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PROCEEDINGS

MR. THOMAS: I will call this meeting to order -- this regular fall meeting.

Before we get into any business at all, Bert, will you do the invocation?

(Invocation by Mr. Adams.)

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Bert. Okay. Roll call, Marilyn?

MS. WILSON: Okay, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bert Adams?

MR. ADAMS: Present.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Floyd Kookesh?

MR. KOOKESH: Present.

MS. WILSON: Mr. William C. "Bill" Thomas?

MR. THOMAS: Here.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Clarence "Butch" Laiti?

Absent.

Mr. Richard "Dick" Stokes?

MR. STOKES: Here.

MS. WILSON: Ms. Mary Rudolph?

MS. RUDOLPH: Here.

MS. WILSON: Ms. Patricia Phillips?

MS. PHILLIPS: Here.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Michael Douville?

MR. DOUVILLE: Here.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Lonnie Anderson?
Ms. Marilyn R. Wilson? Here.
Mr. John Littlefield?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes.

MS. WILSON: Ms. Dolly Garza?

MS. GARZA: Here.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, that's completed.

MR. THOMAS: We have a quorum.

Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I want to welcome each of you that are here today. We've had a lot of extraordinary things that's happened since our last meeting. And the topic of subsistence remains a very sensitive topic, as it should, to many people.

And I think collectively everybody is looking to find an optimum management plan to assure that we don't -- that we don't use up any of the resources that we have available with regards to edible subsistence.

And I want to welcome the representatives from the different agencies that are here, as well as the public.

Herman Kitka is our honorary lifetime member. I was happy for him to show up. I don't know if he came here to pick on us or he's going to be a nice guy. I think we ought to give him a hand.

(Applause.)

MR. THOMAS: We're always happy to see you, Herman.

Herman represents a wealth of information that he has been very generous with sharing over the years. He continues to do so. And we want to glean from that as long as we can.

So, at this time, I think I'll have, like we've done in the past, introduction of Regional Council staff and guests; and we'll do that by telling who we are and where we're from and kind of go around the room. We'll start with the
council table at first, with Mike Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: I'm from Craig, Prince of Wales.

MS. PHILLIPS: Patty Phillips from Pelican.

MR. THOMAS: Bill Thomas, Ketchikan.

MS. GARZA: Dolly Garza from Ketchikan. And I thank the Yakutat people for inviting us here. It's wonderful to be here. It's a beautiful place, and it's wonderful to be here.

MR. MARTIN: I'm Harold Martin, Tlingit. I was born and raised in Kake. I live in Juneau.

MR. KOOKESH: Floyd Kookesh from Angoon.

MR. ADAMS: Bert Adams from Yakutat; and just on behalf of the president of Yakutat Native Village, Ray Sensmeyer -- he won't be here until this evening -- he asked me to extend a warm welcome to everyone here, and wishes that we have a real successful meeting over the next couple of days. We'll have a chance to see him this evening during the dinner.

I want to apologize to Dolly. The first thing, she came to me when she walked into the door, chastised me for not meeting you all at the airport. So -- and then she threatened to take the meeting somewhere else.

Anyhow, I apologize for that. I'm a very busy person. I thought I was late when I came down here 5 minutes to 1:00, but I'm glad I made it and welcome everyone. We welcome you to Yakutat.

MR. THOMAS: Where are you from?

MR. ADAMS: I'm from Dry Bay.

(Laughter.)
MR. STOKES: Dick Stokes. I'm from Wrangell. After his long-winded presentation, I'll just sit down.

(Laughter.)

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'm John Littlefield from Sitka. I'd like to thank Bert for inviting us to Yakutat, and noted we're all three from Dry Bay, originally.

MS. WILSON: I'm Marilyn Wilson from Haines. This is my second time here for a Federal Subsistence meeting. Thank you for inviting us once again.

MS. RUDOLPH: I'm Mary Rudolph from Hoonah, and this is also my second time here. Thank you for the invitation to come over again.

MR. CLARK: I'm Fred Clark. I'm the coordinator for the Council and also the staff anthropologist. I live in Juneau. I also wanted to say thank you to the people of Yakutat for bringing us here once again. This building is one of my favorite places in Alaska. I'm hoping that sometime somebody from Yakutat will provide us with a history of this building.

Bert?

MR. CASIPIT: I'm Cal Casipit. I'm the regional office subsistence staff fisheries biologist. I'm also the lead biologist for the team in support of the Council.

I'm sure most everybody in the room knows that this will be the last meeting for Fred Clark, your coordinator. He's moving on to another job with the Forest Service. I'm really -- I'm sad to see him go on one hand, and happy for him on the other.

Fred and I, as most of you know, share office space, and we talk amongst ourselves quite a bit. I'm really going to miss Fred when he leaves.

He's taught me the heart of this
program, which is, I think, the most important part of this program, the heart for the people.

Before -- I would like everybody who has had interactions with Fred -- I did bring a Totem, what we call the Totem, a big piece of paper with a Totem pole on it -- put your thoughts for Fred on his way out. He's leaving. You might want to give a few words, write a few words for him on that Totem. It's kind of a momento from us in the Forest Service to Fred so he can take that with him and remember everything he did here and all the people he interacted with.

There's also a little envelope on the back if you care to contribute to his going-away gift as well. Encourage everybody to sign up for it before you leave the meeting today -- before you leave the meeting this week.

Thanks.

MR. MYERS: My name is Marty Myers. I'm the Forest Service law enforcement coordinator out of Juneau.

MR. WILLIAM: Steve William. I'm a radio reporter. I live in Sitka and work for Public Radio there; and we broadcast in a number of your communities, and also we share my stories with other stations in Southeast Alaska and around the state.

MR. GILLIKIN: My name is Dan Gillikin. I'm the local fisheries biologist with the Forest Service here. Patricia O'Connor asked me to sit in for her. She had another meeting at the Forest Service, and she wanted me to welcome all of you to the Forest Service District from Yakutat.

MR. JACKSON: My name is Burt Jackson. I'm from Kake. I'm one of the technicians for one of the subsistence monitoring programs in Kake. I'm here to monitor -- here to check out the meeting and the first time here, so....

MS. GARZA: Who is your mother?
MR. JACKSON: My mother?
MR. THOMAS: Don't tell her.

MR. JACKSON: Pauline James; my father is Norman Jackson.

MS. GARZA: I know who you are.

MR. MIKE JACKSON: Burt's my nephew. I brought him along as my bodyguard. Our first time to Yakutat.

Thanks, Bert, for having the meeting here and you guys showing the issues that you guys have and the booklet is very interesting. I'm very interested in a couple of projects that were here. My name is Mike Jackson. I work for the Organized Village of Kake, IRA and resource specialist.

Thank you.

MR. VEACH: My name is Eric Veach, from Copper Center, fisheries biologist for Wrangell-St. Elias, and I also cover fisheries subsistence with Sandy Scotton.

MS. SCOTTON: My name is Sandy Scotton. I'm a fishery biologist with National Parks.

A SPEAKER: I work for the National Parks Service in Yakutat and Dry Bay.

MS. MASON: Rachel Mason, anthropologist, for the National Parks Service. Formerly, I was the staff anthropologist for this RAC.

MS. HILDEBRAND: Good afternoon. Ida Hildebrand, BIA staff committee member for the Federal Board.

MR. JOHNSON: R. K. Johnson, a wildlife biologist for the Southeast team of Tongass.

MR. SUMINSKI: Terry Suminski, fisheries biologist for the Forest Service
from Sitka.


MR. TUREK: Mike Turek, Fish & Game Division of Subsistence. Good to be back in Yakutat. Glad the meeting's here, and look forward to a nice five days.

MR. LARSON: Bob Larson with the Forest Service, subsistence biologist.

MR. MORPHET: Tom Morphet, subsistence outreach coordinator for United Fishermen of Alaska. If any of you want to know what that is -- long explanation -- pull me aside and I can explain my program. I'm glad to be here. Thank you.

MR. BOS: Greg Bos, Fish and Wildlife Service in Anchorage, staff committee member.

MR. RIVARD: My name is Don Rivard, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management out of Anchorage, and one of the division chiefs there in the office.

MR. KELLY: Scott Kelley, regional staff coordinator for Department of Fish & Game in Juneau.


MR. LaPLANT: I'm Dan LaPlant with the Office of Subsistence Management. I'm the liaison to the Alaska Board of Game.

MR. BROOKOVER: Tom Brookover, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Sitka. I'm the regional manager coordinator for sport fisheries.

MR. CHADWICK: Bob Chadwick, Alaska Department of Fish & Game. I work
for the sport fish management, biologist in Sitka.

Mr. McCurdy: I'm Steve McCurdy, also with Fish & Game, sport fish biologist, Prince of Wales, Klawock.

Mr. Johnson: I'm Bob Johnson, area management biologist here in Yakutat. Welcome to this town.


Mr. Kahler: Craig Kahler, law enforcement based in Sitka Forest Service.

Ms. Cartwright: I'm Meg Cartwright. I'm the coordinator for subsistence monitoring projects for Fish & Game.

Mr. Schroeder: Bob Schroeder, social scientist, at the Forest Service science lab.


Mr. Belton: My name is David Belton, director of Hoonah Indian Association.

Mr. Kitka: My name is Herman Kitka, and I'm here to see that everything goes right for our people in Southeastern. I've been a representative of the ANB since 1937 on subsistence.

Mr. Pate: Jude Pate, attorney for Sitka Tribe.

Ms. Craig: Robi Craig. I also
work for the Sitka tribe.

MR. LORRIGAN: Jack Lorrigan with the Sitka tribe as a biologist.

MR. WALTER JOHNSON: Walter Johnson. I don't represent nobody.

(Laughter.)

MR. WALTER JOHNSON: I'm here on my own, and I'm here to take advantage of all you people being here in Yakutat. Thank you much.

MR. WIDMARK: My name is Woody Widmark, Tribal Chair for Sitka Tribe. I want to thank Yakutat and the Community of Yakutat for allowing me to be here.

MR. THOMAS: I think we're talking with the Sitka Tribe this afternoon. Anyway, thank you all for introducing yourselves. I like to do that, to give everybody a little better feel for who you're meeting with and some who haven't met before, some -- we know almost everybody very well. We like to keep it as user friendly and to track as much participation as we can. I was just reminded that somebody just walked in the door, tell us your name, rank, and serial number.

MR. BARTEN: My name is Neil Barten, area biologist with the area conservation with Department of Fish & Game in Douglas; and Yakutat is part of my area.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

Good.

Okay.

Everybody had a chance to read the -- Fred, maybe you can go over it -- I'll ask him to.

MR. CLARK: That's better.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How many Council members did not receive their booklet before coming here?
MR. LITTLEFIELD: Did not. Why don't you ask if any did?

MR. CLARK: I knew more hands would come up. That's why I did it that way. To those of you who I have not talked to before, the booklets were at a printer in Anchorage that's owned by an Arab-American that somebody got upset because he was Arab-American and trashed his business, destroyed a bunch of copy machines and put the printer out of business. The good news is the printer is back in business and able to produce the booklets. It was a little later than our schedule. So they just arrived for most of us on Saturday. Some arrived on Friday. Finally, the bulk arrived today.

So, that means that we can spend a few minutes just to go over the booklet in a little bit more detail so we can have a better idea of what to look forward to. I think the size of this book is probably a new record for our meetings, and probably statewide for any of the subsistence meetings, the Federal Subsistence Programs. It's huge.

I did distribute to you kind of a two-page or three-page copy of the agenda from the front of the books so we don't have to keep flipping back and forth all the time. That will provide an easy reference. The book starts with Tab A, which is also an old address list. Some of you will notice that you have new phone numbers and fax numbers and e-mail addresses and things like that that do not show up on here that you told me about. So, over the course of this week, if you want to tell me again about your new numbers and addresses and whatever, we can make sure that I have them on my new list.

We will be removing, unfortunately, Mr. Lonnie Anderson from the roster. Lonnie has resigned from the Council, but he'll -- I'm sure that he will let us know himself what his reasons are. He has good reasons.

Behind Tab B are the minutes from
our most recent meeting in Sitka. So, we'll be dealing with that very soon.

Behind Tab C starts the briefings. Not all of the briefings that were listed on the agenda have materials in the booklet. So we'll have to go through that one by one when we get there.

The big Tab, that's Tab B, and those -- Tab D. Those are the analyses, the proposals to change the Federal regulations for the subsistence fisheries. That's what we'll be spending the bulk of our time on.

Another big Tab issue and in some ways a big ticket issue, is Tab E, which is the 2002 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. We'll actually have an introduction to the fisheries monitoring program in the new business section when we have the briefings, but what this section does, under Tab E is looks ahead at the new proposed projects for the Council to make recommendations on.

The briefing under Tab F had to do with customary trade. And I believe we're going to have a request to move that forward because it's really old business because we've dealt with that before. So we can go forward to the briefing section.

MR. THOMAS: Before we do that, Fred, what I'd like to request of the Council is to consider rather adopting the agenda -- there's been some minor changes in people's schedules and bits of information that were prepared, and it would be difficult to allow for those if we had an agenda that was rigid. So, I'll leave it to the wish of the Council.

I'm entertaining a motion.

MR. CLARK: Shall we wait until we actually move to adopt the agenda?

MR. THOMAS: Yes, yes.

MR. CLARK: Under Tab H is a copy of our current Regional Advisory Council Charter for the Council's review to make any suggested changes.

It's been pretty constant, only minor changes so far.
And finally, under Tab I is the meeting window for the next meeting.
That's what's in the book.
The book does not have some of the things that are on the agenda, so briefings from the Wrangell-St. Elias National Parks; Bert, will do that briefing. We'll talk about developing an annual report for the upcoming year. And other new business that will just come up later on. That's the booklet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Fred. Okay. Review and adopt agenda?

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Bert. I move we adopt the agenda as recited.

MR. THOMAS: Moved. Seconded?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Second.

MR. THOMAS: Question has been called for. Mr. Chair?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few additions to the agenda.

MR. THOMAS: The request right now is not in order because we're adopting as a guide, not as a rigid agenda. You'll be able to insert those regardless.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman, the words were withdrawn. I would like to have the public know that those are not withdrawn. If we want to talk about them, specifically --

MR. THOMAS: This won't jeopardize at all.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: As long as it doesn't jeopardize it.

MR. THOMAS: It's not going to jeopardize that.
Okay.
Another question?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Question.

MR. THOMAS: All those in favor, say "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. THOMAS: Those opposed.
The motion carries. We're not working with a rigid agenda. We want to accommodate the concerns that are going to be brought here. I'm sure there's going to be many, and we want to give them the -- a fair opportunity to be heard and -- Fred.

MR. CLARK: Well, that being the case, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just inject a little bit of housekeeping comments, if I may.

Bathrooms are this way; coffee pots are over here; and for those of you who haven't been here already, there's a sign-up sheet -- actually a print-up sheet. I want you to print your names so we can read it, along with a contact number or something along with that, back on the table there.

Also, people wishing to address the Council should fill out a testifier's sheet over here, and give it to me. Might be a little clumsy since I'm over here. Give it to me and I'll make sure the Chairman gets it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. While we're doing that, after about quarter after 4:00 this group turns into a school of piranha; so, were there any plans here for dinner or anything? If not, we need to know that.

MR. CLARK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I talked with Ray Sensmeyer this morning. He told me that we will be having dinner here tonight. We will also be having lunches and all other dinners here. Community fund raisers right here at the hall.
MR. THOMAS: Fund raisers, no free gratis?

MR. CLARK: No free, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. You all heard it from Fred, not from me. You heard it from Fred.

Thank you.

What's your wishes with minutes of March 22 and 23?

If anybody that would like to defer until you've had a chance to study them more, we can do that and come back to it.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I move we defer the minutes until later on.

MR. THOMAS: Hearing no objection, so ordered.

Okay. Now is the time for public comment. I have a request here from a guy that doesn't represent anybody. He's not here to talk about anything in particular. He just wants to make a public comment.

Walter Johnson.

Up to the table, Walter. You got to keep it under two hours.

(Laughter.)

MR. WALTER JOHNSON: I never trusted these things.

Mr. Chairman?

MR. THOMAS: Walter?

MR. WALTER JOHNSON: Regional Advisory Council.

First of all, I would like to welcome you to Yakutat, and I know, myself, personally I appreciate all the support that the Southeastern Regional Council has been giving Yakutat, especially on the moose hunts and those are things that I really appreciate. Like I said, I'm going to take advantage of you guys while you are all here and I'd like to bring some subjects up.
The one thing that is coming shortly would be a -- we are trying to get an area to be set aside specifically for -- specifically for subsistence, and we haven't gotten it together yet, but it will be ready for next year.

And I have a question about Alaska Native allotments. Those are Federal lands protected by the Federal Government, and some of those lands are bordered by salt water, and I -- my question is is not those lands protected by the Federal -- those lands and those waters that are connected to the allotment, are they not protected by the Federal Government and considered waters to be controlled by the Regional Councils?

Just those lines like, for instance, up in Icy Bay, the whole one bay is surrounded by allotments, and the State has issued permits, and I feel that those permits that they issued are wrong. They allow two log rafts in there and those log rafts are destroying that little bay -- even though it's state land, they should have precedence over it. It's something I would like an answer to.

MR. THOMAS: Walter, I don't know if anybody can respond to that right now. But if you would jot down those questions and leave them with us and if there's no one here that can answer with any confidence or authority, we'll have someone explore that and come back to you with a response to that.

MR. WALTER JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's the main reason I was asking the question, so it would be foremost in your mind and an answer would be forthcoming. Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Did our reporter get that?

Good. We're good to go. Under king salmon rod and reel, I was checking the regulations and I find that before we can subsist, we have to buy a license which is understandable, then we also must have -- go by the -- by the same
number that they're allowed, and I was thinking and we have to fill out a permit or subsistence permit, and we just bought the license we would have everything else and we wouldn't have to fill out the permit. And that doesn't follow our customary uses.

We usually go out and catch as many as we can because gas costs so much money and the shells cost so much money, and bait and everything costs so much money. Once we go off, we get as many as we can, come back and we share if necessary, and we eat it or put it away so we won't have to go out.

Now, if the limit is one fish, that means we go out and catch one fish and come back. Next day we have to go out and get another fish and come back, which is not customary and traditional on the side of fishermen.

As far as the rod and reel goes, the State is saying that we cannot use a rod and reel for subsistence purposes, and I don't know -- I guess it has to wait until somebody is picked up for it by the State and find out which one is right. But we've always used rod and reel as far as I can remember.

Also -- we also travel quite a distance just to get those kings, and if we were just to go up and catch one fish and come all the way back, it's not economically feasible for us to do that.

I also have a question. This is for the Forest Service, I guess. As far as I can understand, the nine townships are one-mile square and on the moose season they put a marker out that's supposed to be the edge of the nine townships. And something is wrong with my arithmetic somewhere, because the township is one square mile, and the markers are about 17 miles out. And I have trouble with that, because I know the nine townships are supposed to be one square mile. The most you can be is nine miles out. I don't understand how that happens. How can they figure that it goes 17 miles outside of town? That's what they say.

And I asked them that, and they
said that's the way it is. I just wanted to bring that to you. It's just a little local problem, but it has to do with the Federal agency, the Forest Service, and I just thought I would bring it to your attention.

One thing that really bothers me about the State -- I'm not giving anybody a break today, I'm going to pick on them all. Under the sports industry, they have laws and regulations that say you are allowed two fish per day, or six in possession.

And that -- to me, that's pretty plain, but then somehow or another, the sportsmen have been able to find a way to get around it. They process them. And the State says that's good, they're processed so they're no longer part of the daily catch. So the sport fishermen go out and get another limit. They process them as long as they want.

I seen people come in here in three days during coho season and then leave with three boxes of cohos, and we know they're either filleted out or headed or dead, but there's something wrong when a person can come in and fish all day long and take our resources and get out, smoke them and go down and sell them for 37, $40 a pound, which they are doing -- well, some of them, not all of them, but some of them are.

The results of one man getting three boxes in three days isn't really too bad, but when you multiply it by the thousands of people that come to this town during the fishing seasons, during four years' fishing seasons span of cohos, then you're talking quite a chunk of Yakutat's fisheries. And those are the fish that have already been allowed and counted as escapement. That's what hurts the most. Those are the fish that are caught above the commercial fishing area.

I guess that's basically what I have, and I know I got a lot of time left on my two hours, but I'll fold up for now and, again, I would like to say thank you to the Southeastern Regional. You help Yakutat, and we appreciate it. Thank you very much.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Walter.
There's some things we can respond to. There's some things we can't.

MR. WALTER JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Dolly Garza, Robi Craig.

One minute, 15 seconds.

MS. CRAIG: 30 seconds. I talk fast. My name is Robi Craig. I wanted to say hello to everyone. Dolly Garza and I are doing an inter-Tribal resource meeting during this meeting. We have some real communities, real simple, quick surveys. Have you seen any changes in being able to get your resources or about contamination or other resources, about subsistence.

MS. GARZA: The project that we're working on is funded through the Royal Caribbean grant funds and it's a joint venture with Teresa Woods with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, habitat division. Robi Craig, Sitka Tribe and myself as University of Alaska Native Advisory Program, and the intent of the purpose is to try and find out -- try and find out how much of our subsistence opportunities have left us because of increasing populations or development or changes, general changes in the habitat.

So, what I've noticed is that time after time you can get, you know, an EIS or a core permit to do something because it affects a very small portion of Ketchikan. But over time and over thousands of permits what you have is very few subsistence opportunities in larger communities and even in some of the smaller ones if you have an activity that takes over a whole bay and you can no longer get clams or you can no longer pick seaweed. We would like to interview at least all of the Council members or anyone living in Southeastern who would like to take the time and sit down with us. It will be fairly quick, but I think it will give us a better idea of what we've lost Southeastern wide and community by community. The grant will
not get us to all of the communities in Southeastern, because the budget was cut in half, but we would like to, through one way or another, find people in all the communities that we can interview.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. CRAIG: We will be returning information to the community that participate as well.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.
Those of you that are interested or wanting a little more about it, please take advantage of the time they're here for this meeting so you can involve yourself.
Jude Pate?

MR. PATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like the Council members to know we've prepared for each of you and for some of your staff a packet concerning Proposals 25 and 37 and the extent of Federal jurisdiction of marine waters will be -- we'll be handing these to you momentarily, or whenever is appropriate, Mr. Chair, and to your staff. I encourage you to look over them for the discussion of the proposals tomorrow.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. What you might want to do is when you distribute those is to follow up by making yourself available to get -- to stress the points you want -- with members of the Council so that that will give them a better position of deliberation.

MR. PATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.
Okay. Hearing none, I'll call Walter back up to finish his two hours.
Mr. Clark, briefings, No. 8, Tab C.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, this little briefing is being held because the Councils requested it in the past just to give a little bit of an idea of
how the administrative structure is set up in terms of the layout, personnel between
different agencies.

As you know, the Federal
Subsistence Program is made up of five separate Federal agencies and everybody --
all these agencies have staff involved. In Southeastern, it's primarily the Forest
Service and Parks Service with a lot of involvement by Fish & Wildlife Service
through the Office of Subsistence Management.

So, what I did is I put together a little bit of a layout and it's already out of date because the names have changed within the last couple of weeks. It's the Forest Service subsistence management staff, that's the first page chart. Actually, the original is in color so you can follow things a little bit better, but this works. It's just separated between the regional office staff, Tongass National Forest and Chugach National Forest staff. And it shows on the far left kind of there's a stovepipe organization so it's kind of separate from the National Forest Lands Management sort of a deal. The office of general Council, that's the Forest Services lawyers for the Department of Chugach. They're off to the side and permeate the whole thing, as does the law enforcement office of the Forest Service.

We have with us here, the subsistence law enforcement coordinator, Marty Meyers over here. He's part of the Southeastern regional team. So, we have expanded the team to include Marty, subsistence management coordinator. The subsistence fisheries biologist, that's Cal Casipit and the Tongass subsistence coordinator, Dave Johnson over here.

Hi, Dave.

So, that spans the regional office structure and the Tongass National Forest structure.

Within the Tongass National Forest, we've got the forest staff officer, Larry Meshew working with Dave, but then also we have people out on all of the ranger districts: Craig, Hoonah, Juneau,
Ketchikan/Misty, Petersburg, Sitka, Thorne Bay, Wrangell, and Yakutat.

The final three on this: Cordova, Glacier, and Seward are actually part of the Chugach.

One thing this does not have is all the contact numbers, but we can provide those if you need them.

On the next page -- and there's going to be a quiz after this. On the next page is the structure of the Office of Subsistence Management. Fish & Wildlife Service office in Anchorage. A lot of folks work there now. It's just really blossomed over the last couple of years. I don't really see much value in going through the whole thing here. You can just refer to this as you go forward so if you have questions pertaining to a particular topic, I would go essentially over to the Interior Regions division, and get ahold of Don Rivard. Say hello, Don.

MR. RIVARD: (Waves hand.)

MR. CLARK: 786-386- --

MR. RIVARD: 3882. I've passed cards in --

MR. CLARK: In Southeast, we don't pass out, we distribute.

MR. RIVARD: I've distributed.

MR. CLARK: You see, Bill, I've learned. Are there any questions? I know you've had such a long time to remember them, probably have them memorized.

John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Fred, I have a question on page 2, "Secretary vacant". I'm wondering which secretary you're referring to when the Tongass, virtually all of Southeastern public lands that are subject to subsistence are managed by the secretary of Agriculture, and I know in ANILCA it refers to Secretary of Interior. Is Secretary of Agriculture the one that points
to the Southeastern Regional Council and other duties like that that are particularly for the forests?

MR. CLARK: For the appointment of Council members, that's done concurrently by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of Agriculture, so that they actually do that together.

This is an old list apparently, too, because there is a secretary. There's -- there's kind of a range of authorities that come from the -- both of the different secretaries. Some of them, they retain, and some of them they've passed on to other people like the Federal Subsistence Board or the heads of the particular agencies. For some things, Jim Caplan, Federal Subsistence Board members for the Forest Service has some of those responsibilities, but not all of them.

MR. THOMAS: John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: The reason I was asking that question is there was a handout that you distributed to Council members and there was a letter from other Council and other Councils complaining about vacancies on the Council. Lonnie had resigned. We have other seats that are coming open, and I guess the question is: Is the Secretary of Agriculture involved at all in the selection of the Regional Council members for Southeastern, where she has predominant -- basically, that's the only place to do subsistence in Southeastern, because of Glacier Bay National Monument is not -- there is no subsistence down there.

MR. CLARK: The simple answer is yes. The Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Interior concurrently for all Councils, including Southeastern and Southcentral too.

There's an Agriculture -- the Department of Agriculture interest in Southcentral as well as Southeastern. Does that answer your question?
MR. LITTLEFIELD: No. Who is going to appoint somebody to take Lonnie's place?

MR. CLARK: The secretaries, both of them together.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Together?

MR. CLARK: Yes.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask -- I'll bring it up later on -- it has some bearing. I just asked the question. We'll discuss it later.

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

MS. GARZA: Just following up on that, Fred; when we've had a vacancy in the past, the policy, I don't know if it was written somewhere or just a general policy, but I'd like to know if it's continuing that the vacancy will be filled by someone who applied for -- to be on the Council in the last year?

MR. CLARK: That's correct when it's an out of cycle appointment. For instance, this vacancy with Lonnie, right now we have a request into the secretary's office to fill that. It's a vacancy that's analogous to the thing that John was talking about in other regions. We sent out that letter just to let you know what was happening and the rationale behind that. It's an out of cycle appointment, so that means we can take people from the slate of applicants from the previous cycle so we have a list of people that we can send in from which the secretaries can appoint.

MS. GARZA: One final question on that process. I'm not up this year, so I'm not paying attention. We had five seats that were up --

MR. CLARK: That's correct.
MS. GARZA: Have any decisions been made on those?

MR. CLARK: No. What's actually happened is they've pushed back the schedule and just assumed that the people that were on the Councils for the past appointment are carrying over through this meeting -- this series of meetings around the state, and then from now on they will actually have appointments take effect for the spring meetings, what we call the spring meetings here, but everybody else calls them winter meetings.

MR. THOMAS: Ida has her hands up. Can everybody hear what's being said? Okay, Ida?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ida Hildebrand, BIA staff committee member. Part of the question Mr. Littlefield was asking, on the Eastern Interior; two problems: One, a good number resigned in between terms and the main problem was the change of administration in Washington, D.C. The secretaries weren't appointed and the people who should have assigned them or reviewed the recommendations that went forward from the Board, the process just came to a standstill.

And that was what, I believe, Mr. Nicholia from Eastern Interior Regional Council was questioning and urging some movement on.

And they hope to alleviate that problem by just putting all the appointments at a later time and that all Council -- seated Council will remain in their seats until the new appointments are assigned by the secretaries.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you. Okay. Continuing with your briefing.

MR. CLARK: Anymore questions?
MR. THOMAS: We had questions. We beat around the bush on that.

MR. CLARK: Be persistent.

MS. PHILLIPS: Excuse me --

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Where is the anthropologist vacancy filing status at?

MR. CLARK: Anthropologist --

MS. PHILLIPS: On this page 2? All the way to the right. It shows two vacant anthropologists positions.

MR. CLARK: Perhaps somebody from the Fisheries information staff could answer that question.

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Doug McBride with Fisheries Information Service, and those positions are currently being recruited. The anthropologist that was on staff, Taylor Brelsford, who is now a staff committee member with BLM, was in that role, and those positions are being recruited right now.

MS. PHILLIPS: When will they close?

MR. McBRIDE: I think -- I'm not the one actually doing the recruiting. I think the other one is perhaps still open, but the Federal hiring system moves at glacial speed, and it's somewhere in the system right now. It's my understanding -- I think they received -- the position is probably pretty close to being filled.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Any more questions on the staffing part? Over the week, if you have more questions, we have lots of folks from all these agencies, including the Office of
Subsistence Management.

MR. THOMAS: We're on ice-breaking phase.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. THOMAS: Marilyn?

MS. WILSON: I have a question. Who is going to pick the person that takes your place?

MR. CLARK: There will probably be a selection -- or evaluation team who would make a recommendation to the selecting official, but I don't think those -- the people on that panel have been selected yet. Is that correct?

A SPEAKER: Yeah, we haven't formed a panel yet. My preference is to have a panel to do that selection.

MR. CLARK: The good news is that the position has already been recruited for, advertised -- advertisements have been made. It's closed, so now there is a group of people that -- once the panel is appointed, they can select pretty rapidly. So it won't take a long time.

MS. PHILLIPS: Can a member of the SERAC be a part of that panel, and does the member of the SERAC want to be a part of that panel?

MR. CLARK: I don't know the answer to that.

A SPEAKER: I don't know the answer either. I'll find out for you.

MR. RIVARD: Fred, if I may. I believe with it being a Federal hiring process, it has to be done internally by the Federal Government.

MS. PHILLIPS: They have final say.
MR. CLARK: Are we ready for the 805?

MR. THOMAS: Let's talk about something happier.

MR. CLARK: Now, this is a letter that you should have received in the mail quite a while ago, and what it is is to let you know what the Federal Subsistence Board did with your recommendations regarding the proposals to change Federal wildlife regulations from the last meeting.

Essentially, the Proposals 1 and 2, which were submitted by Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council and Western Interior Regional Advisory Council are proposals that are to include definitions of airborne, bait, drainage, and salvage, and to clarify the definition of aircraft. The Board adopted the proposal as recommended. This is page 3 in Tab C. That proposal did go through.

Proposal 3 was from the Prince of Wales; Prince of Wales and Game Advisory Committee of Thorne Bay. This proposal requested eliminating the antlerless deer harvest in Unit 2. The Board rejected that proposal.

Proposal 4 was submitted by the Forest Service and requested that the Board remove the regulatory provision allowing hunters to shoot ungulates from boats in Unit 4.

This is an issue that is still with us. The Board deferred the proposal until after the State Board of Game meeting, which is coming up in January 2002. We'll be talking more about this issue at this meeting. We'll be hearing quite a bit about that.

Proposal 5 was submitted by Lewis M. Hiatt of Craig. This proposal requested a shift in the wolf season in Unit 2. The Board adopted this proposal and followed the recommendations of this Council.

Proposal 6 was submitted by Patricia -- Patty Phillips of Pelican who requested an extension of the marten, mink,
and weasel trapping season in Chichagof Island in Unit 4. The Board adopted this proposal consistent with recommendation of this Council.

And that concludes the actions by the Board.

See, I didn't bring my little handy-dandy agenda, so I keep having to keep switching back and forth.

That brings us up to --

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Chair?

MR. THOMAS: John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Fred, you said we were going to discuss the deer in another place.

MR. CLARK: Right now.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Right now?

MR. CLARK: And somebody from OSM was going to present.

Dan, you want to do that?

MR. THOMAS: Let us all know where we're at. Where are we at?

MS. GARZA: The briefing paper?

MR. CLARK: Briefing paper right after the 805 letter in your booklet.


MR. LaPLANT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, my name is Dan LaPlant. I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management. I'm the liaison to the Alaska Board of Game, and I'm going to be presenting the issue of shooting a deer from a boat in Unit 4, Tab C on page 6. During your March 2001 meeting from Sitka this past spring, you heard testimony from several subsistence users concerning Proposal 4 submitted by the Forest Service to remove the current Federal
regulation that allows shooting ungulates from a boat in Unit 4. The testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of maintaining language in the Federal regulations to allow shooting deer from the marine waters and pursuing changes to State regulations that currently prohibit it. The fact that the Forest Service proposal was to eliminate the shooting from a boat on any waters in Unit 4, including freshwaters, drew the most opposition. Those testifying made it clear that the subsistence users in the area were aware of the State regulations, were opposed to it, and didn't want the Federal regulation to change to accommodate it.

You all know this because you were at the meeting. This is kind of an update on the situation.

Understanding that the proposal -- the purpose of the proposal was to eliminate a regulation that conflicts with State regulations, for the benefit of subsistence users, the Council opposed the proposal and passed a motion to amend it. Your amendment was to, instead, change the definition of the word "take" to refer to "where the animal is standing, not from where the hunter was shooting"; and to have the regulation clearly state that shooting from a boat in marine waters was an exception to the rule in Subpart A. This is our regulations -- subsistence management regulations. The motion also included your justification for the Federal Subsistence Board to take this extraterritorial jurisdiction.

At the May 9th, 2001 meeting of the Federal Subsistence Board, the Board voted to defer the action on the proposal until after January of 2002. January 2002 is when the Board of Game is expected to take up the request from the Federal Subsistence Board to repeal the State regulation that prohibits big game -- shooting big game from boats in marine waters in Units 1 through 5.

The request to the Board of Game was originally submitted back in January of this year, 2001, with a request for them to take some action on the issue at their March
meeting. The Board of Game heard some very compelling testimony from both Dr. Wini Kessler of the Forest Service and Mr. Littlefield from the Council. However, they were reluctant to take any action on the issue because they had not had the request of the proposal out for public notice and they didn't have any input on the issue from the local Fish & Game advisory committees.

So they deferred that issue until this coming January meeting.

Since then what we've done is the Federal Subsistence Board has resubmitted the proposal to the Board of Game. We actually did that last month. This gets published in the Board of Game's proposal book. That book of proposals will be available for public comment throughout November and December and the comment period ends on January 4th, 2002.

The public can provide written comments to the Board of Game before the January 4 deadline. And subsistence users may also attend local Fish & Game advisory meetings in November and December to express their positions concerning the proposal to repeal the State's shooting from a boat regulations.

I'd like to emphasize that those local Fish & Game advisory committee meetings throughout Southeastern during November and December are key parts of that decision-making process by the Board of Game.

In addition, those who want to testify directly to the Board of Game should attend the January meeting, January 18th through the 23rd in Anchorage. And the Office of Subsistence Management will provide travel support for a representative from the Council to attend and give testimony at that meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state that the Office of Subsistence Management intends to continue working with the Southeast Regional Council to help provide a legal method for eligible subsistence users in Unit 4, to take deer from Federal lands while shooting from a boat in marine waters.
The Federal subsistence also recognizes the importance of maintaining subsistence users current authority to shoot from boats while on Federal waters, i.e., fresh-waters. We also recognize the importance of fishing from a boat.

That concludes my testimony. I'm prepared to answer questions.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much. That was an excellent update.
We find here it's the understanding that the purpose of the proposal was to submit a regulation that conflicts with the State regulations for the benefit of subsistence users.

There's no truth in that statement, and nothing we do here is for convenience. Everything we do at this Council level is driven by a necessity, and I say this because in the past -- I'm not -- I'm not putting all of this in your pocket. In the past we have made concessions with the -- for the convenience of having regulations read the same for a convenience. And none of that -- none of that was for the benefit of subsistence users. And so right off the bat, we wound up in the posture of giving ground, so to speak, to areas that we didn't like to begin with, but somehow our compassionate side told us to go ahead and be good guys and make these parallel. And I think from now on as we -- as we grow in this process, that we won't be so fast to do that anymore for a matter of convenience. And we'll have to do more substance than that. I appreciate your overview, and I'm sure there is some questions here, and Don John, you hand your hand up?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I had a question. It was the last sentence of the paragraph: The motion also included your justification for the Federal Subsistence Board to take this extraterritorial jurisdiction.
Subsequent to this meeting and also subsequent to the January meeting, we had a meeting in Sitka which I brought up the marine waters, so I've been working on
some of this for a while, and I'm wondering what would be the position of OSM if under 36 C.F.R. 242.3(b)(28) we were to strike the three words and exclude "the marine waters"?

To me that looks like -- I know we're going to be talking about jurisdiction after a while, but are there any other regulatory areas that would prevent us from allowing shooting from a boat if those four words were not in the Federal Register? Do you know of any others?

MR. LaPLANT: Mr. Chairman,
Mr. Littlefield, not to my knowledge. I believe that is the language that identifies the current Federal jurisdiction. So, changing that would extend the current jurisdiction. So that's where we were looking at as extraterritorial jurisdiction, the extent of territorial jurisdiction that we currently had stated in the regulation. So, yeah, that statement, if that regulation related -- words to be deleted from that regulation, yes, that would grant jurisdiction to the Federal Subsistence Board. That's a decision that the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture have to make. Subpart A regulations are their authority.

MR. THOMAS: Any more questions?
Thank you very much.

MR. LaPLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I believe I have the next briefing statement as well.

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

MR. LaPLANT: This is the briefing on the State/Federal coordination. That briefing statement is also under Tab C on page 8.
This briefing is entitled "Federal/State Coordination." I intended to update you on the status of the working relations between the State and Federal regulations relative to Federal subsistence
management.

As you remember during the February/March of last year -- this year, at the Regional Council meetings, Fish and Game Department found it necessary to significantly reduce their involvement in Council deliberations due to a lack of adequate funding for their staff support. That wasn't as much of a notable issue at Southeast Council meetings. If I remember, I was there in Sitka as well and it was Fish & Game Department personnel at that meeting as well. But throughout most of the Council meetings, that did not happen.

And, again, it was because of the lack of funding to support their staff.

In addition, the State resource professionals were unable to continue their participation in the State/Federal memorandum of agreement that is working toward developing protocols for the subsistence and State Regulatory Program. In May we finally resolved the funding issue, and it was resolved for the balance of the calendar year. Additional funding for liaison and staff support for overall coordination and collaboration on protocol development is a high priority for the Federal Subsistence Program and we anticipate providing additional funding to the Department for the remainder of this year and -- and in year 2002 and beyond.

So we're again fully engaged with the Department of Fish & Game. Recent decisions with the Federal Subsistence Board, Mitch Demientieff and the Fish & Game Commissioner, Frank Rue, reaffirmed their full support for continuing coordination and cooperation between the Federal and State programs. Department and staff are here today, in attendance of your meeting. The MOA working group met to address how to get the protocols on track.

At the February meeting, March, whenever you have the meeting, we hope to be able to provide you with a schedule of accomplishments to getting these protocols underway.

I think we're back on track, as I said before, and I think we're off to a new
start. That concludes my briefing statement on the Federal and State coordination, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you. Questions.
Mike?

MR. DOUVILLE: I have a question for the Federal Subsistence Board, repeal the state regulation that prohibits big game in marine waters -- on the next page, the Office of Subsistence Management is only looking to provide a legal method for subsistence users in Unit 4.

I know that Unit 4 was at the forefront of this request originally. Why was it not included in Southeast?

MR. LaPLANT: Mr. Chairman, the current State regulation includes Units 1 through 5 so that's why we referenced it in the statement here, and that's up to the Board of Game to address whether they want to consider this proposal for just Unit 4 or Unit 1 through 5. Unit 5 is what the current regulation pertains to. Unit 4 is -- excuse me, the Federal proposal was specifically for Unit 4 and this proposal came through this Council as just pertaining to Unit 4. That's how we passed it on through to the Board of Game; and like I said, their regulation is for 1 through 5. It's yet to be seen how they will address it.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much.

MR. LaPLANT: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: I've been advised that 8(d) or whatever will be deferred to a later time on our agenda. Are we ready for 8(f), Fred?

MR. CLARK: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

What this part of the agenda is designed to do is to provide the Council with some background on types of projects that have been ongoing, the ones that have already
been started, for those that have something to report. So you can see kind of the trend of projects that have been happening, at this point.

I think the way that we'll arrange it is Doug will give kind of an introduction, an overview of the projects that have been funded and started and ongoing. Then we have some examples, some more specific examples of some of the projects that people are doing. The projects will be presented by Rachel.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Got an overwhelming request for a short break. We've got people that smoke and we've got people that do other things. I can't mention some of those, and so we'll take a five-minute break. Pardon us for interrupting your eloquent presentation like we did.

All right.

MR. McBRIDE: Just to get one word in before the break. I'm going to -- at each one of your stations there, I put three packets I'll be speaking to. Then there are packets on the table so we're not interrupting the meeting as we get started. The fishery information -- Fishery Resource Monitoring Program, green report and yellow report. On the back table.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

(Break.)

MR. THOMAS: Does that bring us now to 8G?

MR. CLARK: No, Mr. Chairman.

We've had a request to go back to the shooting deer from boats issue for a little update.

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

Neil Barten?

MR. BARTEN: Good afternoon, excuse me. Again, name is Neil Barten. I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game
from Douglas. I have just a little information to add regarding this shooting deer from boats proposal.

Given that the State regs do not allow the shooting of deer from boats in Southeastern Alaska, the Federal regs do allow shooting deer from boats in Unit 4. We are gathering committees in Southeastern Alaska, and require of them whether they would submit a proposal to the Board of Game to change the state regs in Southeastern Alaska from boats. We've actually in September and October sent out surveys as well as called 23 different advisory committees from different communities throughout Southeastern Alaska, and in a lot of cases we didn't get answers to the survey in the letter format, in which case we tried calling people, and in a lot of cases we were able to get ahold of each member of the advisory committee. I'll kind of give you a rundown of what we came up with from their views of this situation.

Ten of the 23 committees we never did get a response from. We're trying to get more information from them. Eight committees we did get written letters from our survey and another five committees we actually got verbal communication with at least two members of each of those committees, and they responded to our question. And our questions were kind of related to: Do you think shooting deer from boats is biologically -- is a sound idea? Do you think there's a public safety concern, et cetera, et cetera? And kind of to summarize what we came up with from the people who did respond, in general, there was a -- a -- what I'm trying to say. In general, most of the people did not favor the shooting of deer from boats and mostly due to the public safety concern, not a biological concern. From the Department of Fish & Game standpoint, shooting of deer from boats does not present a biological deer problem, except in years of deep snow, where you get deer harvested in one small area, people shooting from boats. Given the information we got up to this point, we're going to continue to get ahold of the rest
of committees and come up with a proposal to
the Board of Game for the winter meeting.
So we haven't collected all the data we want
yet, but we have been attempting to.

MR. THOMAS: On your data
collecting, how many of those surveyed are
familiar with shooting from a boat?
Shooting deer from a boat?

MR. BARTEN: Certainly a lot of
folks from the communities -- a lot of them
probably don't actually participate in the
practice, but they still --

MR. THOMAS: But they were
speaking an opinion in any case.

MR. BARTEN: Yeah. They know
someone who has done it or know hunters from
Unit 4 that are familiar with the practice. I think most of them have a fairly decent
grasp on what it would be all about. Most
of the comments were to the extent of either
public safety, ethical concerns. They just
didn't think it was a good idea to be
shooting from a boat, they might be moving
from the water.

MR. THOMAS: Those are
speculative scenarios, and the people that
have requested the legalization of this
practice are people that are eligible
subsistence users, and there's a drastic
difference in expertise on the successful
and safety of the approach of an eligible
subsistence hunter than there is -- you
can't compare those that are not eligible to
be in there. So, their input would be only
opinion, and if -- if you're going by
opinions, I don't see how that could have a
biological application, you know. To me,
that's pretty simple biology. I wasn't a
biologist, now I feel like I'm a Ph.D.

MR. BARTEN: Mr. Chair, we also
did contact advisory committees in Unit 4.
We got opinions from members of communities
in Unit 4. Again, not all communities
answered. We're trying to get information
from ones that did not answer, or other advisory committees who never responded to our surveys. We did contact advisory communities in Unit 4 where they did participate in the practice.

MR. MARTIN: I'm curious. When you talk about advisory committee communities, who are you talking about?

MR. BARTEN: We have a Board of Game, we also have 72 local advisory committees throughout the state. Most communities have an advisory committee under the State regs, Yakutat, Haines, there are advisories committees scattered throughout the state. The Board of Game -- and the way, the State system works, uses the committees as eyes and ears.

MR. MARTIN: Are there Natives sitting on these?

MR. BARTEN: I don't know the makeup of all of them. I only deal with three around Juneau.

MR. MARTIN: I think I agree with the term. I think what you need to do is go out to the communities that are actually involved. I grew up in a subsistence lifestyle, and I hunted with my Dad, on the rowboats, rowboat. We didn't have an outboard. We had to row. And he told me never to shoot if the boat is rocking -- you only take what's for sure you can get. And you only take what you need when you need it. I think you need to go to the people that are involved, not advisory board. I have a hard time.

MR. THOMAS: It's not easy to conquer.

MR. BARTEN: I agree with you guys. The more information we can get from all the local communities, the better. You know, and, again, this was a very -- I guess you could call it a cursory examination of what the feelings were out there from the
advisory committees. Again, to contact everybody just wasn't realistic. You know, just in the time constraints we had wouldn't have made any sense. The advisory committees are kind of, you know, each community or a lot of the small communities do have advisory committees. We wanted to get to those folks and tried to get as much input as we could from the many different communities as possible. As I said, a lot of the advisory committees never responded and we're still attempted to get more information.

MR. THOMAS: I could have saved you a lot of paperwork and responded like those people.

John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: First, I would like to request a copy of the questionnaire that was sent out, because the format of any questionnaire can give you any answer you want. First off, I found it inconceivable that we're sending a biological question to a person who is not a biologist. I'm an electrician and, if I asked you if this building was electrically sound I probably could not answer that. The biologists are all in agreement as far as I know. There's nothing biologically wrong with shooting deer off a boat. I haven't heard a biologist come out opposed to that.

As far as safety, what's unsafe about it? Can you shoot a beer can off a boat now? Can you shoot off a boat anytime you want to? Sure you can. Those questions can be formed so that your opinion can basically get where you want. I think the members of this Council should have an opportunity to look at that questionnaire and comment on it. I agree with the previous speaker that also we need to have more involvement on this. I know Sitka Regional Advisory Committee held, I believe, three or four meeting on the proposal when it came up and the vote was 10 to 2. Two people who voted against allowing shooting from a boat, who discussed safety. One Native on it. Predominance of sport
MR. BARTEN: And let me correct that. I gave you the wrong idea there. It isn't certainly the majority of the people. Again, it was the majority of the advisory committees that responded. There is a big difference. As far a copy of the survey, I can get you one tomorrow morning. I'll get one from Juneau. It will be sent via e-mail. That's a guide. You should take a look at it.

MR. THOMAS: Marilyn?

MS. WILSON: Yes, I wanted to know, we have a lot of ANB in each community, and usually the ANB has a fisheries committee or a subsistence committee, and right now we have someone who has been from Sitka ANB and he's from the grand camp level that is representing subsistence, and when the grand camp is represented, that means all the communities are represented through -- oh, goodness -- our esteemed member, Herman Kitka, Sr. And he's here representing the ANB camp. And I think that we should start using these people that have these committees. They're not on the State committee. They're not on a Federal or any government committee, but they're just as important and just as reliable. So, why can't we use those committees as a source of information?

MR. BARTEN: I think it's a wonderful idea. And, again, this was very much a cursory dive into trying to get some feedback from some of the communities from Alaska. It wasn't a comprehensive survey. It wasn't meant to be. This information I'm presenting to you is, again, a snapshot --

MR. THOMAS: Who generated the
survey?

MR. BARTEN: It was put together -- I don't know exactly who, within the Department of Fish & Game in Southeastern Alaska over in the Juneau office. I'll bring one in tomorrow, and distribute them amongst you all, and have you look at it.

MR. THOMAS: Any more questions? We're going to take two hours of comment.

MR. DOUVILLE: I don't know if you got our response from the Craig Advisory Committee. I know most of those people on there have -- most of them are involved in fishing and most of them -- I think -- I'll give you advice on what my reasons would be. I was at the meeting.

MR. THOMAS: Patty?

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Thomas, I don't want to put you on the hot seat. I have a comment also, is that this Regional Council is a representation of subsistence users, and many of us are leaders in our communities, and we carry it on as different jobs from our communities; and this -- this SERAC is a result of the State's Fish & Game Advisory Committee's failure to represent us, the subsistence users. And many of us feel a distrust toward the State Fish & Game Advisory Committees, and though your intent is a good one to get public input on shooting from a boat, it seems to me that the results are going to be based on public opinion, popular public opinion rather than grassroots, what is actually right and what is fair for subsistence users.

MR. THOMAS: Dolly?

MS. GARZA: I guess along those same lines, I mean it's unfortunate that the Board of Game decided that there wasn't enough testimony at the last meeting, because I know that Sitka went through a
long process of testimony, and the people who went from Sitka represented a broad range of people and represented numerous meetings, and the conclusion of the meetings and the same goes for here, I mean, we have discussed this at length, and we represent our communities, and it almost feels like to do a survey is an attempt to overturn what we have decided. Unless you go back with those surveys and explain why the Southeastern Regional Advisory Council is supporting this, then -- I mean, you could get a survey out there that people say we don't like shooting Bambi; we don't like doing this; we don't like doing that. It's easy for someone to say that they don't like something that they're not involved with.

I quite agree with John that you can write a survey to get the results that you want and considering that there has been some dislike toward this practice by the State and by ADF&G in general, one would be suspicious of any survey written by ADF&G. So, I do think that we need to see it, and I think we need to remember that we do work very hard as a Southeast Regional Advisory Council to represent the region and to represent the subsistence users.

Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Since this has been on hold. I have to go and shoot those deer on the beach, and they're getting big and ornery to know that they can't be shot at. Shooting from boats has been on hold until this discussion clears up.

Any more questions? Comments? Thank you.

MR. BARTEN: Thank you for my chance to comment.

MR. THOMAS: Fred?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we're back to Doug.

MR. THOMAS: Somebody.

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. What I'm going to be speaking to the Council about is the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program that has been implemented so far, and the material I'll be talking about -- I handed out a handout that looks like this, white pages, and these are just the talking points, basically the points I'm going to be going through.

The more detailed material is this green handout that I gave you entitled "Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program 2000-2001, Southeast Alaska Region."

MR. THOMAS: Is this bringing us back to 8(e)?

MR. McBRIDE: I didn't bring my agenda.

MR. CLARK: 8(f).

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

MR. McBRIDE: Again, this a report on progress for the projects that have already been funded in the first two years of operation, 2000 and 2001, again, I'll be -- I'm sorry, Dolly.

MS. GARZA: What is the fiscal year start date? 2001 started when.

MR. McBRIDE: Year starts October 1. We funded two years of program. And whether we call them fiscal years or calendar years at this point, it really doesn't matter a whole lot. Kind of the small program was started in 2000. Then if you remember last February when we met in Anchorage, that was the full -- what's anticipated to be the full annual program, and that was 2001 program we made decisions on last February.

MR. THOMAS: Doug, the gallery behind us can't hear. What's going on? Is there some way we can put this speaker back that way farther?

Can you hear me? Testing one, two, three.
Thank you.

MR. McBRIDE: So, again, we're going to be doing a quick summary of the report of progress, projects funded in the years 2000 and 2001. I'll be summarizing information in this green here, which has an executive summary and then a project by project summary of progress. And I'll just apologize upfront. This didn't make it to the Council book. Since you didn't get the Council books anyway, I don't have to apologize too badly.

MR. THOMAS: It sounds good, thank you.

MR. McBRIDE: The agenda for what we're going to be spending the next couple of minutes doing, first of all, I'm going to very briefly give you some background on the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, just to kind of update the information we covered before. We'll also briefly go over the issues and information needs identified for this region, and then we'll actually get into a brief summary of the report of progress on the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, for Southeastern region. Later in the meeting, after you go through the regulatory proposals, late in the meeting, I'll be making another presentation on the draft -- 2002 plan. That will be the draft plan for new work to be funded in fiscal year 2002.

Real briefly, let's discuss the backgrounds of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. The objective of the program is to gather and improve information necessary to manage subsistence fisheries.

And if you remember from our previous discussions, when we look at projects for any particular year, the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is structured to provide a funding commitment up to three years in duration.

From a financial standpoint, across the entire state the fisheries resource money for the program was initiated in fiscal year 2000, two years ago, and
approximately $2 million were allocated statewide for the first year projects, and then those funding commitments over a three-year period of time, through 2002, totaled 4 million.

Then, again, last February, when we met in Anchorage, the full program, a total of a little over $7 million, $7.25 million was allocated statewide. That's the program we discussed last February.

If you'll turn to the next page, page 5 in your handouts, the bar graph looks like this. This is a picture or a graph of the financial information on a statewide basis. And there's a couple of things that's worth mentioning on this.

If lieu of this graph, you'll see at the bottom years, years that we're talking about, and then the total dollar amounts on the vertical scale, and then the real dark black bars on each of the first three years, that was the 2000 program. So, in the first year, we allocated about $2 million to get the program. Some of those projects had multiple years of components to them, and so that's those black bars you see in years 2001, 2002.

Then you go to that second bar, the big bar over the year 2001, and over the small black section, there's that gray section on top, 7.25 million that was allocated for 2001. Again, that was what we discussed last February. Then we follow those gray markings that you'll see the financial commitment from that as that goes over the three years.

And it's those two bars I'll be discussing right now. We do the 2002 plan, you'll see starting in 2002, light gray shaded area. It's got a number in there, 2,064, a little over $2 million. That's the money over 2002. We'll be discussing that in a little more detail.

One more, just brief comment on background: How is the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program administered? The oversight is by the Fisheries Information Services, which is the Office of Subsistence Management. Again, that's who I work for.
most people refer to us. Among other things, FIS staff provide assistance during project planning and implementation. And as part of all cooperative agreements, all the different investigators -- all investigated -- were required to provide a progress report by September 1, 2001. That's the individual progress reports that I've provided in this green report. The actual progress reports submitted by the investigators.

The next page is issues and information needs. I don't think we need to spend a lot of time on this, other than to say there's really two primary sources of information, including Southeast. Obviously, the major one comes from this Advisory Council. What I've done in here is listed four major information needs that you identified. We did it last February, and updated at the March meeting in Sitka.

Right-hand side of the page, obviously, other issues and information come from the subsistence Board. Regulatory issues in front of the subsistence Board now and then obviously during the time when this program was implemented.

MS. GARZA: Those points from the Federal Subsistence Board, when did the Board consider them?

MR. McBRIDE: These are issues that have been from the Board, either now or have been from the past. These would have been information needs that would have driven the program as far back as two years ago.

MS. GARZA: So, are those -- but did the Board -- did the Federal Subsistence Board as an Advisory Council say -- could they surface as where the issues are?

MR. McBRIDE: These serve as regulatory proposals. Just get right into the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program for the Southeastern region.

So far, we've implemented a total
of 13 projects across the region.

These 13 projects are a mixture of both Stock Status and Trends and Harvest Monitoring and TEK projects.

Actually, the next page of the handout is a table, looks like this. This is actually Table 1, page 7 in the green book.

This table right here, and during the rest of the presentation, what would probably be helpful to open it to this table, you can track along with the projects.

If you look at that Table 1, the way it's organized -- I'll just move from left to right. Far left is the comment FIS number. It's a number we give every project, accounting system. Next data -- is data type, Stock Status Trends or Harvest Monitoring TEK Project. Next we've got project title.

The next column, we put in the major investigators for each project, you can see who is actually doing the projects.

Then on the far right is the financial information. Each year how much that project costs and then if it's a multiple of how many years, you can see the funding commitment over the life of the project.

If you look at that table, what you'll see is most of the projects are grouped under estimation of sockeye salmon escapement. That has been the single biggest financial commitment of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program so far. It's clearly been a major information need identified by the Council. Also been a big subject of regulatory proposals from the subsistence Board, and in terms of numbers of projects and money, that's clearly been the major theme of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program to date.

And then the remaining projects have been categorized under documentation of subsistence use patterns.

Again, that's been a very major informational need identified by the Council, and this also obviously plays into the regulatory analysis in a large way.
So, now, what I'm going to do is just go through and I'm not going to give you a project by project, blow by blow description of each individual project, I'm going to try to capture some of the highlights of these projects.

Another thing I'll mention is the audience is filled with investigators that actually do a lot of these projects. I think some of them are planning on doing presentations. Others are certainly here to answer questions. If you want to get down into the details of the individual project, there's plenty of people here to do it.

Looking at that first category, Sockeye Salmon Escapement Assessment Program. In total, we've estimated escapements now in 15 island systems throughout Southeastern Alaska. The methodology of those projects includes primarily either weirs to count fish or tagging systems to estimate escapement.

Many of these projects are also estimating localized subsistence and sport harvest, needs to be harvests in close proximity to the individual system, and a lot of the projects are also trying to estimate and determine productivity.

And in total, most of these programs are designed to determine escapement goals. They're measuring escapement, measure the harvests at least occurring locally, trying to measure lake productivity. Together those are being used to try to determine what an appropriate escapement goal would be for the systems.

I think the other thing that I can generally say about all these projects in general; most of the projects have achieved all of our objectives. By and large they're all moving forward as they originally anticipated and we discussed previously.

The projects -- projects that are using weirs, I think I can report to you now with very little doubt that these are clearly successful efforts to estimate escapement. The systems that we got include Klawock, Falls Lake, Klag Bay, Salmon Lake and Virginia Lake.
All of those weirs have gone in as originally designed and are working as originally designed. They've been very successful. I think the tagging programs are also successful. A lot of those tagging programs -- some of them are still going on and there's a lot of analysis that still needs to be done, and I think the investigators are worrying a lot. They're not quite as straight forward as they're putting the weir or fence up across the creek and counting escapement. I think there's more review that needs to go into that part of the program. I think the other thing worth adding right now, as we're going through these reviews and those analyses, some systems may be added or dropped as we go through time. May be some systems that make sense to continue. Other systems may be undoable for other reasons. There may be some program movement as we go through time. If you look at the list of projects that are being covered here, obviously, a lot of these systems are under regulatory consideration, and you'll be discussing those over the course of the next couple of days. And also, a lot of these -- or several of these escapement assessments are critical for either inseason management or rehabilitation.

For instance, Klawock Lake clearly is the subject of a lot of rehabilitation effort and the assessment work that's going on here is doable to that. Another system, Falls Lake is probably the best example. I can pick up off the top of my head -- not Falls Lake, Salmon Lake, Sitka weir, some active inseason management is going on and escapement information is integral to that.

The other thing that I'd like to mention on this table is that if you go about halfway down the table, Project 126 there, Kanalku, Hasselborg, and Sitkoh Lake. That's a project that this program was unable to fund, just simply because the funding was -- funding constraints didn't allow us to fund it. Included on this table
for informational purposes, the Forest Service was able to fund that, clearly has major bearing, with this program. I thought that was worth putting on the table.

MS. GARZA: What is ADA?

MR. McBRIDE: I think that's Angoon, isn't it? Isn't that it, ADA? Floyd?

MR. KOOKESH: I have no idea.

MR. McBRIDE: I think it's the Angoon IRA.

MR. KOOKESH: ACA, sorry.

MR. McBRIDE: I'm sorry for that.

MS. GARZA: Angoon.

MS. WILSON: ACA.

MS. GARZA: I thought it was an ADA project.

MR. McBRIDE: Just a few more comments about the sockeye escapement program. Most of these projects contain cooperative agreements with rural organizations to build capacity. All of these projects have funding commitments in 2002 and some of them through 2003. If you go to the table, you can see which ones go to 2003 and which ones have funding commitments that go through 2002.

I think it's important to recognize now that some of these projects should be considered for further funding commitments, and I say that because I think it's very important to realize that long-term escapement data sets are usually invaluable, and one of the things we clearly need to do is go through strategic planning process to identify and maintain those key escapement data sets.

And the final thing I'll say about the sockeye escapement part of the
program, is, again, there are investigators present, even myself, that can answer very specific questions if you have them. John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: You talked about weirs earlier. On the weir -- areas -- we have weirs. We have a foot survey or helicopter survey, other index datas that track the trend on weirs.

MR. McBRIIDE: Most of the weir programs, in fact, a lot of the weir programs have a backup, tagging component in case there is a weir blowout. I -- tagging components to try to identify substock spawning locations within the systems. A lot of the programs have ongoing survey work that's going on, so we can try to couple that up with weir data. And so, there's a lot of work going on trying to see whether a meaningful, either index or at least a financially cheaper alternative for the weir will go forward and provide meaningful information.

What I'd like to do now is go to the subsistence use patterns projects. Those would be the five projects on the bottom part of Table 1.

And these projects are doing obviously, just what the category says, trying to document subsistence use patterns in the Southeastern.

Most of these projects are utilizing interviews to document both historic and contemporary subsistence use patterns. Many of these projects are going to provide some kind of mapping, usually GIS data set.

This information is critical for providing the basis for customary and traditional and fishery regulatory proposals. And one project on here which is the East Alsek Salmon Historical Use and TEK Project, 091. This one has simply been rescheduled for 2002. It was part of what we discussed last February, for initiation this year, but there were some problems with us, with the Fish and Wildlife Service getting some of the funding instruments or
funding agreements out in a timely enough manner to get projects going, that were supposed to happen this past spring. This is one project where we simply have rescheduled it, postponed the money, and postponed the work until this coming year.

I think one general statement about at least most of these projects, unlike some of the sockeye escapement work, most of this work should be conclusive after the final year of funding commitment.

However, there are some projects on this list that should be considered for further funding. Particularly ones that are updating annual database.

In summary, for the entire program, most of the funded projects were successfully implemented. I think it would be very easy to say that significant progress was done in building capacities of rural organizations. Most of these projects have funding commitments in 2002. That means most of these projects will be ongoing this coming year, and will continue as planned.

There are a few projects where there are questions of study design and we'll resolve those prior to proceeding in 2002.

And then several of these projects should definitely be considered for continuation -- funding continuation beyond the current funding commitments.

With that, Mr. Chairman, that's the end of my presentation. I'm prepared to answer any questions.

Thank you.

MR. McBRIDE: That's a presentation that will happen at the end -- later in the meeting, that's also what's under Tab E in your book. That is the Draft Resource Monitoring Program.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: All those -- we just got this book about two minutes ago. Is there a listing of all the projects as well as the status -- the recommendations?

MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: What Tab is that?

MR. McBRIDE: Tab E.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'll study them.

MR. McBRIDE: Okay.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you. Dolly?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I'm curious, I know that several of the people who have been involved in these projects are here. Are we hearing on individual projects or are they here to look good?

MR. McBRIDE: I believe the short answer is "yes."

MR. THOMAS: People involved --

MR. McBRIDE: Sorry.

MR. THOMAS: People that are here involved in the projects, here more or less -- are they prepared to participate?

MR. McBRIDE: Fred, I'll talk to you.

MR. CLARK: Does your question have to do with inseason projects?
MS. GARZA: OVK -- do we have people from Fish & Wildlife, will we hear reports, is this it?

MR. CLARK: We have people here who are going to do presentations when he's done.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: This draft that you showed me earlier, is the declining funds from year to year, it's apparent to me. What does your crystal ball say we're going to be looking at in 2003? It looks like it's going to zero out before 2004, the graph where the funding is.

MR. McBRIDE: John, what's going on here, the current thinking for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is that there will be $7.25 million annually, okay? And what's going on on this graph is when the program started in 2000, that's what those little black bars -- start here -- that was a single pot of money under the Federal system, no-year money, used to jumpstart to get the program off the ground. That money, about $4 million, that's going to be spent over a three-year period of time. Once that money is gone, it's gone. The $7.25 million first came into play in 2001. That's this big gray bar over the top in 2001. $7.25 million, and if you go to 2002, this coming year, there's the very last bit of the original no-year money that's left and the full $7.25 million; and then starting in 2003, that no-year money is completely gone. Then what we're looking at is level funding, $7.25 million annually to fund in the future.

What this $7.25 million covers is the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and the Partnership for Fisheries Program. And that's one of the bars that starts in actually in 2002. That very top bar up there in 2002, that is the Partnership Program statewide, about a million dollars. But that comes out of the $7.25 million statewide.

So, as we go through time, the
funding is stable. Now, if it does stay stable over a long period of time, that will, in fact, mean that there will be a decline in the amount of money, inflation will heat it up. That is the plan, $7.25 million annually.

MR. THOMAS: John?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: The reason I asked that is because there are a number of fisheries projects that we deferred or did not recommend for funding in February that has merit. And I look at the proposals that I saw -- I haven't looked at your Tab yet. The proposals that are with the Internet, I see a continual decline. We're looking at $240,000 -- $248,000 of new projects next year for Southeastern. This concerns me. Whether you look at the top graph or the bottom graph, these are all going downhill, and they actually should be going on. We should be having, instead of 7-and-a-half million, 10 million or more to fund very worthwhile projects. That's why I asked you what your crystal ball said. I think they're going down here. Everybody should realize, we have some very worthwhile projects that are being axed because there is no funding. We need to go on funding, hopefully, to address this.

MS. GARZA: So we're meeting in February to go over the --

MR. McBRIDE: No. What we'll be doing later in this meeting is going through the 2002 recommendations, the draft plan for 2002, and that's to be acted on by the Federal Board at the December meeting. That February meeting last year, because -- just because the old program getting started two years ago in October, '99 trying to jump-start the program in 2000, then we kind of had a compressed time frame to do the 2001 program. What's anticipated for having councils' opportunity for input on the Draft Resource Monitoring Plan on an annual basis is to do it at your regularly scheduled fall meetings. I don't know what the cost of the
February meeting was, but it was substantial.

MS. GARZA: But we have had statewide meetings. Do you know if we will have one again? Do you know if the regions will have a statewide meeting again this year? Fred is shaking his head "no."

MR. CLARK: That doesn't seem to be in the works.

MS. GARZA: In looking at this, we certainly had more projects than we could afford, and also because of the definition of the moneys we were not able to consider some things that some communities were interested in, like stocking in Klawock. Whatever it is, it would be good for us to figure out how we can help communities find alternative resources. So, I was thinking of that as a State training; but if we're not going to have a state training meeting, then if we can find people -- if you know there are events that are coming up, if you can e-mail them out to us and we can get them out to meetings. Klawock, if you wanted new habitat restoration, whatever, then these would be the sources to go to. So, that's just going out to the general fish & game population that if we all -- don't get training, it would be good for us at least to get to know the sources.

Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: In response to Dolly, this past year one of the ways the hatchery and some other organizations did go after funding was with the $14 million governor's fund, so there were a lot of those proposals that came in for the FIS process that actually were redirected over to the governor's fund, and I know some of those funds did wind up in some projects that were originally identified as FIS projects.

MR. THOMAS: Ida?
MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to Dolly's question, I'm sure it's on the Internet, but HR-1157, U.S. Congress put out in $200 million, Washington State, Oregon, Idaho -- Oregon, Alaska, did put in Tribes. It was for salmon enhancement and salmon habitats, and if that has, indeed, been funded, it would, indeed, be a resource for other projects.

MR. THOMAS: Fred?

MR. CLARK: I need to remind people to identify themselves when they come to the microphone and speak to the Council, so we can get it on record, please.

MR. THOMAS: You get the microphones yet?

MR. CLARK: No.

MS. PHILLIPS: I was looking at this sockeye escapement assessment. It says the strategic plan is needed to identify making key escapement data sets, and I remember from one of our proposals that late fertilization increases sockeye escapement. Would that be a part of this -- I'm not familiar with late fertilization. I don't know its pros and cons.

MR. McBRIDE: It could be. There's certainly a fair number of working enhancement systems throughout Southeastern. It takes into account stocking refertilization, trying to boost sockeye production. And it would seem to me that doing some long-term monitoring of those efforts to determine whether it's successful or not would make sense. I guess the short answer to your question is yes, I think that certainly needs to be taken into consideration in trying to determine which systems to invest in over a long-term basis.

MS. PHILLIPS: When Dolly was mentioning enhancement projects, I just -- I'm not familiar what all the types of
MR. THOMAS: Were you looking for a list of enhancements?

MS. PHILLIPS: Well, here I read one, late fertilization, I think you mentioned "stocking," and I'm not sure what that means.

MR. McBRIIDE: Means raising fish in a hatchery and putting them in the system.

Again, there's a lot of staff here that is going to -- I'm sure will go into a lot of detail on that.

One of the projects that's on this list here is the very top, the top is the stock project, Klawock. They've got a lot of issues and types of problems associated with it. Most people recognize that as depressed from low term from historic standards. There's a lot of things going on in that system, logging, stocking going on, those types of enhancement. One of the questions in there is what -- which parts of that program are working, maybe there are parts that aren't. What needs to be done to bring that system back up to some reasonable level of reaction?

MS. PHILLIPS: It's good to have a fishery resource monitoring program. I'd like to follow it all the way, when you do have the strategic plan, that you can actually fund that plan to get more of an enhanced population in the end.

MR. THOMAS: I have a question myself with regard to spending. You may not have the budgets in front of you, but I was curious to know how much of the budget was spent on staffing, if you give us a rough estimate.

MS. GARZA: Patty, I think that was the frustration that some of the other Tribes brought up, and it was my understanding that the fishery funds cannot
be used for enhancement, that they're assessment, and that's why we need to start looking for alternative resources so that once we assess a population as low, that we find the moneys to start improving the situation.

MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

MR. THOMAS: Doug?

MR. McBRIEDE: Dolly is exactly correct. One of the things we pointed out in 2002 Resource Monitoring Plan, we had a discussion with the Federal Board of this last Federal reg, I believe, and to try to focus this $7.25 million, so it didn't all get, you know, spread too thinly. They identified several activities that this funding source would not be able to -- would not be appropriate for. One of them is stocking. That doesn't mean that we might not want to do some escapement monitoring on stock system, with the physical act of stocking -- I can tell you from past experience, things like captures are very, very expensive, $7 million in a couple of avenues.

MR. THOMAS: How much does it cost to bleed stock?

(Laughter.)

MR. McBRIEDE: Dolly is exactly correct. I think that it's important when you look at this program that what we're trying to do is fit in around other funding sources. Some of them have been ongoing for a long time. Others are fairly recent. But what we're trying to do is fit in around and make the best use of this in a lot of the programs.

MR. THOMAS: I think the information that you provided us with today is -- interest has always been there. It's just that they weren't familiar with some of the intricacies, and I think there's a desire for membership to somehow involve
themselves with a little closer association
with some of those.

Cal?

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Cal Casipit. I'm with
the regional subsistence staff fisheries biologist for the Forest Service. Before I
came to the subsistence program, I was the regional fish program leader for the Forest
Service. A major part of my duties was running the Forest Service Fishery
Enhancement Program throughout the region. Doug was right, we're trying to focus on
stock assessments and assessing salmon populations, other fish populations, and
important subsistence users. However, a big part of the Forest Service program as well
as what we call anadromous fisheries programs, that's where we do enhancements,
lake fertilizations, fish passes, open up new habitat, those sorts of things.

I did make a presentation to the Regional Advisory Council a couple years ago
on the Forest Service's enhancement program. I still have that loaded on my laptop. I'd
be happy to represent it to the Council. I know there's new Council members coming on
board.

To enhance project -- projects to enhance projects, there are many in this
room that work for the Forest Service that work in that area directly. I'm sure they
would be more than happy to find out about potential projects out there. Each ranger
district has a fisheries biologist on staff that primarily what they do is they enhance
the program, fisheries enhancement program, and the Forest Service, I can't -- I don't
know exactly how much we have available this year for fisheries enhancement work, but
it's in the millions of dollars in the Alaska region.

Probably not as well funded as subsistence program, but they do get
substantial amounts of money to do enhancement work. And they're always
willing to look at subsistence opportunity and look at subsistence uses. That's a big
deal. If somebody comes into a district
office and says, "Hey, look. I've got this idea for enhancement program." Most of the users are subsistence users. I guarantee you, that's going to get some high consideration for funding. If you have those projects, if you have those opportunities, I encourage you to contact your local district ranger and get the ball rolling on it. There's an established way of doing that, established funding mechanism. There's ways to get those projects done.

And you don't have to go through the Federal Subsistence Program to get approval to do those projects. District ranger says that's what we're going to do, that's what he's going to do.

MS. GARZA: How come no-- that's the most eyesore -- everybody drives there to look at dead fish in the summer.

MR. CASIPIT: I was on Prince of Wales, and Staney Creek is where I scratched my head. What could we do because of the magnitude of the habitat alterations, kind of wonder what you can do in the situation like that.

I'm sure there are some things, I know that Staney Creek is one of those areas that we're all working as far as rehabilitation and restoration. As far as enhancement, I'm not sure what can be done, though.

I encourage you to get with the fish biologists from the district and try to work something out.

MR. JOHNSON: Jim Beard is the person who is involved there. He is off on extended sick leave. And I think that we're using hydrologist. If you give me a call, Dolly, I can check that out when we get back.

MR. THOMAS: What's happening at Staney? What's going on there? Is there any people activity going on there?

The reason for my question is I think Staney Creek is one of those systems,
even though the system has been altered as much as it has. I think without further -- without further disruption of that system, given time, it will probably rebuild itself.

MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Dave Johnson, Forest Service, subsistence coordinator on the Tongass. I think what's needed for the Council is a briefing from our anadromous fish program manager hydrologist regarding the road condition surveys that have been conducted over the last -- probably the last three years. Those road condition surveys were the initial starting point, if you will, for restoration rehab work on a number of systems on Prince of Wales Island.

The Klawock system, as some of you are familiar, last year we had a report from Art Leaner that was recently completed. The road condition surveys there as well as functioning condition surveys for the systems -- the stream systems themselves. And as a result of that, there were a number of reaches of stream that were found to be no longer functioning. And one of the recommendations that came from that was on those high-priority fish streams, culverts that need to be removed and roads that need to be repaired or put to bed, and other stream stabilization and erosion control. We do have that information. Back to your question about Staney Creek, I can't respond specifically today, but we can provide you information that we're looking at for information in the future.

MR. THOMAS: You're looking for restoration in what would be considered a dead stream now?

MR. JOHNSON: For the most part, the streams that were looked at were not, quote, dead. They were streams that had been affected by intensive management activities, both on National forest lands and private lands.

And as a result of that survey work, the degree of functioning was identified on the sliding scale, and so that
those streams that were one high value streams and also had the biggest impacts were the same ones that were identified for future restoration rehab work. And so there is a listing of systems -- Tongass-wide, that identifies where are the biggest problems for the most important streams and the restoration work that's proposed along with that.

One of the projects with Klawock identified specific work with Klawock -- Shan Seet, Alaska lands where there's some very specific stream sections that were important for sockeye spawning and rearing that were identified for restoration work.

MR. THOMAS: What kind of response are you getting from those streams?

MR. JOHNSON: We're getting a good response. We've also had the Prince of Wales watershed Council that is comprised of members from ADF&G, habitat division, also folks from Prince of Wales Hatchery Association, Forest Service, and the Tribes as well as Tlingit-Haida Central Council. Initially, we got the grant through TNH as a result of the Project 319 moneys for EPA for restoration work, and now the objective is to help the Tribes identify alternative funding sources for the work that needs to be done. But we've had excellent response from all three organizations and they've been very participated in the watershed Council process, and obviously were very instrumental in getting some of the funds for the Prince of Wales Hatchery Association for additional enhancement work there for expanding the sockeye production as well as the coho production on that system.

So, I can honestly say that those three organizations have been very, very effective in helping out, particularly with the Klawock system.

MR. THOMAS: I'd like to see if the work could be funded, just to address this issue with restoration, rehabilitation and enhancement, and because I think -- I think there's some input of -- from members
of Council, to offer that considerable valuable information for those efforts.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, also the Forest Service conducted extensive public involvement meetings over the course of more than a year from a broad cross-section of publics on Prince of Wales Island regarding road closures, and there were some very interesting things that came out of that. One of the things that people were not aware of is that many of these roads that, quote, no longer exist, that are not really on the road system are still functioning in a sense that people are still driving down them and there's still things occurring in the watersheds and the streams associated with them.

MR. THOMAS: Are they violating any regs?

MR. JOHNSON: Are they violating any regs? I don't know, Mr. Chairman, I'm not a law enforcement officer.

MR. THOMAS: Do you know where there might be one?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I can probably find one.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. MIKE JACKSON: I'm Mike Jackson from Kake, and what I brought here was just for information for the Yakutat Sitka Tribe, but I thought it would be good information and update on the two questions of restoration. We have resolutions I just brought up here out of interest of restoration -- incubation process. For your consideration, possibly for your workshop, we have an organization that is formed through the Alaska Inter-Tribal Council, another agency or another group of people that have taken the most egg incubation, very economical cost of restoring salmon streams by using almost the traditional
method. But it would be good for you guys. Maybe I can give it to the staff people to make copies for you, or other interested parties.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Just to start conversation.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you. Any more comments? You have more to offer?

MR. McBRIEDE: Mr. Chairman, just one other real quick thing that does directly affect the question. There was just one other report. I'm not going to spend a lot of time going through this. This is the same progress report for the inter-regional program, 2000 and 2001. There is one project that does bear mentioning. It's 011-07, Implementation of Statewide Subsistence Fisheries Harvest Assessment Strategy.

Mr. Chairman, what this project does is the offshoot of the statewide subsistence harvest monitoring workgroup, which is the project that was funded the first year of study, workgroup that was funded to look at subsistence harvest monitoring throughout the state. I was on that committee. Harold was on that committee, and Cal Casipit was on that committee, among others.

We recommended several follow-up projects, and this is one of them. And what this project does is it holds a series of regional workshops with both agency and subsistence user representatives, and the whole idea of the workshops is to review subsistence harvest monitoring within that particular region, look for ways to improve subsistence harvest monitoring and to actually develop a written operational plan so that we can see how it's being done and work on it in the future.

And for Southeastern, that workshop is going to be coming up this winter, and one -- it's hosted by the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game Subsistence
Division and AITC. And one of the things
they've done in the workshops they've held
so far, which have been in Kodiak and
Southcentral, is they have asked a member of
the Regional Advisory Council for that area
to participate on that workshop. So, fairly
soon here, I'm sure you'll be getting some
notification and being asked for somebody
from this Council to participate in that
process.

That, Mr. Chairman, that's all I
have.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you.
Any questions?
Okay.

MS. PHILLIPS: I have a comment.

MR. THOMAS: Comment.

MS. PHILLIPS: Several of our
duties as a Regional Council is to make
recommendations concerning policy standards
guidelines and regulations, and recommend
strategies for management of Fish & Wildlife
populations within the regions, and Cal
appropriately pointed out that we should go
to our district rangers and tell them areas
of concern where we would like to see
population enhancement projects, but it is
also reciprocal in that many of the agency
people have multiple responsibilities within
their job that they could present our
concerns to the needed area where we would
want to see fish population enhancement.

If we identify something, then
perhaps someone within staff can roll with
that idea and improve our fish resources.

MR. THOMAS: The way she quoted
that, just like someone had written that.

Thank you.
Okay, we're recessed, 9:00
o'clock. Dinner will be served here at
5:00. So, I want you guys to line up in the
appropriate rooms here. Get yourself all
groomed. 5:00 o'clock, dinner right here.
(Southeast Regional Advisory Council adjourned at 4:25 p.m.)
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