the next meeting?

10
11 DR. SCHROEDER: The next meeting is in
12 Saxman.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I know, but hold
15 over until when?

16
17 DR. SCHROEDER: I'd suggest holding
18 this over until our next meeting in Saxman.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We'll
21 hold that over until the next one.

22
23 The next item on the agenda is comments
24 on Board of Fish proposals, but before we do that, I'm
25 going to skip all the way to the end.

26
27 Let's go to the last page there. We
28 just talked about where the meetings were going to be,
29 and we need to -- two things we should do before we get
30 done is confirm the wildlife meeting in Saxman as well
31 as establish dates and venue for the fall of 2006. If
32 anybody has to leave, I'd like to get these items taken
33 care of.

34
35 Dr. Schroeder, could you tell us, I
36 think it's the last of the book, but.....

37
38 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we were
39 invited to Saxman by the Saxman representative. And we
40 had tentatively agreed to meet in Saxman for our coming
41 meeting. In the back of your Council book, on page 245
42 and 246 you'll see meeting window calendars. The
43 meeting window for our fall meeting, we identified the
44 week of February -- excuse me, for our winter meeting,
45 we identified the week of February 27th as the time
46 that we wanted to meet in Saxman. So what would be
47 appropriate at this time would be to confirm that
48 meeting.

49
50 And also, Mr. Chair, we had some side

1 discussions about how we seem to have trouble
2 completing our agendas in the time available, and there
3 was a suggestion to schedule a four-day meeting during
4 that week.

5
6 So perhaps you could discuss those two
7 items and provide some direction.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Previous
10 action selected Saxman. Does anyone have any objection
11 to continuing the meeting site as in Saxman. Is that
12 okay with any -- any objection to that.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. And then
17 the second item was the length of the meeting. Down at
18 the bottom it says that we were going to do three days.
19 Some discussion is we're -- the same thing that happens
20 at every meeting, we run out of time, and I think we
21 should consider a four-day meeting.

22
23 Council recommendations. Dr. Garza.

24
25 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would also
26 recommend a four-day meeting, because I think we will
27 have proposals on Unit 2 deer, Unuk moose, and I think
28 we will have substantial testimony.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's my
31 thought, too. Is there -- I know everyone has to give
32 up something to attend these, and I know it's a burden
33 to do this, but I really think we need four days to do
34 this correctly. So if there's no objection that, we
35 should pick which four days we want to go.

36
37 Mr. Adams.

38
39 MR. ADAMS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I
40 would support, you know, those days.

41
42 Just to let you know that the SRC will
43 be meeting the week of the 20th. I think it's going to
44 be the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So there's no
47 conflict for the next week for you to have your reports
48 and all that.

49
50 What four days do we want to pick. Dr.

1 Garza.

2

3 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, the flight 62
4 comes in like at 11, so we could start at 1:00 o'clock
5 on Monday and go until Friday, and allow you guys to
6 leave on the afternoon flight. Otherwise you're going
7 to come in and you're going to have nothing to do until
8 the next day, on Tuesday. There aren't many options in
9 and out of Ketchikan from the north.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Your
12 recommendation is to come in on the morning of the
13 27th, start the meeting at 1:00 p.m. Monday, end on
14 Friday in the morning sometime so everyone can get out
15 on Friday for the weekend.

16

17 Council. Is there any objection to
18 this. I know it probably won't fit anyone, but I think
19 we need to allow ourselves a little bit more time for
20 these meetings.

21

(No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder.

24

25 DR. SCHROEDER: No. We can complete
26 this item, and then I had something else.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield If
31 we're going to extend them, you know, there's just the
32 possibility that I will not be able to attend the whole
33 meeting. And I just wanted to forewarn you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank
36 you. Everybody has a life to do, and I know you're
37 very busy. So these things unfortunately take some of
38 our time, so hopefully you'll be able attend. But that
39 may happen to other Council members, too, as well.

40

41 Let's flip over to the next page. Dr.
42 Schroeder, can you tell us about the windows here.

43

44 DR. SCHROEDER: Yes, the next window
45 will be for our fall, our next year's meeting. Fall
46 2006.

47

48 Just before we do that, I also had side
49 discussions with Council members. We have had an

50

1 occasional teleconference meeting which is easier for
2 people to attend, and it's also cost effective for the
3 Federal Government, and we may explore the possibility
4 of dealing with some issues through teleconference
5 meetings if that's the interest of the Council.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think that's
8 pretty good. If we can pick one subject, one or two
9 subjects that we can dispense of in an afternoon or
10 something like that. I think it makes good sense. I
11 don't have any objection to looking into that.

12
13 DR. SCHROEDER: I think that would
14 potentially save a lot of money for one thing, but also
15 volunteer time. And we don't want to use up our
16 volunteers, and appreciate your participation.

17
18 The one thing that is difficult is that
19 for the Council to meet, we need to have a noticed
20 meeting, and that requires work by Staff to put in a
21 Federal Register notice and to go through those steps.
22 And I see Bill Knauer nodding there, because he's the
23 person who's been helping us with those things.

24
25 Our fall meeting window is open as you
26 see from August 28th until October 20th. At this
27 moment it's essentially wide open for us to choose a
28 date. Unless there's a pressing reason for scheduling
29 over the end of the fiscal year, it works much better
30 for Staff to not hold a meeting that begins say on the
31 29th and continues to the 2nd. So that's the one
32 qualification I'd put on here.

33
34 So beyond that, what we found in
35 scheduling our fall meetings in other years is that
36 commercial fishing is usually pretty busy early in
37 September. Some lucky individuals go moose hunting mid
38 September. And we've tended to end up pretty close to
39 this time of the year, the last week of September or
40 the first week or two of October. The Alaska Native
41 Brotherhood Grand Camp typically meets the first week
42 of October. Perhaps Council Member Adams knows the
43 schedule for next year. And late in the month we --
44 quite typically AFN meets quite often October 16th or
45 so. I don't have the schedules for those.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So we
48 have two things we've got to do here for the fall of
49 2006 meeting. We've got to select a place and then
50 we've got to pick the date, so let's go first with the

1 place.

2

3 Mr. Kitka.

4

5 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chairman, I'll
6 volunteer Sitka.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Sitka. I
9 think -- we're hitting Saxman at our next meeting, and
10 we're going to have rural review. And I think we're
11 going to have rural subjects at this.

12

13 Mr. Kookesh.

14

15 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. As a
16 representative for Southeast, I've been to most
17 communities. Maybe I've been to -- I have also been to
18 Sitka in my six years on the Council. I'd like to -- I
19 believe we should spread ourselves out and go to Kake
20 or Haines, those communities, or Pelican. I don't know
21 about Pelican, but.....

22

23 (Laughter)

24

25 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, I don't want to go
26 there. But I think we need to go to communities that
27 we represent other than those ones that we normally
28 will be going to.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Gustavus on
31 September 15th.

32

33 (Laughter)

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do we have any
36 requests, Dr. Schroeder, that you know of from any
37 community, have they expressed an interest in having us
38 attend?

39

40 DR. SCHROEDER: No, I don't have
41 anything at this moment for that advanced time. Let's
42 see, Bill, did you have something for us?

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The request from
45 Sitka came from Mr. Kitka. Mr. Adams.

46

47 MR. ADAMS: Notwithstanding the fact
48 that I consider Sitka my second home. If I were to
49 move from Yakutat, that's where I would move to,
50 because of my strong ties there. but I feel like my

1 friend Kookesh here that maybe we ought to give other
2 communities an opportunity, you know, like Kake or
3 Haines. I hope somewhere down the line, you know, we
4 might even consider Yakutat, you know, maybe about 10
5 years from now.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. This
10 obviously is a Council decision. I will point out that
11 the rural determination issue is likely to be pretty
12 hot at that time at our fall meeting next year. If the
13 Federal Subsistence Board schedule is followed, the
14 Federal Subsistence Board will be making a decision on
15 rural designations in December of 2006, and I would
16 suspect that Sitka may have a great deal of interest in
17 this. A meeting in Sitka would allow greater
18 participation by people who were affected by that
19 decision.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

22

23 DR. GARZA: I guess I have to
24 respectfully disagree with that, because it will go
25 into the Federal Register by sometime the end of June,
26 and the October meeting isn't going to mean anything in
27 terms of rural. The decision will have been made,
28 unless you can argue the Federal Register successfully,
29 and that won't be done through the regional advisory
30 process.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Knauer,
33 could you give us the dates of the proposed rule and
34 the final rule.

35

36 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, we would
37 anticipate that the proposed rule would go into the
38 Federal Register probably June or July of '06, and that
39 would be the proposed rule with comments during the
40 fall Council meetings. And then the Federal
41 Subsistence Board would -- I think the schedule is for
42 the Federal Subsistence Board to make the final
43 decision in December of '06. So the fall Council
44 window is a very appropriate time for communities and
45 interested people to comment.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So it's at the
48 proposed rule stage in October at our next meeting.

49

50 Okay. We have -- were you suggesting

1 -- did you want Yakutat, and were you -- because how we
2 normally do this, we just vote for, you know, if
3 there's five communities, we just go through and pick
4 the numbers. We've been to Kake, we've been to
5 Hydaburg.

6

7 MR. STOKES: How about Hawaii.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'd say
10 Scottsdale in October would be pretty nice.

11

12 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

15

16 MR. ADAMS: Well, I just threw in
17 Yakutat as, you know, as consideration for the future,
18 and not, you know, right away. I'd be in favor of
19 either -- you know, I'd be in favor of Kake.

20

21 But let me just tell you a little bit
22 about Yakutat if I might. We're in the process of
23 really doing a major repair on our ANB Hall. I mean,
24 we're not talking about pennies. We're going to sink
25 maybe about three or \$4 million into it. And probably
26 around, you know, after 2008 or during 2008, you know,
27 we will have it all completed, and then we're going to
28 start inviting everybody there, because we're going to
29 have a little museum in it and everything.

30

31 So we can talk about that, you know, at
32 our next meeting possibly, Mr. Chairman, but I just
33 thought I'd throw that out.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Sounds
36 remarkably similar to the James P. Nolan Building
37 request. We would do that certainly I would hope.

38

39 Dr. Garza.

40

41 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, the invite to
42 Saxman came from me and did not come from Saxman. I
43 had to go to them and say, gee, was this is a good
44 idea. And so we can invite ourselves to a community we
45 haven't actually gotten an invite from and hope that
46 they'll honor it.

47

48 But I do agree with our two members
49 from -- our Council members from Sitka that it could be
50 a fairly big meeting. We may need Saxman people there.

1 We may need Ketchikan people there. So for this
2 particular meeting, we may need a lot of hotel space.
3 And for that reason, I would go for Sitka.

4
5 And for the future I think that these
6 two men on the end are right. I mean, we need to start
7 soliciting invites from communities that aren't
8 represented on this Council. From Haines, from
9 Skagway, from Kake, Gustavus.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What's the
12 Council's wishes? We have two for Kake, is that -- two
13 for Kake. Is anybody else -- I know we have several
14 for Sitka. Is anybody proposing anything else.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I guess,
19 let's just -- if you want to go to Sitka -- let's do it
20 this way. If you want to go to Kake, raise your hand,
21 for the next meetings. If you want to go to
22 Scottsdale, raise your hand.

23
24 (Laughter)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. If you
27 want to go to Sitka for the next meeting, raise your
28 hand. For the fall meeting, 2006. Okay. We will
29 schedule the meeting place for the fall 2006 meeting to
30 be Sitka.

31
32 And now we need to discuss the dates.
33 We generally stay away from the September through the
34 20th because of the troll. I know Mr. Wright had a
35 problem this year with crab. October 10th usually is
36 the fall fishing opening. So none of these dates are
37 really good.

38
39 MS. PHILLIPS: The 12th, 13th and 14th.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And again I
42 would suggest at least a four-day meeting.

43
44 MS. PHILLIPS: September 12th, 13th and
45 14th.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's a
48 Saturday, the 14th, and I think we're going to get in
49 big trouble from the Feds.

50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: What about -- I mean,
2 we've got those hunters, you know.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What about
5 Saturdays, Federal Staff?
6
7 DR. GARZA: Patty, you were saying
8 September 12th, 13th, 14th. You could throw in 15th.
9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: That's troll season is
11 going.
12
13 MR. DOUVILLE: (Indiscernible,
14 microphone not on)
15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yeah, we've had
17 this discussion several times. And it seems to me that
18 early September had always been ruled out, because it
19 affected too many people, their activities, summer
20 activities of fishing.
21
22 Mr. Adams.
23
24 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, you know, you
25 asked me if I knew -- or I guess it was Dr. Schroeder,
26 when the ANB conventions were going to be, and he
27 alluded maybe to the first week of October. I'm not
28 sure about that. I know they have been playing around
29 with dates and all that. But I'm not positive.
30
31 That would be a good date for me. And
32 the reason I would like to have it then is.....
33
34 MR. KOOKESH: What date?
35
36 MR. ADAMS: The first week of October.
37 I haven't been on a moose hunt with my kids for a long
38 time now, and they've been going out and getting them,
39 you know, without me. And I'd kind of like to go this
40 next time if I can. But, you know, it's up to this
41 Council. If they want to have -- it seems like the
42 most logical time would be that -- you know, the week
43 of the 8th, but I just want to, you know, put in a plug
44 for another time if we can.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Well, that would
47 be very similar to what happened this last time. We'd
48 put in for a week earlier and we ended up putting the
49 date back. So again we just selected days out of a
50 week, so if the week of October 2nd is your choice,

1 then fine with me.

2

3 MR. STOKES: That would be good.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The week of
6 October -- we'll just block out the 2nd to the 6th and
7 try to pick -- at the next meeting we'll refine that,
8 and it may be that we have to change it back a week.
9 Something might come up. Is that okay? Mr. Douville.

10

11 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. You're
12 talking about October?

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, that would
15 be October 2nd to the 6th in 2006. Okay. Dr.
16 Schroeder, let's just block those days out. We'll
17 refine that at our next meeting and we'll probably have
18 some new information at that time. We may have to
19 change it. But tentatively it will be October 2nd to
20 the 6th, and we'll pick either three or four days out
21 of there. We'll refine that at our next meeting.

22

23 Okay. Comments on Board of Fishery
24 proposals. Cal Casipit, Bob Larson.

25

26 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 Just to answer from the previous
29 discussion on whether or not Big Ratz Creek was on the
30 list of small streams with special restrictions, and I
31 just wanted to confirm for the Council on the record
32 that, yes, indeed it was considered a small stream with
33 the two fish per household, one fish daily limit, and
34 the 24-hour harvest reporting, rod and reel only -- or
35 rod and reel, dipnet, spear, and handline that began on
36 April 1.

37

38 So now I'll skip over to the Board of
39 Fish. Currently Federal Staff is working with the
40 Office of Subsistence Management to prepare Federal
41 Staff comments on Board of Fish proposals that we feel
42 require our input. And I would be happy to go over
43 that list of proposals at this time.

44

45 Under the subsistence and personal use
46 proposals under the Board of Fish's schedule, we're
47 looking at number 118, that's review of C&T in ANS for
48 salmon. We are looking at Proposal 119 that creates a
49 Stikine River State subsistence fishery, and at the end
50 of what I do here, I would like to talk a little bit

1 more about that. Proposal 120 deals with lawful gear
2 for obtaining salmon, and that would be -- the specific
3 proposal is to allow the use of a bow and arrow.

4
5 For management plan proposals, we have
6 on our list number 123, Taku River king salmon winter
7 troll fishery. We have 132, again king salmon,
8 District 8 gillnet specifications and operations. For
9 Proposal 115, the Southeast Alaska enhanced salmon
10 allocation management plan.

11
12 DR. GARZA: What was that?

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Wait, what's
15 that number?

16
17 MR. CASIPIT: 155, 1-5-5. Number 169,
18 District 12, Hidden Falls hatchery terminal harvest
19 area salmon management plan. This is related to the
20 proposal that you got from Ben VanAlan last night.
21 Proposal 197, fishing seasons in the Yakutat District,
22 Alsek River. And then the -- and then 198 regards
23 reporting of steelhead landings in the net fishery.
24 That's Proposal 198 for steelhead. Then we have
25 Proposal 215 dealing with pink salmon, and that's
26 methods and means, bag and possession, size limits in
27 fresh water for pink salmon.

28
29 And those are the proposals that
30 Federal Staff are working on with OSM to prepare
31 Federal comments. Is there any questions with that
32 before I move on.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: How about 217.

35
36 MR. CASIPIT: 217. At this time we do
37 not have anybody assigned to 217.

38
39 DR. GARZA: Cal, I sat down and missed
40 the first two. I started with 120. Did you have a
41 couple before that?

42
43 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, 118, 119.

44
45 So at this point I'd like to talk a
46 little bit about 119, that's to create a State
47 subsistence fishery on the Stikine River. We recently
48 received some comments from Fish and Game that they
49 would like to address the Council on, and at this time
50 I'd like to call Marianne See up to introduce those

1 comments. And then I may have some additional follow-
2 up information after Marianne is done.

3

4 DR. GARZA: And before you start there,
5 I just want to let you know that there is some black
6 seaweed back there, and that's from the Craig area that
7 Dave Johnson and I harvested.

8

9 MS. SEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
10 the record my name is Marianne See with Fish and Game.

11

12 And normally Deputy Commissioner David
13 Bedford has been the main contact on this, but I bring
14 this information after consultation with him.

15

16 When the Federal subsistence fishery
17 for the Stikine was negotiated as required with Canada,
18 the terms of agreement specified a Federal subsistence
19 fishery for Federally qualified users.

20

21 And this is a very important point,
22 because the issue now is proposing a State subsistence
23 fishery, and that includes different criteria. A State
24 subsistence fishery would be open to all Alaskans.
25 Therefore a State subsistence fishery would not be
26 consistent with the agreement that was negotiated with
27 Canada. So this is a very problematic point.

28

29 It's the State's understanding that the
30 current Federal subsistence fishery provides the
31 opportunity for subsistence users that was originally
32 requested by the Council and the Federal Subsistence
33 Board. The State supports, as we noted yesterday, the
34 process to obtain additional proposed adjustments, such
35 as gear and season dates as are proposed currently in
36 Federal Proposals 27 and 28.

37

38 However, if a new State subsistence
39 fishery was created, it would be outside the scope of
40 the current negotiated agreement, and that situation
41 would be very problematic.

42

43 As stated in the Board of Fish proposal
44 book, there's already a State finding of customary and
45 traditional use for salmon in the Stikine. Thus, a
46 request for a subsistence fishery that would go to
47 Board of Fish, and any such request, where a customary
48 and traditional determination already exists would be
49 fully considered by Board of Fish, and would normally
50 we would expect, would be approved.

1 So once the proposal -- once any
2 proposal is submitted to the Board of Fish, it cannot
3 be withdrawn by the original proponent. And actually
4 this is very much like the way things operate in the
5 Federal system. That's also true with the Federal
6 Subsistence Board. However, the Board of Fish would
7 carefully consider a request from a proponent to take
8 no action on a proposal. And this again is essentially
9 the same as sometimes happens with the Federal Board.
10 We note that a request to the Board of Fish to take no
11 action would not have any effect on the current Federal
12 subsistence fishery. It would, however, provide a way
13 to be consistent with the negotiated agreement with
14 Canada.

15
16 And I'd be happy to answer any
17 questions about that, but Cal Casipit and Bob Larson
18 and I have discussed this at length, and I think they
19 may have some additional comments.

20
21 Mr. Chair.

22
23 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, Mr. Chair. As you
24 know, this proposal, 119, was submitted by this
25 Regional Advisory Council to create the State
26 subsistence fishery. As Marianne alluded to, that the
27 Board would probably, you know, pass this proposal. It
28 would have to be negotiated with the Canadians through
29 the Panel process and, you know, all the way up through
30 the Pacific Salmon Commission. I think the Council is
31 well aware of the kinds of negotiations and back and
32 forth that it took just to get our little Federal
33 fishery recognized.

34
35 I'm sure that if it was a State
36 fishery, since it would be a larger group of qualified
37 individuals, that is, all residents of the State of
38 Alaska, that this would create quite a stir in the
39 treaty process, and I'm not sure that the chaos and
40 confusion that would ensue from that would be in the
41 best interest of our Federally qualified users.

42
43 That's kind of what I wanted to say
44 about that, but the proposal is the Council's, and the
45 Council has the ultimate say on whether or not -- where
46 they want to go with this. I'm not sure if Bob has
47 much to add to that, but that's kind of where we're at.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Where are we
50 here? Your recommendation is that we tell the Board

1 that we want to take no action on Proposal 119?

2

3 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, we are asking that
4 you consider that, yes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you also
7 recommending that we increase the bag limits and loosen
8 up the harvest for the Federal program?

9

10 MS. SEE: My comments don't address
11 those points, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. What's
14 the Council's wishes. We have -- Dr. Garza.

15

16 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would move
17 that we accept the recommendation of ADF&G and ask the
18 Board of Fish to take no action on Proposal 119.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
21 second.

22

23 MR. ADAMS: Second.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
26 and seconded to support the ADF&G recommendation on
27 Proposal 119 that we take no action. Dr. Garza.

28

29 DR. GARZA: I would like to note it's
30 probably the first time I've ever moved that we accept
31 the recommendation of ADF&G, but I do agree with the
32 same points that were brought up. I've talked to
33 people on the Transboundary side, on the Canadian side,
34 and if it looks like it's opened to anything broader
35 than the communities that we have, it will not be
36 accepted.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
39 reason I can accept this is because most of the
40 subsistence users, quote/unquote, that we consider in
41 the Federal program are covered by this. So there
42 would be very little effect on people, except if
43 somebody wanted to come from an area that we know would
44 trigger a bunch of stuff, so I don't have any problem
45 with it.

46

47 Any other Council.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready
2 for the question. The question before the Council is
3 to accept the State ADF&G recommendation on Proposal
4 119 and make a recommendation to the Board of Fish that
5 they take no action. All those in favor please signify
6 by saying aye.

7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed,
11 same sign.

12
13 (No opposing votes)

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We will forward
16 that, Dr. Schroeder, to them on 119. We may have
17 others, so at this time we would go to --let's go
18 backwards to 118. This is where we're going to extract
19 the quid pro quo.

20
21 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, would you like
22 me to introduce that, or would you like to have the
23 State introduce that since that's a Department of Fish
24 and Game proposal.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: No, I think I'd
27 like -- why don't you just go ahead and introduce it.
28 Not everybody has a copy of this unfortunately. We
29 should have had board books so everybody could be
30 looking at. So let's just -- let us know what 118 is.

31
32 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33
34 As I've stated, Proposal 118 was
35 submitted by Alaska Department of Fish and Game. If
36 you recall earlier in the meeting, Mr. Turek and Ms.
37 See talked about this issue, amounts necessary for
38 subsistence.

39
40 Would you just like me to read the
41 issue statement and all that into the record or --
42 okay. I'll just read the issue statement into the
43 record.

44
45 This proposal, No. 118, as I said,
46 submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
47 requests a review and update of the amount reasonably
48 necessary for subsistence use, ANS, of salmon in
49 Southeast Alaska and Yakutat. Whenever there is a
50 harvestable surplus o fish stocks subject to customary

1 and traditional uses as determined by the Board, the
2 subsistence statute also requires the Board to
3 determine the amount reasonably necessary for
4 subsistence uses, AS 16.05.258. In making ANS
5 findings, the Board considers information about
6 subsistence harvest and use patterns from the
7 Department and the public, and may periodically
8 reconsider and update these findings or address public
9 proposals to change them.

10

11 In 1989 the Board made customary and
12 traditional determinations covering all of Southeast
13 Alaska communities for all fisheries. The Board also
14 established an administrative.....

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Excuse me. Why
17 don't we summarize. We're running -- I hate to cut you
18 off, but we're running out of time. Can we just put a
19 summary together.

20

21 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. Well, basically
22 what this does is it requests that the ANS finding for
23 Southeast Alaska which were administrative -- was
24 administrative action. Basically the range was 21,000
25 to 34,000 salmon in Southeast and 1,200 to 3,000 in
26 Yakutat. Again, these findings were based on permit
27 data biased low due to under and unreported harvest.

28

29 As Mr. Turek had mentioned earlier, he
30 revised -- what he has done is he's looked at the
31 permit returns for 1996 through 2003, incorporated a
32 correction factor for non-reporting and under-
33 reporting, and basically what his recommended ANS
34 ranges are -- basically they're 45,824 salmon to 70,041
35 salmon would be the suggested new ANS range for
36 Southeast and Yakutat. No, no, that's -- that includes
37 Yakutat, okay. The Yakutat figure would be 5,800 to
38 7,832. That's probably all I need to say.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. My
41 recommendation on 118 would be similar to the last one,
42 is that we ask the State to take no action on 118 until
43 we can consult with you on your data, because if you
44 look at some of these numbers and just take the number
45 of people in Sitka, for instance, of 8,000 and say that
46 we get 10,000 to 20,000 salmon, I have to dispute that.
47 I don't think those numbers are correct.

48

49 And I think I'd like to share with you
50 some input that we have, if we could. I don't think

1 there's any burning desire or need to run this through
2 at this time. And if we could ask the State to take no
3 action on this until you can work with us, the Federal
4 Staff as well as the Council to develop numbers --
5 because we're doing this as well, and I guess I'd like
6 to get the State's opinion, but that would be my
7 recommendation, is that we ask you to hold off on these
8 until we can share some data and work together on
9 developing these numbers which I think are low.

10

11 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair. This is the first
12 I'd heard of that recommendation. However, we were
13 intending with this particular proposal to try to
14 rectify what we thought were low numbers and make them
15 more realistic. Certainly it's not time critical that
16 that be done in this cycle, but we had intended to do
17 it in what we considered a timely manner to go ahead
18 and get those numbers more realistic. You're certainly
19 welcome as a Council to recommend that we allow
20 additional time for input on developing additional
21 material that might influence the numbers that are
22 derived.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it possible
27 it could be held over to the next meeting? That's
28 common to do on some proposals. And if it doesn't
29 affect the timing too bad, could we hold it to the next
30 meeting and just do it then?

31

32 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, you're talking
33 about the next Federal cycle or the next Board of Fish.
34 It could be scheduled into a different meeting. It
35 would get out of cycle, but if there's a compelling
36 reason to do so, we can certainly look at requesting
37 that.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you
40 support that? I think that would be our request, is
41 that if you just hold it over one meeting, one Board of
42 Fish, and that we could collaborate and maybe look at
43 these numbers at the Council and with Federal Staff a
44 little bit and see if maybe some of them need some
45 tweaking?

46

47 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, we would certainly
48 consider your request.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Now you know why

1 we did 119 before 118. Okay. That would be my
2 recommendation to the Council is that we ask the Board
3 of Fish to hold this over for one cycle until we can
4 collaborate a little bit with the Federal program on
5 developing numbers that may be more representative of
6 what we believe really is going on.

7

8 Council. Mr. Hernandez.

9

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: It seems also it makes
11 sense to hold off until the rural determination has
12 been settled. That could, you know, drastically alter
13 present condition.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yeah, I see no
16 burning issue here that we have to -- that the State
17 has to address here, but that's their -- I think at
18 least one meeting would allow us to have some input.

19

20 Dr. Garza.

21

22 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would move
23 that Southeast Regional Advisory Council submit a
24 recommendation to the Board of Fish that the proposal
25 118 review of amount necessary for subsistence
26 determination for salmon in Southeast Alaska be held
27 off for one cycle. One cycle.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Is there
30 a second to that.

31

32 MR. STOKES: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been
35 moved and seconded. And I think we kind of hashed this
36 around. We've got to get moving. Is there any
37 discussion of what we're trying to do here.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Let's go
42 with it. The proposal before you is to recommend to
43 the Board of Fish that they defer Proposal 118 for one
44 cycle until we can -- and for the reasons given. All
45 those in favor please signify by saying aye.

46

47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
50 same sign.

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We will
4 prepare that. The next one. We're really running out
5 of time, so I know we've got to take care of -- how
6 about 169. I believe that's Mr. Kookesh's proposal. We
7 also had the one from Hidden Falls. Let's kind of go
8 to those. We've seen them a little bit, so maybe we
9 can go through them.

10

11 MR. CASIPIT: Right. Mr. Chair, and in
12 the interest of time I would suggest we prioritize that
13 way and go directly to that proposal, 169, the Hidden
14 Falls hatchery terminal harvest area salmon management
15 plan.

16

17 Mr. Chair, as you mentioned, that was a
18 proposal submitted by our own Mr. Floyd Kookesh. I
19 think Mr. VanAlen did a pretty good job introducing
20 this topic last night, and given you some really good
21 background as to why it is in the book and it is before
22 the Board of Fish. I think it is a good idea for us to
23 get involved in this issue early on before some really
24 back things happen. And, you know, I'll leave it to
25 the Council to decide what they want to do.

26

27 I think as a minimum, the proponent and
28 perhaps other members of this Council that are -- that,
29 you know, have a really good idea of what's going on in
30 Chatham Straits actually be appointed to the committee
31 process during the Board of Fish process to hash this
32 -- to actually be at the table, be in on the
33 discussions and the negotiations that eventually will
34 come about from this. I'm sure Mr. VanAlen will be
35 involved at well. But I think it would be a good thing
36 for the Board of Fish to at least see some
37 representation from this Council at that Board meeting
38 during that committee process.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. Mr.
41 Kookesh.

42

43 MR. KOOKESH: And I'd also like Ben
44 VanAlen to comment on this. I know we're running short
45 on time, so we'd like to -- we'll try to keep it short
46 here.

47

48 One of the things we're looking for is
49 your support. And we know that in taking this issue
50 back to Angoon and Kake, that there was a concern as to

1 us moving the proposal so fast, but that was based on
2 the deadline. And we are going to go back to Angoon
3 and also to our brothers in Kake and seek their support
4 on this proposal. So we really do look forward to your
5 support.

6
7 We also noticed the meeting that
8 Chilkoot Indian Association was very good about
9 supporting proposals, so we're also going to ask them
10 if they could support us.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
13 Kookesh. I think it's important that we support
14 Proposal 169, and also that we request that Mr. Ben
15 VanAlen be at that meeting as well as involving our
16 fisheries biologist to dig up these numbers to support
17 this. Because I really think there's some issues here
18 that are rearing their head.

19
20 Dr. Garza.

21
22 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I would move
23 that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council submit the
24 -- I mean, support the Board of Fish Proposal 169
25 requiring the first 4,000 sockeye harvested in Hidden
26 Falls THA be donated to Angoon and Kake.

27
28 MR. ADAMS: Second.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been
31 moved and seconded to support Proposal 169 at the Board
32 of Fish.

33
34 Any discussion. Do we need any more
35 discussion on this. Dr. Garza and then Mr. Douville.

36
37 DR. GARZA: Under discussion I would
38 also recommend that we do have Federal Staff at the
39 meeting and if possible affected Councilmen.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville
42 followed by Mr. Adams.

43
44 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 I've read this proposal, and it's good. It may help
46 people get some subsistence fish. But it really does
47 not address the real problem, which is this fishery is
48 intercepting a lot of those fish, and this proposal
49 does nothing to rebuild them. So the problem is still
50 there or will continue to get worse. So I just wanted

1 to point that out.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. Mr.
4 Adams, you go first.

5

6 MR. ADAMS: No, I didn't have anything,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Mr.
10 Kookesh.

11

12 MR. KOOKESH: I believe we could have
13 Mr. Ben VanAlen address that, because we do have that
14 -- it is listed in here, if you -- and we'll let Ben
15 talk to that.

16

17 MR. VanALEN: Yes. Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just a second.
20 We had this presentation the other night. I think the
21 data is in there, Mike. He made a presentation, and
22 it's clear, and we've got -- if we approve this, we're
23 asking Mr. Ben VanAlen to be at the meeting to make a
24 presentation.

25

26 I would further ask that you make a
27 request that I attend this meeting. And I can claim 15
28 minutes as the Chair of the RAC and have Mr. Ben
29 VanAlen sit right next to me, and we can make a 15-
30 minute presentation to the Board of Fish on this
31 proposal if you wish. And I think that's important.
32 We can bring out a lot of stuff in 15 minutes.
33 Otherwise, you've got -- Floyd will have three minutes
34 to make his presentation, and that's it.

35

36 So I think the information is in your
37 report, but we need to get it to the Board. So that
38 would be my recommendation is that we also -- in
39 addition to supporting Proposal 169 that we ask if I
40 could attend that meeting and testify along with our
41 Staff.

42

43 MR. KOOKESH: Could we answer his
44 question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What was that?

47

48 MR. KOOKESH: Did it address the
49 problem.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Mike, are
2 you -- I don't know if you saw that last night. He
3 made a presentation on that. So, Mr. VanAlen, just real
4 quickly, you can go over some of that.

5
6 MR. VanALEN: Yeah. I only wanted to
7 say one thing, is that the real intent of this Proposal
8 169 is that the Board of Fisheries establish a working
9 group to help work through issues dealing with Chatham
10 Strait area sockeye. So I'm just saying that's the
11 ultimate, is to get a working group formed.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Casipit.

14
15 MR. CASIPIT: I think a good way to
16 think about this proposal is that it's taking a two-
17 prong look at things. Number 1, there's a short-term
18 solution proposed which is this 4,000 salmon thing.
19 The other part of it is a more long-term approach of
20 getting together a working group and delving into these
21 questions and looking at the data that Ben submitted
22 and pulling together something similar like -- to what
23 happened at Redoubt Lake.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

26
27 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 I fully support the proposal. My concern is the
29 declining stocks of sockeye.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think the
32 intent is to flesh that out at the meeting.

33
34 MR. DOUVILLE: I understand that.
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I suggest that
38 we have an amendment to this motion, and that is that I
39 can attend that meeting. I think it's important to
40 claim that time.

41
42 Mr. Adams.

43
44 MR. ADAMS: I'll amend the motion to
45 indicate that our Chairman, John Littlefield, attend
46 this meeting as well.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
49 second to that.

50

1 MR. KOOKESH: Second. I think we've
2 heard the discussion. Are you ready for the amendment.

3
4 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. the
7 question before you is to amend the main motion to
8 allow the Chairman to testify at the Board of Fish
9 meeting. All those in favor please signify by saying
10 aye.

11
12 IN UNISON: Aye.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed,
15 same sign.

16
17 (No opposing votes)

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is --
20 the amendment has been adopted. Are you ready for the
21 main question on Proposal 169, to support as amended.

22
23 MR. ADAMS: Question.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Proposal 169 is
26 before you as amended to support at the Board of Fish.
27 We're going to do two things. We're going to support
28 with a letter, and also we will provide testimony. All
29 those in favor please signify by saying aye.

30
31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
34 same sign.

35
36 (No opposing votes)

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That will be the
39 action and wishes of the Council.

40
41 What other proposal is burning.

42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.
44 Is it clear that support Staff is going to be with you?

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think the
47 record is clear that we want Mr. Ben VanAlen to -- I
48 think that's what we'll do, is as the Chair of the
49 Southeast Council, I can claim 15 minutes, and I would
50 think that Mr. VanAlen with the great numbers that he

1 has will be doing most of that 15 minutes right
2 alongside of me. And that way we can do that. So
3 that's the intent. I think that's clear.

4
5 Any -- I know we have a bunch more
6 proposals. Are there any that anybody wants to bring
7 up specifically? We can always write our own
8 recommendations. Ms. Phillips.

9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: Are we done with our own
11 agenda? I mean, I don't -- I would prefer we get back
12 to our own agenda, and if we have time.....

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: This is on our
15 agenda and it's in order right now.

16
17 MS. PHILLIPS: I don't have any
18 information in my packet on what you guys are doing.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I think
21 we've probably got to move on here.

22
23 Dr. Garza.

24
25 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. There's item
26 number 14 and the proposal, although we don't all have
27 -- I know that Schroeder sent out just the list of the
28 proposals, and I took a look at them before I came up.
29 However, this may be an item that we could do as a
30 teleconference, and have the draft recommendations for
31 Cal Casipit sent out to us and we can all do a dial up
32 and finish this up. Because some of these are
33 important, but we have some more important things
34 coming up.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Can we meet the
37 30 days and the notice and all this stuff for Board of
38 Fish proposals? Can we do it?

39
40 DR. SCHROEDER: Marianne, do you know
41 when the comment deadline is? I could look this up as
42 well here I suppose.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

45
46 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. If we have a
47 teleconference and we have a Chairman that's going to
48 that meeting, he can testify on any of the proposals
49 that we have comment to.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm sorry, I
2 couldn't hear that.

3
4 DR. GARZA: You can sign up to testify
5 for all of those proposals, so if we have comments that
6 don't make the write-in deadline, those comments can
7 still go forward verbally with you as chair.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, but I'll
10 only be able to testify once on all of the proposals.
11 So everything that we adopt, I'm only going to be
12 allowed 15 minutes, but we can do written stuff. We
13 can put together a written one on teleconference,

14
15 And I'm looking in the book and it says
16 comment deadline January 5th, 2006. Is that correct?
17 So we could comply with that, the 30 days, have a
18 teleconference meeting later in the fall, and I suggest
19 that we do that.

20
21 DR. SCHROEDER: Okay. Staff will work
22 with Office of Subsistence Management and Bill Knauer on
23 setting up a Board of Fish -- a Council teleconference
24 to deal with Board of Fish proposals. I realize that
25 some of these proposals are very important to the
26 Council.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. And
29 that will be on Thanksgiving Day, right?

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Let's go
34 to 16.A.1., review of rural determination. We want to
35 come back to that. We had our presentation by Mr.
36 Buklis. We also had I believe three or four people who
37 made recommendations to us. There's action items there
38 that we need to take care of. We need to make a
39 recommendation as requested by Mr. Buklis.

40
41 Dr. Schroeder, can you help us out
42 here, where we need to go.

43
44 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we had a
45 good deal of discussion about rural determinations
46 earlier and received strong public testimony. There
47 have also been various side discussions about what
48 direction the Council would wish to go with
49 recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board at this
50 time.

1 At this time, the main issued before
2 the Federal Subsistence Board is not making the final
3 decision on rural determination, but a more limited
4 one, which communities should be subject to further
5 study, and which communities should be resumed to stay
6 in their existing status.

7
8 The discussion concerning Saxman, the
9 appeared -- the Council sentiment appeared to favor
10 Saxman's position of -- that Saxman should simply be
11 recognized as being a rural place and not subject to
12 further analysis by Federal Staff. That may have been
13 the position that the Council was leaning with respect
14 to Sitka. The discussion when Merle and other folks
15 were here from KIC, Merle and Bob Sanderson, Jr., was
16 that certain issues existed concerning Ketchikan that
17 definitely merit further study and review.

18
19 I took notes during that session, and I
20 have some of those on the screen that may guide -- if
21 these are accurate, they could be written up in a
22 better form, and see if they reflect the Council
23 position. I'd suggest through these as follows.

24
25 The first point is an important one.
26 It has to do with the place of the Regional Advisory
27 Councils with respect to the rural determinations. As
28 you know, the Regional Advisory Council recommendations
29 are accorded a deference under Section 805(c) of ANILCA
30 when we're talking about taking. And under 805(c) a
31 regulation that concerns -- it clearly concerns taking,
32 carries a good deal of weight with the Federal
33 Subsistence Board, to wit, that the Council
34 recommendation can only be overruled for very good
35 reasons, namely that it's not supported by substantial
36 data, violates principles of conservation or sound
37 management, or is not good for subsistence users, or
38 causes a conflict between Councils.

39
40 There has been some discussion on the
41 side that offered a rationale for how rural
42 determinations in fact involved taking, and perhaps
43 Chairman Littlefield would go through that for us. So
44 that would be a first point that we deal with. I was
45 asking Chairman Littlefield to go through the logic on
46 how making a rural determination is in fact a taking
47 question.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: No, you do it.

50

1 DR. SCHROEDER: In our discussions, the
2 idea was that it was a taking question, and that if a
3 community is classified as rural, but Federal -- taking
4 may take -- may occur under Federal regulations. If a
5 community is not recognized as rural, absolutely no
6 taking can take -- can occur. And so that was the
7 logic under discussion right there. Did you anything
8 to say on that?

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: In a nut shell,
11 if you're not rural, you can't practice ANILCA, and we
12 believe we're -- we have the right to bring this
13 through the Council and comment on it.

14
15 Dr. Garza.

16
17 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. This is an
18 important area, but I do have a list of -- I tried to
19 come up with the final recommendations, and when we
20 asked each of them, and I would like to bring those
21 forward as motions. And then we can.....

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We'll do that.
24 I'm just saying that this question for deference was
25 that taking was something that we need to run through
26 the RAC. That should be an additional one. But I have
27 that list, too. So let's get rid of that list first.

28
29 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. The request
30 from Saxman was fourfold. I'd like to list all of them
31 and then move to support them. First, that Saxman be
32 taken off the list for further analysis and remain
33 rural. Second, that Federal Subsistence Board hold a
34 formal hearing in Saxman to review Saxman's status.
35 Third, that Saxman requests assistance from Federal
36 Staff and agencies in putting together data and
37 information supporting their rural status. And,
38 finally, that Saxman receive copies of the data used to
39 put them on the list in the first place. I would move
40 that we support these four items.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
43 second.

44
45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion
48 before the Council is to support Saxman's four items,
49 which were to be taken off of the list, because they
50 want to be taken off of the list, because they are

1 rural and below 2500. They request support of their
2 rural status. They request staffing to accomplish the
3 purposes, and they request a Federal Subsistence Board
4 meeting in their area.

5
6 Is there any other discussion. Dr.
7 Garza.

8
9 DR. GARZA: The final item was to
10 receive copies of the data that was used to put then on
11 the list to begin with.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And to receive
14 copies of the data that put them on the list in the
15 first place.

16
17 Is there discussion, or have we talked
18 enough about this.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. All in
23 favor of supporting these five items for Saxman, please
24 signify by saying aye.

25
26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And those
29 opposed same sign.

30
31 (No opposing votes)

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is
34 adopted. Staff will prepare the appropriate letter
35 with these items in it for the Federal Subsistence
36 Board with that recommendation on Saxman.

37
38 Dr. Garza.

39
40 DR. GARZA: And along with that letter,
41 the support evidence that they provided with us copies
42 of.

43
44 Mr. Chairman. For Ketchikan, Ketchikan
45 Indian Community requested three items. One, that they
46 be placed on the list for analysis., They are not on
47 the list, only two parts of the Ketchikan area are,
48 Saxman as well as the two ends of Ketchikan, but not
49 Ketchikan proper. By putting them on the list, they
50 would be considered for redesignation to rural. They

1 have requested a formal hearing from Federal
2 Subsistence Board, but have not heard from them, so
3 they're requesting our support in insuring that they
4 get that formal hearing in Ketchikan. And they are
5 also requesting Federal Staff and agency assistance to
6 put together data and information that would help them
7 demonstrate easily that they are a rural community. I
8 would move that we support these three items.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
11 second.

12
13 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
16 and seconded to support the request of Ketchikan to,
17 number 1, be added to the list. Number 2 is to have a
18 meeting with the Federal Subsistence Board. And three
19 is to get the necessary assistance to help us.
20 Correct?

21
22 Any discussion on this or are we.....

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. All those
27 in favor please signify by saying aye.

28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And those
32 opposed same sign.

33
34 (No opposing votes)

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion has
37 been adopted. the Staff will prepare a recommendation
38 to the Federal Board on Ketchikan.

39
40 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. We do have a
41 resolution that was faxed to us from Sitka Tribe that
42 is requesting that they remain rural. I have not heard
43 directly, but I imagine the first line of the request
44 would be that their name be taken from the list for
45 analysis.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's my
48 interpretation. If they remain rural, they would be
49 removed from the list, because every other community
50 that was not on the list is assumed to be what it was.

1 DR. GARZA: And that we support their
2 efforts to remain a rural community. So it would be
3 two items, and I'm sure three, the same third item,
4 that they would -- they want a public hearing, and that
5 they receive staff support from -- receive support from
6 Staff and the agencies to help to pull together data to
7 easily demonstrate that they continue to be a rural
8 community.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The
11 motion is to support Sitka by removing them from the
12 list. Number 2, we're supporting their request to ask
13 the Federal Subsistence Board to have a hearing in
14 Sitka. And, thirdly, to request Staff assistance to do
15 this. Is there a second.

16
17 MR. KITKA: Second.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
20 further discussion on this request.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those in
25 favor of supporting Sitka's status please signify by
26 saying aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
31 same sign.

32
33 (No opposing votes)

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And we will
36 prepare a similar letter, and I would suggest that one
37 letter's probably adequate for these. We'll lump them
38 all together showing that -- and we should notify the
39 communities of what we've done.

40
41 Dr. Garza.

42
43 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Further to
44 that, I mean, we should have Staff use whatever means
45 that they can. If it include the definition of take or
46 what you guys were talking about earlier, then that's
47 what we need to do.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right. I think
50 the letter should include that as, Dr. Schroeder, when

1 you look at ANILCA, it talks about taking and if you
2 can't -- don't have a rural area, you can't take, and
3 that taking is regulated by this Council, so that they
4 should show some deference to the Councils and our
5 recommendations as well as our requests, because it's
6 part of our job. And I think that should be added to
7 the letter as well.

8

9 Dr. Schroeder.

10

11 DR. SCHROEDER: And, Mr. Chairman, Dr.
12 Garza, if we could identify Council members who'd
13 review whatever went in to make sure that it reflected
14 the Council wishes, find out who would be able to do
15 that, and in rather short order, because we want to
16 meet the October 28th deadline.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

19

20 DR. GARZA: Since it includes our
21 communities, I would suggest it include myself and
22 you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Anybody else
25 want to be on there? Another additional duty.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Anything
30 else on rural determination. Is that it on rural?

31

32 Dr. Garza.

33

34 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

35

36 I guess along those lines, I would like
37 to request that we invite any of the Federal
38 Subsistence Board to the Saxman meeting in February,
39 because I think rural determination will be a topic
40 there, and they may have -- and we have had Federal
41 Subsistence Board members attend our meetings in the
42 past. We don't this time, but it would nice to see a
43 couple of them there.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We certainly can
46 do that. We can extend an invitation to the Board
47 members to attend, as many as could, the Saxman meeting
48 as well as the Sitka meeting, because rural
49 determination will be high on the list at that time.

50

1 Let's take a short break. I'd like to
2 have the Council members kind of caucus a little bit if
3 they could on the topics for annual report, because we
4 need to kick those in before the end of the day. We
5 will come back with item 15, Mr. Buklis, calls for
6 proposals, change to Federal subsistence hunting
7 regulations.

8
9 And before we do that, we probably will
10 discuss the white paper that's been distributed to
11 everyone, and then we'll have that closure review.

12
13 So take a short break, come up with any
14 items you can think of of topics for annual report.

15
16 (Off record)

17
18 (On record)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're getting
21 close to winding it up, and I think we're okay on the
22 time.

23
24 Right now we're going to do -- I'd like
25 to ask Mr. Steve Kessler and Marianne See to come to
26 the front table.

27
28 I received a copy of what we call an
29 issue paper or a white paper, and I did not receive it
30 through the Federal program. And when I got that, I
31 wanted to make sure that the Regional Advisory Council
32 had a copy of that. So I did distribute that to -- a
33 copy to each member yesterday.

34
35 There were several things that were
36 disturbing to me about it, but I firmly believe that
37 the Regional Advisory Council is the foundation of the
38 ANILCA program. And if we -- any way you look at the
39 regulations say that they needed to be routed through
40 the RAC.

41
42 So I guess I will leave it at that and
43 ask the State as well as well as the Feds on maybe the
44 history of this paper.

45
46 MS. SEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members
47 of the Council. I do have some comments to offer for
48 your about the background of how this paper came to be,
49 and some of the resulting activities from having
50 developed this paper.

1 The State's with Department of Interior
2 at a fairly high level to look at the dual management
3 system with the intent of looking at the benefit for
4 subsistence users and all others concerned. We want to
5 ensure that Title VIII is implemented in a fair,
6 sensitive and efficient manner for all citizens. The
7 State and Department of Interior officials have met
8 three to four times during the past several months to
9 discuss policy. And I -- pardon?

10

11 MR. KESSLER: Too far away?

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm having a
14 hard time hearing you.

15

16 MS. SEE: Oh, sorry, I'll get closer.
17 To discuss policy about how the Federal Subsistence
18 Board, Federal agencies, the Office of Subsistence
19 Management, and the State of Alaska work together to
20 make the Federal regulatory process better.

21

22 We consider that it is appropriate for
23 the State and Federal Governments to discuss the
24 Federal regulatory policy and process, and ways to make
25 it efficient and effective. Oops, I hit my buttons.
26 To make the process efficient and effective.

27

28 Both parties share the responsibility
29 for the management of fish and wildlife on Federal
30 lands in Alaska, so it's essential that we work well
31 together. The rules and responsibilities of the
32 Councils in those discussions was not a topic.

33

34 The State did prepare a white paper,
35 which is essentially a discussion paper, that outlines
36 some of the State's policy concerns, and that was
37 initially developed to flesh out what those concerns
38 were for those discussions that were held with
39 Department of Interior. These kinds of papers are
40 typically done to develop complex issues, which there
41 are a number of in this particular paper. So that was
42 the background for developing that paper, which was
43 then subsequently provided to the Federal officials,
44 the Department of Interior officials for those
45 discussions.

46

47 The paper is currently -- it was
48 developed through the Commissioner's office. It is
49 currently available through the Commissioner's office,
50 and that is where the paper developed.

1 Some of the topics that came up in the
2 discussions from -- and that are also outlined in the
3 paper, are not going to be pursued further by either
4 the State of Department of Interior at this point in
5 time, but there are some where there will be continuing
6 discussion or resulting actions. For example, the
7 State did raise the issue of closures for fishing or
8 hunting that would affect non-Federally qualified
9 users, and in fact there is now a list of those
10 closures that is being discussed in the various
11 Councils throughout the state as appropriate to those
12 regions. So that is one outcome of those discussions,
13 which in fact then goes out into the realm of the
14 public arena and the Councils, as would be required by
15 the Federal program.

16
17 And I'd be happy to answer any other
18 questions on this. My colleague here, Mr. Kessler, may
19 have some additional points.

20
21 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman and members
22 of the Council. Ms. See did a good job talking about a
23 little bit of the history here. I wanted add just a
24 couple of points.

25
26 As Ms. See talked about, the Governor
27 asked the Secretary of the Interior for a high level
28 working group to address subsistence issues. That's
29 probably -- that's in a letter, I believe it was from
30 January 2004 which you may have seen. The Secretary of
31 the Interior responded by assigning these discussions
32 to her senior advisor for Alaska affairs. The
33 Secretary has recused herself from subsistence-related
34 policy because of her former work.

35
36 Senior advisor Drue Pierce with local
37 Alaska top managers and attorneys have listened to the
38 State's concerns as requested, but have said that they
39 will not direct changes. The Secretaries have said that
40 they will not dismantle the Federal subsistence
41 program, and no big changes are planned.

42
43 However, based on those discussions
44 with the Secretary's office, there will be -- well,
45 excuse me. Based on these discussions, the Secretary's
46 Office will be asking the Board to formalize policy on
47 two issues, and that is customary and traditional use
48 and closures. Policy proposals before they are adopted
49 by the Federal Subsistence Board will be presented to
50 the Regional Advisory Councils for comments.

1 The one item that Ms. See talked about,
2 and that Mr. Buklis will be talking about soon, is the
3 Federal closures. And at this point, OSM expects that
4 that will be looked at on a three-year cycle, but that
5 also will be part of this policy process that will be
6 developed by the Federal Subsistence Board.

7
8 So the direction from the Secretary's
9 Office is -- as I understand it, actually the letter
10 has been signed. It should be out later this week.
11 All it does is it directs the Federal Subsistence Board
12 to consider whether policy should be developed and what
13 that policy should be, but the secretaries will not
14 develop the policy.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I just have a
17 question. If you wanted a closure removed, is there
18 anything in our existing system that prevents you from
19 submitting a proposal to the Regional Advisory Council
20 to remove that closure on a yearly basis, not a three-
21 year basis? Is there anything that stops you from
22 doing that at this time?

23
24 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair. No, there is
25 nothing to stop us from that kind of a request. Thank
26 you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So
29 personally that's the way I would have rather have seen
30 it. So other questions for the Council, or are there
31 any questions. Are you happy with the briefing.

32
33 Dr. Garza.

34
35 DR. GARZA: Do you know if there is an
36 estimated time list for this process, or a timeline for
37 this process.

38
39 MR. KESSLER: Yes, there is. I did see
40 a draft of the letter, and the draft of the letter had
41 expectations from the Secretary's Office for the amount
42 of time the Federal Subsistence Board would have to
43 develop any policies. And I don't remember that
44 exactly, I believe that the policy would be -- the
45 first policy that was asked to be developed is the
46 closure policy, and that a draft of that would be out
47 prior to the winter RAC meetings, and available for
48 comment by the Regional Advisory Councils then at those
49 winter RAC meetings and that within a short time after
50 that, the Board would finalize any new policies.

1 And I believe that as far as customary
2 and traditional use and any policies associated with
3 that, I think that that was anticipated for the next
4 Regional Advisory Council meeting cycle, so that would
5 be following next fall's meeting.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's probably
8 only my perception, but my perception was that on the
9 C&T part of the discussion that perhaps we were looking
10 for more than substantial evidence, we were looking for
11 a higher level of evidence? It seemed to be implied to
12 me that we needed more than what Mr. Ustasiwski has
13 always given us that what we need to do to make a
14 decision. And I think we've been applying that, but it
15 seemed to be implied in this paper that we weren't
16 doing a good enough job on that. Can you comment on
17 that?

18
19 MR. KESSLER: The Secretary's letter as
20 I remember it leaves the sideboards for this wide open
21 to the Federal Subsistence Board to figure out what
22 they think is best. If I remember correctly, it also
23 does imply that perhaps there should be a little bit
24 more of a quantitative evaluation based on some sort of
25 standards, but it does not direct anything like that.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
28 comments. Ms. Phillips. And then Dr. Garza.

29
30 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
31 Littlefield.

32
33 I was especially astounded by paragraph
34 -- one, two, three -- paragraph 4, Page 2. It says
35 while steps are underway to improve coordination
36 between the State and Federal Subsistence Program,
37 successful resolution of some of the primary issues of
38 the dual programs will require clarification of Federal
39 policy through issuance of Secretarial directives.
40 These policy directives may be adopted in the form of
41 formal published policy or instructional memos.

42
43 And that the fact that directives can
44 be made without our -- without the input of Regional
45 Advisory Councils is troubling to me, and that
46 instructional memos can go out without our knowledge
47 that promulgate policies that continue to weaken the
48 deference due our advice to this program.

49
50 Thank you.

1 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
2 Phillips.

3
4 The Secretaries have said that they
5 will not issue any instructional memos, that any new
6 policy will be heard by the Regional Advisory Councils
7 before it is issued. And they will listen to your
8 comments prior to issuing any final policy direction
9 for the Federal system. So it's not to be issued by
10 the Secretary's office.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza. Any
13 other comments. Questions. Okay. Well, thank you.
14 Go ahead.

15
16 MR. KESSLER: Ms. Phillips, I guess I
17 should follow up on my answer is that, I mean, I don't
18 think that they want to close the door as if there
19 never -- that might -- something might never happen,
20 but right now that's what they've said is everything
21 will be aired through the Councils.

22
23 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I thought I was
26 done until you said that. The very next thing I'm
27 going to do is I'm going to be calling of Mr. Buklis to
28 present a proposal on closures, and this is exactly
29 what -- it's right in here, and, you know, like I said,
30 I didn't want to get into that, but it seems to imply
31 to me that somebody directed OSM to do the closure,
32 which would seem to contradict with what you just told
33 me. And maybe that -- not any more and as long as the
34 sky is blue, but right now it seems like it's happened.

35
36 MR. KESSLER: Chairman Littlefield. As
37 I understand it, that direction did not come from the
38 Secretary, and it certainly didn't come as I understand
39 it in written form. Now, maybe Mr. Buklis knows
40 something different, but as I understand it, the Office
41 of Subsistence Management listened to the State's
42 concern, agreed with the State's concern, and thought
43 that it was appropriate to take a regular cyclical view
44 at these closures, and that any changes in closures
45 will be aired through the Regional Advisory Councils
46 through the regular regulatory process. They're not
47 going to sidestep anything.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Perhaps the
50 Secretary didn't do it, but it got directed. So, okay.

1 Any other.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All right.

6 Thank you for your presentation.

7

8 Mr. Buklis.

9

10 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11

12 The briefing on closure reviews is on
13 Page 215 in your book, and I'll kind of give you the
14 short version, going over a few key points.

15

16 The Office of Subsistence Management
17 has initiated an evaluation of existing closures of
18 Federal public lands. There are currently 30 closures
19 in Federal subsistence wildlife regulations distributed
20 over nine of the 10 regions. There are no such
21 closures in the Kodiak/Aleutians Region.

22

23 Section 815(3) allows closures when
24 necessary for the conservation of healthy populations
25 of fish and wildlife, and to continue subsistence uses
26 of such populations. The existing closures represent
27 both situations.

28

29 The review of existing closures
30 examines whether the original justifications continue
31 to apply. All closures implemented prior to the 2001
32 regulatory year are being included in this current
33 review.

34

35 Following presentation by a wildlife
36 biologist on closures relevant to their region,
37 Councils are being asked in this round of Council
38 meetings to consider the OSM recommendation and share
39 their views on the issue. Input from the Councils will
40 be helpful in the development of regulatory proposals
41 needed to consider appropriate adjustments to the
42 regulations.

43

44 All proposals that are developed at the
45 conclusion of this review process will be considered
46 through the normal regulatory cycle. And as you know,
47 the current proposal period closes October 21st.
48 Councils may choose with Staff to develop proposals.

49

50 Mr. Chairman. For this Council, Dave

1 Johnson is prepared to present a wildlife closure
2 review for moose in Unit 5(A) which dates back to 1991.

3
4

5 Mr. Chairman, if I could just add my
6 own comment to your question that came up a moment ago
7 about why we're doing these reviews at this time, my
8 understanding is that it is -- it does flow from the
9 policy discussions that Ms. See and Mr. Kessler were
10 talking to you about, but that it wasn't directed that
11 OSM do this. But it was seen as -- on the Federal
12 team, as one aspect of the concerns raised that we
13 could act on, and that in retrospect we probably should
14 have been reviewing these closures to ensure that they
15 were still current and appropriate.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I guess my
18 comment is that this Council has gone on record quite a
19 few times saying that the program starts from the
20 bottom up, and we didn't like proposals coming from the
21 top down. I mean, that's clear that that's been the
22 past position. This is another one coming from the top
23 down, and the way I look at this, had there been a
24 burning desire on somebody, it could have been the
25 State, it could have been a non-rural person to
26 initiate the closure review here, all they had to do is
27 submit a proposal in the normal way that we do
28 business. And I guess that's why I'm looking at these
29 -- I still believe that things shouldn't flow from the
30 top down in this program, that they should come from
31 the bottom up, from the people who are affected. And
32 if somebody had been affected by this closure that
33 we're going to review right now, they would have said
34 so. And that's -- and the program was working.
35 Anyway, that's my comments.

36

37 Mr. Johnson.

38

39 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman. Council.

40

41 The Staff analysis for this was
42 prepared by Dan LaPlant, and you should have a copy of
43 that in your folder as item number 6. It was in your
44 blue packet I believe.

45

46 I'll try to be brief, Mr. Chairman.

47

48 The current closure before you for the
49 moose, Unit 5(A), except Nunatak Bench, reflects from
50 October 8th to October 21 Federal public lands are

1 closed to taking of moose except by rural Alaska
2 residents of Unit 5(A) hunting under these regulations.

3
4 In 1991 federal lands were closed from
5 October 15th to the 21st. In 2000 that changed to a
6 closure from October 8th to October 21.

7
8 On October 5th, 1990 OSM published a
9 Federal Register notice of an emergency closure of
10 moose season in Unit 5(A), October 15 to 21 to all by
11 Federally qualified subsistence users. No proposal
12 number or special action number was found in the
13 history of the proposal -- in the analysis. The 1991
14 regulations continued the closure which was identified
15 as Unit 5(A), except Nunatak Bench, because the Nunatak
16 Bench area had no open season. There was no 1991
17 proposal used to consider making this decision a
18 permanent regulation and the Board did not discuss the
19 issue at the 1991 Board meeting.

20
21 The justification for the original
22 closure, prior to the Federal closure, there were
23 numerous people from Southeast, primarily Juneau, and
24 from Southcentral, primarily the Anchorage area, that
25 would fly Alaska Airlines to Yakutat to hunt. It was a
26 relatively easy and inexpensive hunt. Therefore local
27 residents had stiff competition from these other
28 hunters, especially for use of Forest Service cabins
29 which are scattered around the Yakutat Forelands. With
30 the Yakutat Federal closure, Yakutat residents have
31 less competition for a limited resource. The Federal
32 Register notice states that the action was taken to
33 ensure a preferential subsistence opportunity of rural
34 Alaska residents with C&T.

35
36 The Council recommendation for the
37 original closure. There was no original
38 recommendation, because the council hadn't been
39 established prior to that date.

40
41 State recommendation. Also there was
42 no record of the September 19th, 1990 board meeting
43 found any State recommendation for closure in the
44 archives.

45
46 Other significant comments presented
47 when the Board adopted the original closure. None were
48 found.

49
50 The ADF&G population objective as

1 listed in their management plan is 1,000 moose.
2 However, in recent performance reports, they state that
3 the objective is probably too high. ADF&G, 2004,
4 estimates the current population is stable as six to
5 800 moose, which appears to be the carrying capacity of
6 the habitat.

7
8 The most recent ADF&G performance
9 report indicates that the moose population in the
10 Yakutat Forelands has been relatively stable during the
11 past 20 years.

12
13 Preliminary findings of a Forest
14 Service study, that again I would point out that this
15 Regional Council supported, states that the 70 percent
16 sightability of moose during winter aerial surveys is
17 higher than previously estimated and that prior
18 populations estimates using the 50 percent factor have
19 been inflated. The higher visibility of bulls
20 indicates that the most recent cow/bull ratio may be
21 slightly elevated as well. This result, however, does
22 not conflict with the reports of a stable population
23 for the past 20 years.

24
25 The 1998/99 performance report
26 indicates that hunters killed 51 moose, 28 under the
27 State registration hunt and 23 under the federal hunt.
28 In that year, the number of hunters, 161 under the
29 State registration hunt and 141 permitted under the
30 Federal subsistence hunts, was higher than the
31 objective of 250, but this number is deceiving as some
32 hunters obtain both State and Federal permits. Hunter
33 effort under the State registration hunt, or 334 hunter
34 days, was lower than the objective of 1,025 hunter
35 days. Hunter success was 17 percent under both the
36 State registration and Federal subsistence hunts, which
37 is below the objective of 28 percent.

38
39 In November of 2002, the State issued
40 Emergency Order 01-04-02 to close that portion of Unit
41 5(A) west of the Dangerous River when the harvest
42 reached 27 moose. The harvest quota of 60 antlered
43 bulls for the entirety of Unit 5(A), except the Nunatak
44 Bench, has not been reached in recent years.

45
46 Harvest data from 2001/2002 indicated
47 that local hunters (Yakutat residents) harvest the
48 majority, 71 percent, of the moose, with most of the
49 harvest taking place during the first two weeks of the
50 session when non-rural hunters are restricted from

1 hunting on Federal lands.

2

3

4 And the OSM recommendation for this
5 closure was to maintain the status quo, the
6 justification being the moose population has remained
7 stable under the current harvest regime. the majority
8 of the moose harvested are taken by local hunter during
9 the time of the closure for non-rural residents. there
10 are no conservation concerns. The harvestable surplus
11 of this population is being used by Federally qualified
12 rural residents. Therefore, the status quo is
13 necessary to continue the subsistence uses, Section
14 815(3). And the status quo is also consistent with
15 sound management principles, and the conservation of
16 healthy populations while providing a preference for
17 subsistence uses over other consumptive uses.

17

18 That concludes my comments, Mr.
19 Chairman.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The action
22 that's requested, Mr. Buklis.

23

24 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman, OSM is
25 looking to the -- OSM is looking to the Councils for
26 their views on these issues. The Council can come
27 forward and generate their own proposal, working with
28 Staff, or advise OSM on their views on the issue.

29

30 In this particular case, the
31 recommendation of OSM is to not change the status quo.
32 So the initial assessment by OSM in this case would not
33 lead naturally to a proposal being generated to change
34 something. So in this case we would be looking to you
35 for your views, and if your views were similar then
36 neither OSM nor the Council would be generating a
37 proposal.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Does the Council
40 want to give them any input.

41

42 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

45

46 DR. GARZA: I would move that the
47 Council accept the recommendation of OSM staff that we
48 maintain status for the closure in area 5(B) -- 5(A).

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Let's

1 just call it WCR05-02. That's the number of it. Okay.

2

3 DR. GARZA: To accept the
4 recommendation from the Staff in WCR05-02.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a
7 second.

8

9 MR. KITKA: Second.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
12 and seconded to accept the OSM recommendation on the
13 federal wildlife closure review WCR05-02.

14

15 Discussion. Mr. Adams. 5(A).

16

17 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18

19 This the first that I have heard of
20 this proposal coming forth, and, you know, I'm -- as
21 I've indicated, you know, throughout this meeting, that
22 I'm a strong supporter of local support. Now, we have
23 a situation with the Ranger District in Yakutat that
24 when anything happens that's going to affect the
25 community that they come to us or we go to them, and we
26 sit down and we consult with one another. And I think
27 that, you know, as we go through the process, you know,
28 that this really should be, you know, shared with the
29 community as well.

30

31 Chairman Littlefield alluded a little
32 while ago about, you know, issues and situations coming
33 from the bottom up rather than from the top down. And
34 again I think, you know, that this is an example of
35 that. So I just want, you know, to emphasize the fact
36 that I think this needs to be shared with the
37 community, particularly with those people who do a lot
38 of hunting in the Nunatak Bench area.

39

40 That's my comment, Mr. Chairman. Thank
41 you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
44 Council.

45

46 I have a question, not exactly to this,
47 but this is the only one we're looking at in Southeast?
48 There were other closures that were listed initially.

49

50 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the second

1 closure that's listed there is a more recent closure
2 that has to do with the closure in Unit 2, okay. And I
3 think if you'll read down on Page 215, it says that all
4 the closures adopted prior to the 2001 regulatory year
5 are included for this 2005 review. Those are closures
6 that would still be in effect today.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank
9 you. Are there any -- is there any discussion on
10 whether to -- on this motion.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ready for the
15 question. The question before the Council is to accept
16 the OSM recommendation on Federal wildlife closure
17 review, Proposal WCR05-02. All in favor please signify
18 by saying aye.

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed
23 same sign.

24
25 (No opposing votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Our
28 recommendation is to accept your deal.

29
30 And I have another question for you.
31 There was a bunch of them that were listed statewide, I
32 don't know how many. Thirty was it? Thirty closures?

33
34 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: How many of
37 those are you recommending that you rescind?

38
39 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. I don't
40 have a breakdown of the recommendations by region.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And other than
43 being listed on the agenda here as call for proposals
44 to change the Federal subsistence, was there any other
45 notice to the public? Like Mr Adams said, is there
46 anyway that the public is more aware of these things
47 happening, or do you just feel because there is no
48 proposal yet, that you don't have to do that? Is there
49 any more public involvement than what we've got right
50 here?

1 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. No, I don't
2 believe there is, but you touched on it a moment ago
3 there in your comment. This is sort of background work
4 to see what issues might warrant advancement to a
5 proposal, and the proposal process would go through the
6 normal public process over the next number of months in
7 the wildlife cycle. So that engage the public and
8 Council process. This is in anticipation of that to
9 sort out which closures might warrant such treatment.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Well, I
12 guess we'll be seeing more of them.

13
14 Mr. Adams.

15
16 MR. ADAMS: Just as some more
17 information. You know, we do have a situation back
18 home, in Yakutat I'm talking about, you know, where the
19 State and the Tribe, you know, has a history of
20 consulting with the tribes. And they do have
21 emergency, you know, closures and openings that they
22 have the power to do. And so I just wanted to make
23 sure, you know, that people understand that we do have
24 a situation there.

25
26 Like, for instance, there was a goat
27 situation a few years ago where the population in that
28 same area, you know, was not satisfactory, you know.
29 And so they called a meeting of the Tribe, the State
30 and the Forest Service sat down, and we analyzed the
31 whole thing, and decided, you know, that for the best
32 interest of the boat population, that we would go ahead
33 and close it down for a time.

34
35 And, you know, this is the kind of
36 arrangement that I think that should happen, you know,
37 when this proposal comes forth. I'm sure it will
38 happen, but I just wanted to bring it out as a point of
39 interest, Mr. Chairman, and to the managers as well.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I guess that's
44 all I have. Okay. Thank you.

45
46 We have two items left. We'll save the
47 best for last, which is Mr. Capra of the National Park
48 Service. He, you know, almost invariably gets stuck at
49 the very end here.

50

1 But we have one other thing, and that
2 was the Section 810 discussion. I have a note on that.

3

4

5 DR. SCHROEDER: I can do that.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think it's
8 fairly quick, if, Dr. Schroeder, you can run us through
9 that real quick, and then we'll go to Dr. Garza.

10

11 DR. GARZA: So are we covering item 15.

12

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're on item --
15 excuse me. We're on item 16 right now, and one of the
16 notes that I had under item 16 is that we would discuss
17 the Section 810.

18

19 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, Cal
20 Casipit's distributing, not passing out, a schedule of
21 proposed actions for Tongass National Forest. And this
22 is an immediate response to the Council's interest in
23 knowing what kinds of Section 810 actions may be coming
24 our way.

25

26 Ranger Mark Hummel provided this to us,
27 and I'll be working with Forest Service Staff to make
28 sure that the Council has an up-to-date list of what
29 actions are coming before the Council, the actions on
30 which the Council may wish to comment.

31

32 As you can see, quite a bit is going
33 on. This output runs to 31 pages with each page with
34 three or four actions that the Forest will be taking.
35 I think what may be useful at our future meeting will
36 be to try to highlight which actions may be of interest
37 to the Council. If that's something that you would
38 wish Staff to undertake, that would probably be
39 appropriate for our Staff biologist, as well as the
40 coordinator to look at for you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All right.
43 Thank you for this information. Let me assure you that
44 I didn't get letters on all of these, I'd have been
45 inundated. but this is good information for the
46 Council. I saw some things already that caught my eye
47 in there just briefly. So this is an informational
48 type deal.

49

50 We have marine jurisdiction under 16,

1 bear handicrafts, registration hunt reports, and then
2 we'll go to the National Park Service. So we'll finish
3 this up.

4

5 Dr. Garza.

6

7 DR. GARZA: Back to item 15. It is the
8 call for proposals for game, and we do usually ask the
9 Council if there are any proposals that they are
10 interested in submitting for the next cycle.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right. We only
13 did the A part of it. I guess there is more to call
14 for proposals.

15

16 Mr. Johnson, can you bring us through
17 the wildlife portion of this call for proposals.

18

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman. Council.

20

21 On Page 15 of current wildlife regs,
22 there is a proposal format for submitting wildlife
23 regulation changes for the up-coming cycle that closes
24 on October the 21st, 2005. And so if there are any
25 proposals that Council would like to have submitted, in
26 addition to the one that was discussed earlier. Staff
27 is available to help prepare that. Or for other
28 proposals or proponents from your communities, now is
29 the time to submit those proposals.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
32 wish on the Council's part to submit a SERAC-generated
33 proposal for the hunting regulations. Nothing prevents
34 you from submitting one by yourself. I've done that
35 several times. But is there any wish for the Council
36 to support one.

37

38 Dr. Garza.

39

40 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I guess it
41 will not go through the Council process, but there will
42 be at one proposal for Prince of Wales to get rid of
43 the requirement that the deer tags be used in sequence.
44 But for some reason we're not going to do it through
45 the Council.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would say
48 there's going to be a similar proposal coming from Unit
49 4, too.

50

1 Mr. Wright.

2

3 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman.

5

6 I'm wondering, is there a regulation
7 for proxy hunting for elders like, you know, or people
8 that are -- the handicapped. You know, I've got a
9 brother that's a quadriplegic and, you know, I wonder
10 about getting tags for him and going out and getting
11 some animals for him.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Johnson,
14 will you do the designated hunter.

15

16 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
17 Council.

18

19 Frank, the Federal program does have a
20 designated hunter program, and anyone that is a
21 Federally qualified subsistence user under the Federal
22 program can harvest fish and wildlife for other
23 Federally qualified users. There's no requirement that
24 the person be physically or mentally challenged. The
25 only requirement is that they be a rural resident and
26 have a customary C&T in that particular unit.

27

28 An example would be someone from Nome
29 who is a rural resident, would not be able to come to
30 Hoonah and either harvest deer for someone else or be a
31 designated hunter I guess is the better way to explain
32 that.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And the
35 requirement for hunting license and tags.

36

37 MR. JOHNSON: If you'll look in your
38 regulations, I don't have the page in front of me, but
39 there is a section in the regulatory language in the
40 Federal harvest of wildlife on Federal public lands for
41 the 2005/2006 that has been in virtually every copy of
42 these regulations that you have to have all permits,
43 license, harvest tickets, tags or other paperwork as
44 required under the State system, unless specifically
45 designated otherwise in regulation.

46

47 So the answer is you still have to have
48 a State hunting license, yes. Page 18 in your -- you
49 can read.....

50

1 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, so if
2 I -- I'm the only one that would have to have a hunting
3 license, but my brother wouldn't have to have one?
4

5 MR. JOHNSON: No, he has to have one,
6 too. In order to get a designated permit, he has to
7 have a license.
8

9 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. So then if I went
10 for him, then I would have to have his license on me
11 and his tags, or just his tags?
12

13 MR. JOHNSON: No, there's -- on the
14 back of the -- well, if you'll look again on Page 18,
15 you actually must have, to get the designated hunter
16 permit form, like, for example, from the Forest Service
17 office, and on there there's a place to record the
18 harvest ticket information so that you would have that
19 harvest ticket information on your person on that
20 permit that you're carrying with you, so you would not
21 have to have his license.
22

23 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. So that I would
24 just have to have it on my license?
25

26 MR. JOHNSON: No, you would carry
27 the.....
28

29 MR. WRIGHT: His license?
30

31 MR. JOHNSON:the designated
32 hunter permit for him with the harvest ticket
33 information on that designated hunter form. And you
34 could hunt up to -- you can have up to two bag limits
35 in your possession. Technically you can hunt for as
36 many other Federally qualified hunters for that
37 particular unit as people would like for you to hunt
38 for them, as long as you don't have more than two bag
39 limits in your possession, and as long as you have your
40 harvest tickets, and as long as you have them
41 validated.
42

43 Anything else, Marty, that I'm missing
44 there?
45

46 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you. I'll
47 figure it out.
48

49 MR. JOHNSON: I'll be glad to walk you
50 through it, Frank. You bet.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Under the State
2 system, you have to be 65, blind, disabled and called
3 lucky to get that permit though.

4
5 Anyway, I have a question for Mr.
6 Knauer before we go on, because I suspect that you will
7 see a regulatory proposal coming out of Craig and
8 perhaps Sitka, and it would be I'm guessing to remove
9 the requirements for the sequentially licensing that's
10 been imposed upon us by the State. Is that within
11 Article C and D, and can we take -- or will that be
12 outright rejected if we were to submit a proposal like
13 that.

14
15 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman We'd have to
16 look a little further into that. That is a State
17 requirement, not a Federal requirement. But we'd have
18 to look and see what the -- how the Federal regulations
19 are worded, and how the -- whether the registration's
20 permits required, and how they're worded. If they
21 don't -- if it's not an area that requires a
22 registration permit, then the -- those would not apply
23 to Federal hunters on Federal lands. And so there
24 would be no need for a proposal in that regard.

25
26 If, for example, in Unit 2 the harvest
27 report indicates that you must comply with the existing
28 state regulations, then it would take -- it would be a
29 proposal that would be appropriate to be considered.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I just
32 wanted to make sure that we don't get these overruled,
33 so we'd know what's coming up. So you have to be
34 careful about how you craft these. Maybe Mr. Johnson
35 could help.

36
37 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. Again, Frank, on
38 Page 12 of the current Federal regulations, there's a
39 section there, Section 7, that says do you have the
40 necessary licenses, permits, harvest tickets and tags,
41 and it is very specific what's required for you to hunt
42 under the Federal regulations to be legal.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, We only
45 have about three minutes left. And I am going to call
46 on Mr. Capra right now. We have four agenda items, but
47 you're coming up here now. We're going to give you --
48 you've faithfully stuck with us for 14 days and here it
49 is. You're last. Go ahead. We won't mention anything
50 about young bulls.

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. CAPRA: Mr. Chairman. Members of
4 the Council. I'm honored to be saved until last.

5

6 I have two short items, and one
7 additional piece of information from Glacier Bay for
8 the Council.

9

10 The East Alsec River which Council
11 Member Adams has mentioned several times, this year we
12 started to move forward with a project funded by the
13 University of Alaska at Glacier Bay, and in cooperation
14 with the USGS to investigate the hydrology and the
15 causes for change in the East Alsec River, specifically
16 the sockeye salmon runs, which have declined rather
17 dramatically since the mid 90s.

18

19 The East Alsec River is fairly
20 important to subsistence needs currently in Yakutat and
21 may become much more important in the future.

22

23 The study has completed the first year
24 of two years in the field, and I should have some
25 preliminary results from the first year's findings by
26 Christmas, and be able to report to you on that at the
27 next meeting in Saxman.

28

29 They are looking for -- trying to
30 determine what's changed in the river, the hydrology
31 and what made it such a rich sockeye stream for the
32 period that it was, and doing as much research into the
33 current stocks as they can and trying to find out how
34 that may have changed by going back into the sampling
35 that was done for the commercial fishing over the past
36 40 years.

37

38 I will also add that the design of the
39 study, and what they're currently doing was helped
40 quite a bit by the three items that were funded through
41 FIS, the TEK study and the two other projects that were
42 dedicated to the East Alsec River.

43

44 The second item from Glacier Bay is
45 that -- to pass on from Superintendent Tommy Lee is
46 that the harvest of gull eggs is now in regulation for
47 residents of Hoonah. And as part of that regulation,
48 to determine the harvest level, the Park Service has to
49 conduct an EA, or an environmental assessment, to
50 determine the harvest levels that are acceptable.

1 Superintendent Lee has just I believe
2 finished signing off an contract to the Hoonah Indian
3 Association to do that environmental assessment. And I
4 don't have the timeline for it, but in general, if they
5 have the data they need, they may be able to complete
6 it before it's time to harvest eggs in the spring.

7
8 The other short item from Glacier Bay
9 is that, as you may know, and I don't know how this
10 would affect subsistence under Title VIII, but in June
11 of 2005 the Supreme Court has decided in the National
12 Park Service's favor that the submerged lands within
13 Federal reservations, including Glacier Bay and the
14 donut holes, the areas more than three miles from shore
15 in the Inside waters, are Federal lands, and they are
16 -- they can be controlled under Federal jurisdiction.
17 They aren't titled to the State.

18
19 I've tried to keep my comments short,
20 my notes, too. If the Council, Mr. Chair, have any
21 questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

24
25 MR. ADAMS: I just want to compliment
26 you, Jim, for coming down here, you know, and spending
27 all these days, and then just giving a three-minute
28 report. But, you know, your report is will taken, and
29 I appreciate, you know, your involvement with the
30 process down here.

31
32 That's all I have. Thanks.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

35
36 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

37
38 So those waters then are controlled by
39 who that would be in the donut holes as you explained?

40
41 MR. CAPRA: The waters in this case are
42 -- they're controlled by the National Park Service in
43 the case of Glacier Bay. I honestly don't know who the
44 submerged lands would belong to outside -- in the donut
45 holes in the Inside waters in Southeast. And I don't
46 know what -- it's just a piece of news. I don't know
47 how it would affect subsistence under Title VIII, but
48 it has been fairly big news for Glacier Bay.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think the

1 donut holes are outside the three-mile limit, you know,
2 where they draw them around, so that's not included in
3 the definition of Alaska, outside the three-mile limit,
4 so we, unfortunately don't have any jurisdiction there
5 as far as I know

6
7 Any other Council comments from Mr.
8 Capra.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Again, I
13 appreciate you standing by with us. I think at the
14 next meeting we'll move you up to the top of 16 or
15 somewhere where you can claim you've got to leave early
16 like some of these other people. Move up one. Move up
17 on the list.

18
19 Thank you very much or your
20 presentation.

21
22 MR. CAPRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're
25 down -- we have a couple things left on the agenda, but
26 none of them are things that we're mandated to do. We
27 have marine jurisdiction, we have some information in
28 your annual report -- or response. The bear
29 handicrafts. You have the Q and A, but we're not going
30 to get anything on that further. The registration
31 hunting report. The news release. I don't think we
32 need to cover any of these things.

33
34 The annual report. If you have any
35 additional items, we've always in the past left that
36 open. You can submit those comments directly to our
37 coordinator, and they will be included in the annual
38 report. They're on any issues that you feel we should
39 be bringing up. And there really are no limits in
40 there, so anything that you feel that needs discussion.
41 I know I'm going to have one in there on per diem. But
42 anything that you need to go and ahead and do that.

43
44 Is that it? Are we done.

45
46 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. I think
47 we're just about there. Ms. See had one comment that
48 we didn't get to earlier that she'd like to put on the
49 record for us.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead and sit
2 down. Dr. Garza first.

3
4 DR. GARZA: It can either go before or
5 after her. Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thirty seconds.

8
9 MS. SEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10
11 A comment made early in the meeting
12 regarding socio-economic value of fish and wildlife
13 resources used by subsistence was one that I wanted to
14 address briefly. The Division of Subsistence does
15 provide a summary of information to provide that kind
16 of value estimate. The most recent one done was for
17 2000, and we are updating that, and we should be able
18 to report on that at your next meeting.

19
20 In 2000 we reported that for Southeast
21 Alaska, we estimated the approximate monetary value of
22 subsistence fish and wildlife resources at various per
23 pound price equivalents. And at the \$5 level, which I
24 think today would be a conservative number, it was more
25 than \$25 million.

26
27 So we'll be prepared to give you an
28 update on our estimates, our methodology for that, and
29 we'll do that at the winter Council meeting at the
30 pleasure of the Chair.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Great, that's
35 long overdue information, because by my numbers, I
36 calculated it as \$251 million statewide. So it's real
37 important. I look forward to seeing that.

38
39 I'll let Dr. Garza go, and then I'll
40 close it up.

41
42 DR. GARZA: Okay. Just one quick
43 cleanup. We did set up some subcommittees, and we had
44 one change on the Fishery Research Management Planning
45 strategic planning meeting. Harvey Kitka will replace
46 John Littlefield.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's correct.

49
50 DR. GARZA: We did not come up with a

1 subcommittee for subsistence use amounts, or maybe that
2 doesn't have to be done at this time?

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right. We'll do
5 that at a later meeting. We haven't developed that
6 fully.

7

8 In our culture sometimes we have a deal
9 where we at the end of the meeting, it's run too -- or
10 end of our Ku-ese (ph), it's run too long, late, in the
11 end of the game, and they'll say there are no more
12 speeches is how they will say it. And so one person
13 will sum it up. And we don't have time. We've only
14 got a couple minutes to get you out.

15

16 So on behalf of the Council, I'd like
17 to take the opportunity to thank Staff as well as ADF&G
18 and other members for providing us information to have
19 a meeting.

20

21 I want to thank all of the Council
22 members for donating their time and being paid \$200 for
23 it. We don't do this for the money. And I want
24 everybody know that we really appreciate them.

25

26 Again, I want to put another thanks to
27 Mr. Don Hernandez as well as the other members of that
28 Unit 2 Deer Subcommittee. I know you guys really
29 worked hard, and we'll see you at the last meeting.

30

31 I'll let Dr. Schroeder say one word for
32 the Staff if he would wish, but other than that, we've
33 got to get out of here.

34

35 Thank you very much.

36

37 DR. SCHROEDER: Well, it's an honor to
38 get the absolute last word, or following shot.

39

40 I'd just like to really thank people
41 for the energy that they've put into this process, and
42 to recognize that it takes a lot of effort of a lot of
43 personal devotion and sacrifice, and I think that it's
44 working quite well.

45

46 And my Chairman reminds me that we do
47 have the nomination period open, and if you think of
48 people who you believe would serve well on the Council,
49 please encourage them to apply. And for those members
50 who are here whose terms are expiring next year, and

1 that would be Chairman Littlefield and Vice Chairman
2 Garza, we expect your applications as soon as possible.

3

4

5 And with that, on behalf of the Federal
6 and State staff, I'd really like to tank everyone for
7 their excellent participation.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting is
10 adjourned.

11

12

(Off record)

13

14

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public
in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby
certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 341
through 501 contain a full, true and correct Transcript
of the VOLUME III, SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically
by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 13th day of
October 2005, beginning at the hour of 8:10 o'clock
a.m. at Wrangell, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and
correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
thereafter transcribed by under my direction and
reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and
ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 28th
day of October 2005.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08