

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

SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

VOLUME III

Juneau, Alaska
September 29, 2004
8:30 o'clock a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- John Littlefield, Chairman
- Michael Bangs
- Michael Douville
- Dolly Garza
- Donald Hernandez
- Eric Jordan
- Harvey Kitka
- Floyd Kookesh
- Patricia Phillips
- Richard Stokes
- Regional Coordinator, Robert Schroeder

RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:
COMPUTER MATRIX COURT REPORTERS, LLC
3522 West 27th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99517
907-243-0668
jpk@gci.net

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

2
3 (Juneau, Alaska - 9/29/04)

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Good morning,
6 ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call the meeting back
7 to order. Welcome again. I don't see any new faces.
8 What we're going to do this morning is, first, if you
9 could look at the board here, we have some special orders
10 for the day. Dr. Schroeder, will you go through these
11 real quickly.

12
13 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we have
14 David Bedford coming in at 10:00 a.m. to talk about
15 progress that the State's making on the Stikine River
16 fishery and that needs to be preceded by Bob Larson
17 giving us a brief overview of what happened to the
18 fishery this year. Bob Larson should be on at 20 minutes
19 to 10:00. At 1:00 p.m. we scheduled discussion of FIS
20 projects and at 3:00 o'clock we scheduled discussion of
21 wildlife issues, including Jan Caulfield, our coordinator
22 for the Prince of Wales deer project, cooperative
23 planning project, will be doing a brief presentation with
24 Don Hernandez. That's what we've got on the docket.

25
26 I'll remind the Council we need to do
27 Council election of officers and we need to establish a
28 meeting time and place for fall 2005.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr.
31 Schroeder. If there's no objection, I would like to take
32 care of those items right now and establishing the time
33 and place of elections. We have at least one Council
34 member who has to attend to some other business today and
35 we have two Council members that are probably leaving in
36 the morning and I would like them to participate in the
37 time and place as well as the elections. Let's go to
38 item 15 on your agenda. It was to establish the time and
39 place for the subsequent meetings. We've tentatively
40 selected Petersburg February 23rd to the 25th. Is there
41 any new information on that, Dr. Schroeder?

42
43 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, that is what
44 we have down. I'd like a little flexibility to see
45 whether we move that on Tuesday through Thursday or keep
46 it Wednesday through Friday, depending on arrangements in
47 Petersburg, if that's okay with the Council.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What are the ferry
50 schedules? Are there ferries out of Petersburg on

1 Friday?

2

3 DR. SCHROEDER: I haven't checked that.
4 That's something I would be checking to make sure we can
5 get us in and out easily.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Then do you
8 recommend we open the window up from the 22nd to the
9 25th? Is that your recommendation?

10

11 DR. SCHROEDER: Yes, that would help me
12 out, Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have
15 tentatively selected this. Is there any objection from
16 the Council to open that up to the 22nd and the 25th and
17 the place will still be Petersburg. Are there any
18 Council comments. Dr. Garza.

19

20 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was
21 just looking at the calendar in the back so we don't have
22 a problem that there's three other councils meeting at
23 the same time.

24

25 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, Dolly. I
26 believe that's okay. Our worst overlap is if we overlap
27 with Southcentral and Southcentral is scheduled for late
28 March. When we went through this, there were various
29 reasons why we needed to have it early in the window. It
30 will also mean that Staff have to work harder to get
31 materials prepared.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
34 questions on the Petersburg meeting. We'll set that then
35 from the 22nd to the 25th. If you'll look on page 229 of
36 your board book, that's the fall 2005 window. So we need
37 some recommendations there. Dr. Schroeder.

38

39 DR. SCHROEDER: It's basically wide open,
40 as you see. We're meeting before Southcentral is
41 meeting, so we can put our meeting exactly when they
42 would have liked to have put theirs. I'd also remind the
43 Council that it's really much easier for Staff not to
44 cross over the fiscal year, so we don't want a meeting
45 that bridges October 1. That makes a lot of unfortunate,
46 unnecessary work for Staff.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Suggestions from
49 Council for time and place. Let's do the place first. I
50 think that would probably be easier. Does anybody want

1 to have us or host us? Do we have anybody that's invited
2 us?

3

4 DR. SCHROEDER: How about Wrangell?

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: How about
7 Wrangell? We have an invitation from Wrangell community.
8 Is that acceptable, Dr. Garza?

9

10 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move we
11 accept the rather casual invitation to Wrangell.

12

13 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
16 and seconded to select the place for the 2005 fall
17 meeting as Wrangell. All those in favor please signify
18 by saying aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
23 same sign.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Wrangell it is.
28 We'll meet in Wrangell. We need to set the time. Dr.
29 Garza.

30

31 DR. GARZA: Considering that the ferry is
32 now up for free use, I guess maybe we should see if we
33 can have it take us there from Ketchikan.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, we'll do
36 that. If we're meeting in these smaller communities that
37 have access both ways with the ferry, it's always wise to
38 have that option to get out of the community. Dr.
39 Schroeder, did you have anything there? It's a bad time
40 of year, as you know.

41

42 DR. SCHROEDER: I think we have to ask
43 Fish and Game to see if they can arrange a special
44 sailing of the ferry for the Wrangell meeting. The one
45 other item would be Mr. Sofoulis has told me that he
46 generally has difficulty earlier in a time period and he
47 was very frustrated that he couldn't be at this meeting.
48 His preference would be that we hold our meeting as late
49 as possible after guiding is over in October.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: What date is that?

2

3 DR. SCHROEDER: The meeting window closes
4 on October 21. I'm not sure whether we have schedules
5 for other events that take place. Grand Camp tends to
6 meet in early October, I believe, so we wouldn't want to
7 be on top of Grand Camp. Selina Iverson may know when
8 Grand Camp is meeting this coming year.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. We'll
11 have Mr. Bangs, but just before we do that -- we normally
12 would never meet before the 20th because that's always
13 the closure and this year I noticed it was out to the
14 30th, so we have several members that will still be
15 fishing in September. Mr. Bangs.

16

17 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
18 know that October 1 is the beginning of the fall season
19 for crab, trawlers. I, myself, do sea cucumbers. The
20 dive season starts on October 1. So October, for myself,
21 and I don't know if the people that commercial trawl are
22 going to have a conflict, but it would definitely be a
23 conflict if we didn't have it in September for me.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So nobody
26 wants to meet in September and nobody wants to meet in
27 October because of conflicts except for us subsistence
28 users that are on the Council. We're not going to be
29 able to accommodate everybody. So what we're going to
30 have to do is make a date and just live with it. Mr.
31 Jordan.

32

33 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. Even though the
34 season is still open in September, some of us have worn
35 out, especially as we get older. The winter trawl season
36 opens October 11th, so it would be really hard for me to
37 be here after that. I would prefer to meet the last week
38 of September to accommodate Mr. Bangs. Also, that works
39 for some of the rest of you. That works really good for
40 me.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have one
43 suggestion the week of the 26th. Any other Council. Ms.
44 Phillips.

45

46 MS. PHILLIPS: What is the fall bear hunt
47 season? Isn't that where Mr. Sofoulis is?

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Anybody from ADF&G
50 that can help us out with that bear season, when the

1 dates are? Only fish people. Okay. Like I said, we
2 can't accommodate everybody. Any other suggestions. The
3 week of the 26th. If there's no objection, let's
4 tentatively set the dates. What we do is try to give the
5 OSM some advance notice of where we will meet. We do
6 have the ability to change that, tweak that slightly. So
7 I would say it would be from the 26th to the 29th. Is
8 that correct, Dr. Schroeder?

9
10 DR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
11 what we have down is the week of the 26th. If you give
12 me some flexibility, we can see what the ferry schedule
13 is. I believe our intention would be to have a three-day
14 meeting unless we have no proposals whatsoever for
15 Southeast Alaska.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Fat chance of
18 that. The time and place is the week of September 26th.
19 We will be meeting in Wrangell at their invitation. Next
20 I'd like to do the elections. This is the fall. We have
21 to elect the chairman, vice-chairman and secretary. Dr.
22 Schroeder.

23
24 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, that's
25 correct. Our custom has been to do our elections in the
26 fall. We will note that we don't have reappointments
27 from the Secretaries of Interior or Agriculture. I
28 suggest we assume that those Council members who are up
29 for reappointment that we act as if they're on the
30 Council and pending notification from the secretaries.

31
32 Perhaps we should start with nominations
33 for the position of secretary. If we could open the
34 floor for nominations for secretary of the Council. Bert
35 Adams is filling that role this last year and he's also
36 filled in -- he's been present on a number of important
37 teleconferences where he's been able to represent the
38 Council very effectively. So we're open for nominations
39 for the position of secretary.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mike.

42
43 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 I nominate Bert Adams for the position of secretary.

45
46 DR. SCHROEDER: We have Bert Adams
47 nominated for the position of secretary. Are there
48 further nominations for the position of secretary?

49
50 MR. STOKES: Mr. Chairman, I move that

1 nominations be closed.
2
3 MR. KOOKESH: Second.
4
5 DR. SCHROEDER: Nominations are closed
6 for position of secretary. Is there any discussion.
7
8 (No comments)
9
10 DR. SCHROEDER: Hearing none. Mr. Adams,
11 with the wishes of the Council, is reappointed as the
12 secretary for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council for
13 the coming year. I'd like to open nominations for the
14 position of vice-chair for the Council. In the past
15 year, Dr. Garza has filled that role and she also has
16 spent a good deal of time in this task mainly on
17 teleconferences and doing Council's bidding. Nominations
18 are open at this time. Mr. Douville.
19
20 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I nominate
21 Dr. Garza for the position of vice-chair.
22
23 MR. STOKES: Mr. Chairman, I move that
24 nominations be closed.
25
26 DR. SCHROEDER: Nominations for the
27 position of vice-chair are closed.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You should ask if
30 there are any objections.
31
32 DR. SCHROEDER: Are there any objections
33 and is there any discussion.
34
35 MR. KOOKESH: Is there a second?
36
37 DR. SCHROEDER: Let's see, we need a
38 second to closing the nominations.
39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Second.
41
42 DR. SCHROEDER: I'm getting schooled here
43 on Roberts Rules of Order. Is there any discussion or
44 any objections to closing the nominations or to
45 recognizing Dr. Garza as our vice-chair for the coming
46 year.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 DR. SCHROEDER: Hearing none, Dr. Garza

1 is reappointed as the vice-chair of the Southeast
2 Regional Advisory Council. I'd like to open up
3 nominations for the position of Chair. John Littlefield
4 has held this position this last year and traveled to
5 Anchorage numerous times and represented the Council with
6 the Federal Subsistence Board. Nominations are now open.
7 Mr. Douville.

8

9 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I nominate
10 John Littlefield for the position of Chair.

11

12 DR. SCHROEDER: John Littlefield has been
13 nominated.

14

15 MR. STOKES: I move that nominations be
16 closed.

17

18 MS. PHILLIPS: I second the nomination.

19

20 DR. SCHROEDER: John Littlefield has been
21 nominated as Chair of the Southeast Regional Advisory
22 Council. Nominations have been closed. Is there any
23 objection or discussion concerning his reappointment to
24 this position?

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 DR. SCHROEDER: Hearing none, John
29 Littlefield will again represent the Council as its Chair
30 at meetings and in dealings with the Federal Subsistence
31 Board. That concludes our elections for 2004. Thank
32 you, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
35 much for your faith in me. I do the best job I can here.
36 I'll bring us back on line and we're on Proposals 24 and
37 26. Unless any of the candidates would like to make a
38 speech. Dr. Garza.

39

40 DR. GARZA: Not a speech, Mr. Chairman.
41 I know we're on a deadline. If we are looking at going
42 out of order a little, I would also like to recognize
43 Mary Rudolph before our other two Council members have to
44 leave. Even though she's not here, I know that we have a
45 placque for her.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go for it.

48

49 DR. GARZA: Is Dave here? Maybe when he
50 shows up, we'll do it.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Proposals 24 and
2 26 are being considered together. Mr. Casipit.

3
4 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ben
5 will be presenting 24 and 26. However, I did want to
6 make the Council aware that I did distribute a four-page
7 white paper that was before you last spring that kind of
8 explains why we have these subcommittee proposed
9 housekeeping proposals if you will before you. I guess
10 the major point there is that the way the federal
11 regulations work is that things are wide open unless
12 restricted further by our regulations that appear in the
13 sections for Southeast or as restricted on a permit. So
14 I just wanted to refresh your memory as to why we have
15 those housekeeping proposals. Thank you.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
18 questions from the Council for Mr. Casipit on this
19 procedure? Mr. VanAlen.

20
21 MR. VANALEN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
22 Members of the Council. Ben VanAlen, Forest Service,
23 Juneau. I'm talking about FP05-24 and 26. I'm on page
24 100. These proposals were submitted by the Southeast
25 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Proposal
26 FP05-24 specifically seeks to clarify possession and
27 annual household harvest limits for sockeye salmon stocks
28 that do not have limits defined in Federal regulations.
29 Proposal FP05-26 specifically seeks to clarify possession
30 and annual household harvest limits for pink and chum
31 salmon stocks that do not have limits defined in Federal
32 regulations. Proposal FP05-26 specifically seeks to
33 clarify possession and annual household harvest limits
34 for pink and chum salmon stocks that do not have limits
35 defined in Federal regulations.

36
37 So there is a direct overlap in State and
38 Federal regulations and management of salmon in Southeast
39 Alaska. Both agencies manage the same subsistence salmon
40 stocks and require harvesters to have a permit.
41 Subsistence fishers have a long history of obtaining
42 their subsistence fishing permits from the local Alaska
43 Department of Fish and Game office. Most subsistence
44 fishing for salmon is done using nets in marine waters
45 under State jurisdiction.

46
47 Federal subsistence fishing regulations
48 for Southeast Alaska do not specify harvest limits for
49 sockeye, pink and chum salmon except in a few locations.
50 However, most sockeye systems do have a harvest limit

1 stipulated on the State subsistence and personal use
2 salmon permits. Relatively liberal harvest limits for
3 pink and chum salmon are also listed on the State
4 permits.
5

6 As Cal just mentioned, it's now
7 understood that the Federal subsistence fisheries are
8 considered open until closed, which is different from the
9 State fisheries, which are basically considered closed
10 until opened.
11

12 So we're working to add a couple of
13 paragraphs under 27(i)(13). I'm looking at page 102.
14 The additional language, first paragraph, pertains to
15 sockeye salmon. If a harvest limit is not listed for
16 sockeye salmon in this section, the harvest limit for
17 sockeye salmon is the same as listed on State subsistence
18 or personal use fishing permits. So that sentence
19 basically helps clarify harvest limits for the principal
20 subsistence sockeye stocks and keeps Federal and State
21 limits consistent.
22

23 The next sentence, if the stream system
24 is not listed on a State permit, the possession limit is
25 10 sockeye salmon and the annual harvest limit is 20
26 sockeye salmon for that stream per household. So this
27 sentence puts harvest limits on the remaining sockeye
28 systems in Southeast. This provides Federal subsistence
29 users with reasonable subsistence harvest opportunity
30 while controlling for an unlimited harvest of sockeye in
31 these basically relatively small and seldom-fished
32 systems.
33

34 Page 102 pertains to pink salmon and that
35 reads there are no harvest limits for the harvest of pink
36 and chum salmon.
37

38 This regulatory change recognizes that
39 subsistence value of these species and that the Federal
40 subsistence take will be relatively small and of little
41 risk to the health of these runs. Any conservation
42 issues for pink and chum salmon will be addressed through
43 in-season management actions and coordination with Fish
44 and Game.
45

46 Possession and annual limits for pink and
47 chum salmon are relatively liberal on the State
48 subsistence salmon and personal use permits. One reason
49 the State has put harvest limits on pink and chum salmon
50 is to better segregate commercial and subsistence harvest

1 effort in these terminal marine areas. This is not an
2 issue for Federal subsistence fishing, which occurs in
3 fresh water.

4
5 Our preliminary conclusion, as written on
6 pages 104 and 105, is to support the proposal with slight
7 modifications in the wording to clean it up, we think, to
8 make it more applicable. Those are provided, again, on
9 pages 104 and 105. This modification still promotes use
10 of a single permit system, promotes cooperation among
11 State and Federal managers, maintains the management
12 flexibility to selectively harvest or protect specific
13 stocks, protects salmon stocks from unlimited harvests,
14 and maintains the status quo regarding where users get
15 their permits, where and when they can fish, and how many
16 they can harvest.

17
18 Justification. Subsistence users would
19 benefit from this clarification in Federal regulations
20 about the use of State permit conditions. Federal
21 subsistence salmon fishing harvest limits in Southeast
22 Alaska would default to the State's permit stipulations.
23 This proposed change would prevent the use of Federal
24 subsistence fishing regulations to conduct an unlimited
25 harvest of sockeye salmon and would provide for
26 conservation and protection of these sockeye stocks.
27 This proposal would not change the location or amount of
28 salmon harvested for subsistence.

29
30 The proposal is designed to promote
31 coordinated management with Fish and Game. The Federal
32 in-season managers will retain the prerogative to accept
33 or reject any pre-season or in-season management actions
34 by Fish and Game. Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. VanAlen, I'm
37 sorry I didn't catch this earlier, but we would like to
38 address these, I'm sure, separately as 24 and 26 because
39 we're trying to put on the table the proponents and
40 language. Of course, these were two separate ones. If
41 you could characterize the language that's shown on page
42 104, I'm going to assume the bottom part is 24 and the
43 top part is 26. If you could make that clear for which
44 part is 24 and which part of the language is 26.

45
46 MR. VANALEN: The suggested language for
47 24 pertaining to sockeye salmon is the bolded print on
48 the bottom of page 104. That relates to Proposal 24.
49 The bolded print at the top of page 105, that pertains to
50 Proposal 26, pertaining to pink and chum salmon.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any
2 questions for Federal Staff on these two proposals. Mr.
3 Kookesh.

4
5 MR. KOOKESH: I have a question for you.
6 I thought when I read the material that it said the in-
7 season managers have the authority and they also have
8 pre-season?

9
10 MR. VANALEN: Yes, I believe we do have
11 that authority given to us. The scenario might unfold
12 that the State has decided to have a harvest possession
13 limit or a season limit on a particular stock that we
14 feel is quite a bit lower than what that stock can
15 support. We might then deviate from the State's permit
16 conditions for harvest in that location and have a
17 different possession and harvest limit, season limit. So
18 I'm saying that decision could be made before the season
19 begins as well as the season unfolds.

20
21 MR. KOOKESH: My question was based on
22 page 105, that last sentence. I remember reading where
23 the Federal Subsistence Board, Mitch Demientieff, gave
24 in-season regulatory authority to the managers. I didn't
25 know it pertained to pre-season. That was my question.
26 Maybe I phrased it wrong or something.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Boyd, is this
29 something you could help us out with here and address
30 this and give us some help?

31
32 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, as you can see from
33 my furrowed eyebrows that I'm not sure what the answer
34 is. I would have to go make a phone call. I don't have
35 the letter of delegation from the Board in front of me to
36 sort of look at the specific language. I've always
37 referred to it as delegating authority to managers in-
38 season. However, I think Mr. VanAlen has certainly
39 articulated a viewpoint of that that's certainly viable.
40 I'd want to check the specific language, but I can get
41 back to you as quickly as possible. I'll make the call
42 now if you want.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We'll get that,
45 Mr. Kookesh. They'll research that. Any more follow
46 up.

47
48 MR. KOOKESH: No.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

1 DR. GARZA: We were trying to figure
2 something out and I'm not sure I heard Floyd's question,
3 so this may be a repeat, but on the top of page 105,
4 unless noted on the Federal subsistence fishing permit.
5 So unless noted means that under current management for a
6 stream there is already a harvest limit?

7
8 MR. VANALEN: Yes. On the Federal
9 subsistence permit, if there's reasons for Federal
10 managers to put a limit on the harvest of, in this case,
11 pink or chum salmon from a particular location, we would
12 put it on that year's permit, a stipulation on that
13 year's permit. If there is no stipulation for a take of
14 pink and chum salmon from a particular location, then
15 there are no harvest limits for it. We'll just keep that
16 clear.

17
18 DR. GARZA: So does that, in effect,
19 create the widest in-season management opportunity
20 available to you? I mean does that mean a subsistence
21 fisher when they come in won't have an idea if they can
22 take 10 or 20 until you note it?

23
24 MR. VANALEN: I think it's the opposite.
25 They will look at the permit and only the locations, if
26 there are any, that the harvest is restricted to whatever
27 it's restricted to. They'll know that all these other
28 locations there's no limit on the harvest of pink and
29 chum. So it's only for the few systems, if any, that are
30 listed would there be a restriction.

31
32 DR. GARZA: Okay. So what is the process
33 for listing the few restrictions? Is that because there
34 are already restrictions in place that would be just
35 automatically printed and noted year by year or do you
36 have the in-season authority to say, okay, this year
37 we're going to reduce the number of chum salmon on some
38 creek down by Kake even though Kake may not be aware that
39 that is going to happen?

40
41 MR. VANALEN: Yeah, it's a little bit of
42 the latter. In other words, it would be a year by year
43 decision whether to identify -- put restrictions on the
44 take of pink and chum salmon from any location. Let's
45 say right now, as far as I'm aware, we wouldn't have any
46 restrictions on the take of pink and chum salmon. There
47 might be instances in the future where we would want to,
48 due to conservation concerns, put a restriction on the
49 take of pink and chum. I would hope that that
50 restriction, the decision to list that on the permit,

1 would involve members of the Council as well as the
2 public, inform the public on that, but that is what I'm
3 suggesting as being some of our in-season management
4 authority.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any follow up on
7 that.

8
9 DR. GARZA: Yeah. I guess I'm concerned
10 about that because it seems like you would set harvest
11 limits on a creek or a stream through this process and
12 there's nothing in here because it just says unless noted
13 that would prohibit you from doing that on every stream
14 in Southeast for every season. Perhaps that's not the
15 intent, but it surely could be read that way and causes
16 me greater concern than I had a few minutes ago.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
19 Mr. Jordan.

20
21 MR. JORDAN: So what is the process if
22 there's a conservation concern? Are you suggesting that
23 you're going to consult with the Council before you issue
24 the permit or are you going to make decisions based on
25 what's happening in that year in your in-season
26 management authority? I'm trying to figure out what is
27 the process that would lead you to set some limits.

28
29 MR. VANALEN: I think the priority on our
30 part would be for conservation. So we would be trying to
31 make sure that we've got well-informed information to
32 take the right action to maintain escapements in each of
33 these systems. So I guess to some extent our contact
34 with the Council or specific members of the Council would
35 be more to inform that this conservation action is needed
36 and this is what we're planning to do. The same with the
37 users. It would be a little bit more to inform.

38
39 I'm going to state this again and maybe
40 this will help Dr. Garza's concern, that we actually
41 don't anticipate these kinds of actions. It would be
42 unlikely that any routine restrictions on the take of
43 pink and chum salmon will be needed given what we've
44 observed over a number of years and what we know about
45 the current pattern of use of harvest for subsistence of
46 pink and chum salmon in fresh water in Southeast. That,
47 combined with the general good health of the runs, is
48 basically not a likely circumstance that we'll be
49 actually putting restrictions on the take of pink and
50 chum salmon, but that ability to have those restrictions

1 on the permit is important in the long run to make sure
2 we maintain healthy runs of pink and chum.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'd like to have
5 Mr. Boyd come forward, please. He has, I think, some
6 information from Anchorage.

7

8 MR. BOYD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To
9 respond to Mr. Kookesh's question, I had Staff check the
10 specific language in the letter of delegation. The
11 letter of delegation doesn't explicitly say pre-season or
12 in-season, but the language is broad enough to allow the
13 in-season manager to make calls to expand or relax
14 seasons or to close or restrict seasons based on
15 available information within the guidelines established
16 by the Board. So I think Mr. VanAlen's interpretation is
17 correct.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I have Eric and
20 then Dr. Garza. If you could clarify one thing for me
21 first, Mr. VanAlen. This last language that Mr. Kookesh
22 talked about, the proposal was designed to coordinate and
23 so forth, that paragraph. That, as far as I was reading
24 this, only applied to proposal 24, which defaulted to the
25 State sockeye limits. It did not apply to 26, which
26 clearly says there are no limits. So it doesn't matter
27 what the State does on pink and chum, it does not apply.
28 Maybe you could clarify that. I saw that as only
29 applying to Proposal 24 language shown on page 104.

30

31 MR. VANALEN: I think the coordination
32 there would be if our counterparts in the State,
33 biologists, bring forward a conservation concern with the
34 pink and chum stock. That would certainly be looked at
35 by our staff and we might make a similar restriction. So
36 that's the coordination on the pink and chum, just as
37 with sockeye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan and
40 then Dr. Garza.

41

42 MR. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
43 don't want to take up too much of the Council's time.
44 I'm aware, as the Chair and other members are, how much
45 we need to expedite these things. For conservation
46 concerns, I need to be very clear on this. Thank you,
47 Mr. Chair. You helped me understand this a little bit.
48 So you are going to be coordinating with the State
49 biologists based on what their estimates for escapement
50 are in the creeks and what's happening that season. In

1 other words, I don't think the Federal Staff has people
2 flying every week looking at how the runs are building
3 and what's happening in creeks. You don't have that kind
4 of staff, do you?

5
6 MR. VANALEN: No, we don't.

7
8 MR. JORDAN: Right. So you are relying
9 on -- and I know I see Bill Davidson here who manages
10 things in Sitka where I'm familiar with. He's flying
11 every week, him or his staff assistants, and looking at
12 practically every creek in the region. So if they advise
13 you, for example, that the summer dog salmon run in a
14 particular creek where some people have applied for
15 permits in the past or may be applying for permits in the
16 future look a little weak, then you could use your in-
17 season management authority to restrict the number of dog
18 salmon allowed on that permit, is that right?

19
20 MR. VANALEN: That's correct. That could
21 be done. It's not quite as easy as that. In other
22 words, the permits are basically a general permit for the
23 take of pink and chum salmon throughout Southeast Alaska
24 without specific reference to a particular stream, so I
25 think in the circumstance you described it might be more
26 of an in-season action, special action taken to close or
27 limit the take of summer chum in a particular location.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it correct to
30 characterize that the unless otherwise noted only means
31 in regulations? In other words, we would know this
32 stream ahead of time, before the previous year, and we
33 would list it in our regulations. What you were talking
34 about, the land manager always has the ability to close
35 that stream under a special action, but that's not what
36 this unless otherwise noted means. They're two separate
37 things. Special action only applies for 60 days. Unless
38 other noted would be in the regulations. Like, for
39 instance, Salmon Lake is closed to the take of pink and
40 chum salmon. That would be something we would have --
41 that's the unless otherwise noted and it would have to be
42 in regulations. Is that correct?

43
44 MR. VANALEN: Not exactly. This unless
45 noted on the Federal subsistence fishing permit is not
46 necessarily something noted in regulation. It would be
47 noted on the annual Federal subsistence fishing permit as
48 a stipulation saying that Salmon Lake is closed to the
49 take of a particular species. So this is something
50 that's not in regulation, but it is a stipulation put on

1 the annual subsistence fishing permit under, I guess, the
2 in-season management authority given to the Federal
3 managers.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I don't want
6 to debate that with you. Dr. Garza.

7
8 DR. GARZA: Oh, but I do want to debate
9 it. When we get to the point of Council deliberation, I
10 will make an amendment so that we separate when it is
11 noted in regulation and when it provides special action.
12 So that would be my intent to separate it.

13
14 My concern will be reflected in the
15 proposal that comes up on steelhead where through in-
16 season action a number of small streams were closed on
17 Prince of Wales, which really pissed off a lot of people.
18 Excuse my language. And it was provided, I think,
19 through something like this. I mean it was provided
20 through very short, ambiguous language and, in my
21 opinion, the Feds got muscled into closing something that
22 should have never been closed. When you have something
23 like this unless noted, it provides that muscle power
24 again for that type of, in my opinion, forced action.

25
26 So I think as a Council we have to be
27 careful as to whether or not something simply stated can,
28 in fact, affect subsistence users far more than we think.
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
32 questions.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you.
37 We're on ADF&G Proposals 24 and 26. Again, recognize
38 that we're most likely going to consider these
39 separately. That would be my recommendation.

40
41 MS. SEE: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
42 members of the Council, members of the public. Mr.
43 Chair, do you want comments on both 24 and 26 at this
44 time, is that correct?

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, please.

47
48 MS. SEE: Okay. The proposal for sockeye
49 salmon, which is Proposal No. 24, provides consistency
50 with harvest limits specified by State subsistence

1 permit, which in turn benefits the management and
2 conservation of these fishery resources.

3

4 As noted in the Federal Staff analysis
5 for Proposal No. 26, any future conservation issues for
6 pink or chum salmon can be addressed through coordination
7 with the State fishery managers and in-season management
8 actions. The specific proposal does present a divergence
9 from State regulations that specify limits. State
10 limits, as noted in the analysis, are intended to be
11 liberal, but the State does specify limits.

12

13 The issue remains whether a State
14 subsistence permit can be used in the Federal subsistence
15 fishery. This was mentioned in the analysis. In the
16 case where Federal subsistence fishery provides an
17 additional gear type, there may be two options. We've
18 given this a fair amount of discussion. It would require
19 follow up.

20

21 The Federal program can issue a separate
22 permit. Alternatively, State and Federal managers can
23 work together to potentially develop a single permit that
24 specifies the distinction between the State and Federal
25 regulations. The State considers these permit
26 coordination issues on a very specific case-by-case
27 basis.

28

29 Since you've requested a preliminary
30 recommendation, at this time we would say we support
31 Proposal 24 and we do not support Proposal 26. Thank
32 you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions for
35 ADF&G. Mr. Jordan.

36

37 MR. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 Marianne, what are the State limits for pink and chum?
39 Are they stream specific or for the region as a whole? I
40 looked through the materials. I don't see what those
41 limits are, but you referred to them.

42

43 MS. SEE: Through the Chair. I figured
44 at this point where you wanted more specifics we'd have
45 Bill Davidson come up, who actually manages the fishery
46 and can answer more specific questions that you may have.
47 If Bill would join us, please.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Davidson.

50

1 MR. DAVIDSON: Good morning. My name is
2 Bill Davidson. I'm with Fish and Game commercial
3 fisheries. A general answer to that question is the
4 limits for pink and chum are on the order of 50 daily
5 possession and 150 annual. I loaned my Sitka permit to
6 Mr. Jordan. I could read those into the record if you
7 like.

8
9 The permits for the Sitka management area
10 are listed on the back of the Sitka permit by species and
11 for chum salmon it's 50 daily possession and 50 annually.
12 For pink salmon, it's 50 daily possession and 150
13 annually. I also have with me copies of the Juneau,
14 Ketchikan and Petersburg permits. So they do vary around
15 the region from one permit to the next. They're
16 separately listed by each local area.

17
18 For Ketchikan, their daily possession
19 limit for pinks is 150. There is no annual limit. The
20 daily possession limit for chum in Ketchikan is 25.
21 There's no annual limit.

22
23 For Petersburg, the daily possession for
24 chum is 50. There's no annual limit. For pink, the
25 daily possession is 100. There's no annual limit.

26
27 Finally, for Juneau, the daily possession
28 for pinks is 150, 150 annual limit. For chum, in Juneau,
29 it's 50 daily and 50 annually.

30
31 So these particular limits were developed
32 by each respective local area management biologist there,
33 generally speaking, intended to be liberal and provide
34 for needs. We haven't had any complaints regarding these
35 limits that they're insufficient. We do have the
36 flexibility on our permit if an individual did want to
37 harvest more, they could simply ask and we could amend
38 the permit for that individual. Thanks.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Follow up on that,
41 Mr. Jordan.

42
43 MR. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, that
44 answers my questions.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
47 questions for ADF&G Staff. Mr. Hernandez.

48
49 MR. HERNANDEZ: I might just ask Mr.
50 Davidson. In your district, are there very many

1 instances where you've had to use your in-season
2 authority to put restrictions on subsistence harvest?

3

4 MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Hernandez, yes, we
5 have used in-season authority with regards to sockeye but
6 never with pink or chum or coho. We've had periods of
7 drought where runs appeared to be small and fish appeared
8 to be unable to get into fresh water to escape the
9 fisheries, so we've taken action in those cases. Where
10 we've had weirs in place where we are monitoring
11 escapements, we can check against the expected run timing
12 at that location and if the run is falling behind and it
13 appears that the escapement is weak, we have taken those
14 sorts of actions.

15

16 We've also taken in-season action at
17 Redoubt Lake under our new management plan where we've
18 liberalized limits in season based on what are known to
19 be very strong returns thanks to a weir at that location
20 operated by the Forest Service.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All right.

23

24 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Patty.

27

28 MS. PHILLIPS: In the management
29 regulations for Federal public lands, it says general
30 restrictions, bait, you may not use live and non-
31 indigenous or subsistence-taken fish as bait for
32 subsistence, commercial or sport fishing purposes. Is
33 there a similar regulation under that permit?

34

35 MR. DAVIDSON: I believe that's a
36 statewide regulation that the subsistence harvest is not
37 to be utilized as bait. It's possible to -- I would have
38 to check that specific regulation and look that up for
39 you to be absolutely sure what the regulation says.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead, follow
42 up.

43

44 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
45 Littlefield. Does that apply for personal use?

46

47 MR. DAVIDSON: I don't think that it does
48 apply to personal use, that you can use personal use for
49 bait. I don't believe that you can use sport caught for
50 bait. Again, I'd have to look that up in regulation just

1 to be sure that I'm giving you the correct information
2 since I'm on record here.

3

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, Mr.
5 Davidson. Because our regulations virtually mimic State
6 regulations when we took it over, it probably does apply.
7 I just became aware that you can't use subsistence-caught
8 pinks for bait, but you can use personal use pinks for
9 bait. In this case, subsistence is being more
10 restrictive than State regulation for personal use.
11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
14 other questions for ADF&G. Okay, thank you. What we're
15 going to do is, we have a special order at 10:00 o'clock.
16 At that time Deputy Commissioner Bedford will be making a
17 presentation. Prior to that we need to have the Federal
18 Staff make a presentation. What I'd like you to do is go
19 in the back if you want to, get a quick cup of coffee,
20 come right back and Mr. Larson will start on his
21 presentation that he has to give before Mr. Bedford gets
22 here. Let's make it really quick. Five minutes, please.

23

24 (Off record)

25

26 (On record)

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There is a small
29 gift that was made by Dr. Garza to Ms. Rudolph as well as
30 a placque. I probably should read that. Do you want to
31 read it? It's pretty long.

32

33 DR. SCHROEDER: I've got to sit down to
34 read this. This is the placque that we're presenting to
35 Mary and the placque says Mary Rudolph, Jinahaak'w, her
36 Tlingit name, in recognition for your many years of
37 service as a member of the Southeast Alaska Regional
38 Advisory Council, your historic knowledge of Tlingit
39 society and your determination to protect the fish and
40 wildlife resources of Southeast Alaska and the cultural
41 uses that depend on them have made a lasting contribution
42 to the Federal Subsistence Program.

43

44 You have carried on the Chookaneidi
45 tradition of public service in support of traditional
46 values and the revitalization of Tlingit culture. The
47 fish, wildlife and other natural resources of Southeast
48 Alaska and the Native and non-Native rural Alaskans who
49 depend on these resources have benefited from your
50 efforts.

1 You have helped U.S.D.A. Forest Service
2 build strong relationships with Native and rural people
3 that are needed to maintain our region's special
4 resources and to respect the life ways that depend on
5 them. Gunalcheesh.

6
7 (Applause)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
10 much, Mike. If you would please express our big thanks
11 to Mary.

12
13 MR. SCHROEDER: I surely will. I'm sure
14 if she was here she'd be very appreciative.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And we have an
17 announcement from Melinda.

18
19 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thanks, John. I just
20 wanted to remind everybody about our fundraiser lunch
21 we're having at noon. It's right outside in the blue
22 building at the community house. We're going to be
23 having deer stew, fried bread, coho. It's going to be
24 for the Tlingit Culture Immersion Dancers from the
25 University of Alaska Southeast, which I'm a member of,
26 and we'd love it if everybody would come. It's going to
27 be \$8 a plate.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Larson. Thank
30 you.

31
32 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. As I think
33 everybody is well aware, 2004 was the first year of a
34 subsistence sockeye fishery for the Stikine River. We've
35 been discussing this for a number of years. I think the
36 first year that the Council saw a proposal for sockeyes
37 was 2000. In that 2001 fishing cycle, Mr. Dick Stokes
38 proposed a subsistence salmon fishery for the Stikine
39 River. Subsequent to that, in 2002 and 2003, we asked
40 the Pacific Salmon Commission to put their stamp of
41 approval on this fishery and they did not comply for a
42 number of different reasons.

43
44 In 2004 at their meeting in January of
45 this year, they did approve a sockeye fishery, but they
46 did not approve a fishery for chinook or coho salmon.
47 One of their conditions was that there be adequate in-
48 season monitoring and that we would report to the
49 commission this fall and that we would move the seasons
50 back to start July 1st to essentially protect king

1 salmon.

2

3

4 The Stikine River regulations that we
5 ended up with this summer were really composed of four
6 parts. One, the permits were valid for 15 days. We had
7 a 600-fish sockeye guideline harvest level. We had a
8 season of July 1st to July 31st and that all other salmon
9 taken incidently should be reported on a permit calendar,
10 but they were legal to have.

11

12

13 We produced a management plan that we
14 distributed to the local users. Our goals for this
15 summer were to provide for an orderly fishery. We wanted
16 to communicate and educate the users. We wanted to
17 provide a good quality of fish harvested in an efficient
18 manner and we wanted to provide in-season monitoring.

19

20

21 Here's a picture of Mr. Stokes receiving
22 the first permit for the Stikine River from Chip Webber,
23 who is the district ranger in Wrangell. In the
24 background there you can see the map showing the mouth of
25 the Stikine River.

26

27

28 2004 we had 40 permits that were issued
29 and we harvested 12 king salmon, 243 sockeyes, 22 pink
30 salmon, 11 chum salmon, one steelhead and one dolly
31 varden. On top of those blue bars you can see numbers of
32 which permits that were fished and the average number of
33 king salmon and sockeyes that were harvested per permit.
34 So, for instance, of those 12 chinook, that amounted to
35 one and a half chinook per permit that was fished.
36 Sockeyes was nine. That was the average. Four and a
37 half were pinks.

38

39

40 This is actually a photo of a setnet near
41 Telegraph Creek, but it's very typical of the kind of
42 fishing operations that are conducted on the Stikine
43 River. The net is held out into the river in an eddy
44 kind of situation. There's either a buoy or a log in
45 this case that holds a short piece of net out. As the
46 fish move up the river, they're caught in the eddy and
47 it's easy to hold the net. There's almost no
48 driftnetting or seining or spearing or that kind of
49 activity.

50

51

52 The river is a very large river and very
53 swift. This year they had a considerable amount of
54 sunshine, which equated to high water levels, a
55 considerable amount of drifting logs and wood and
56 actually a fairly dangerous place, difficult to fish.

1 Years when there are cooler summers, the river should not
2 be so high and it will be easier to fish.

3
4 I expect that as people get a little more
5 experienced with fishing and water levels that are not so
6 extreme -- for most of the summer you couldn't even find
7 the shore. The water was up in the trees. In future
8 years, we'll be much more successful in catching
9 sockeyes. Especially coupled with the number of sockeyes
10 we had this year. This year I should mention that we had
11 excellent returns of both the chinook salmon and sockeye
12 salmon.

13
14 The US/Canada Agreement calls for
15 monitoring both the chinook and sockeye salmon. This is
16 a picture of the Fish and Game test fishing operation
17 targeting chinook salmon. In that case, they drift the
18 net. This is about halfway between marine waters and the
19 border on the US side. They drift a 50-fathom gillnet
20 down the middle of the river. At this point, the river
21 is 20-some feet deep. As I was saying, that kind of
22 activity is restricted to experts.

23
24 The sockeye fishermen on the other side
25 of the river, the commercial Canadian sockeye, does most
26 of their fishing with driftnets. But they condition the
27 bottom in a location and just take turns drifting this
28 net down through it. They've already chained the bottom
29 and dug up all the root wads and things that might be
30 hanging up for them.

31
32 If we look at the daily harvest, it's a
33 little bit busy, but I think you can see in the blue bars
34 starting with the 1st of July there was light effort,
35 with the peak amount of catch on the 18th of July and a
36 little bit of harvest at the very end of the year. The
37 numbers that are near the yellow dots are the numbers of
38 permits that are fishing in that day. There's some
39 correlation to weekends. July 18th was a Sunday.

40
41 One of the highlights of the season this
42 year was a visit by Denny Boucher on the left. He is the
43 regional forester in charge of Forest Service activities
44 in Region 10. That includes both the Chugach and Tongass
45 National Forests. Next to him in the red T-shirt is John
46 Murgass. He's a resident of both Petersburg and the
47 Stikine River. He shares his time almost equally between
48 those locations. He had harvested a few sockeyes in the
49 days previous to his visit and we stopped in and helped
50 him sample his product.

1 The woman in the Forest Service uniform
2 on the right-hand side of the screen is the deputy forest
3 supervisor for the Tongass, Olleka Rappe-Daniels and our
4 own Dick Stokes on the right.

5
6 DR. GARZA: Is that your smokehouse?

7
8 MR. STOKES: No, that's John's. It's
9 right on the Stikine.

10
11 MR. LARSON: So where are we now? Re-
12 opening the Stikine River fishery is important to local
13 residents and to the State and Federal governments. It
14 is a priority for the Subsistence Board. It's also a
15 priority for the US section of the Pacific Fisheries
16 Commission. I think it's universally accepted that we
17 would like to expand the sockeye fishery to include both
18 chinooks and cohos.

19
20 What do we do? The mat has been elevated
21 now and I think that Dave Bedford will speak to this. I
22 hope that the Department of State views this as a matter
23 of mutual concern with Canada. The Subsistence Board is
24 committed to re-establishing these fisheries. Both the
25 Transboundary Panel and the Pacific Salmon Commission is
26 scheduled to discuss these issues in January of '05. And
27 that's my presentation.

28
29 MR. KOOKESH: We have no leader.

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Where are we?

34
35 MR. LARSON: We're ready for questions.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any questions. I
38 have one. What were the escapement numbers for all three
39 species?

40
41 MR. LARSON: The escapement for pinks and
42 chums is unknown, but it's not a big deal. There's not
43 many fish of those species. Specifically to king salmon,
44 escapements, last I heard, and it's kind of a moving
45 number, will be about 84,000 large chinooks. It doesn't
46 include jacks. They had a fairly good exploitation rate
47 in the commercial fisheries and the sport fisheries in
48 marine waters, but we do not know what the total return
49 was to the Stikine River this year. Escapements we have
50 a fairly good number. I believe the catch in Canada is

1 probably six, seven thousand fish, something like that.

2

3 For cohos, it's too early to have an
4 escapement, but I believe when it's all said and done
5 it's going to be at least adequate. It may be good.
6 Sockeye is a fairly high number. I don't know that we've
7 ever had a higher. There's a weir for sockeyes on
8 Tahltan Lake. This may be the highest escapement we've
9 ever had. As I recall, we could have about 75,000 fish
10 in the Canadian commercial fishery and probably 110 or
11 115,000 in the terminal US fishery.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

14

15 DR. GARZA: Marvelous report, although I
16 should have been in that slide, you know.

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 DR. GARZA: My only question is what was
21 the distribution of the subsistence participants? Were
22 they primarily Wrangell? Did we have a good number from
23 Petersburg? Did we have any from the other community? I
24 forget the name of it.

25

26 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. We issued 40
27 household permits this summer. Of those 40 permits, we
28 had 18 from Petersburg, 22 from Wrangell. If we were to
29 allocate the harvest, probably 60 percent of the harvest
30 came from the permits that were issued to Petersburg and
31 40 percent to the people in Wrangell. There were no
32 permits issued to people other than in those two
33 communities.

34

35 Meyer's Chuck is that other place.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan.

38

39 MR. JORDAN: Can you explain why the
40 people in Wrangell allowed the people in Petersburg to
41 catch more fish out of the Stikine?

42

43 MR. LARSON: I think they're just used to
44 it.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
47 questions. Dr. Garza.

48

49 DR. GARZA: Just a general comment
50 because I can see Mike right beyond. Kake was excluded

1 from this process, Mike, because we didn't have good
2 information on it. If Kake is interested, they need to
3 come up with some C&T information and submit a proposal
4 if you guys use it.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
7 questions. I'd just like to echo nice report, good
8 pictures, too. I like that. Thank you. At this time we
9 have a special order on our agenda at 10:00 a.m. It's a
10 few minutes early, but if Deputy Commissioner Bedford is
11 ready, I would like to go ahead and give him the floor.
12 Maybe we could turn the lights back on.

13
14 MR. BEDFORD: Mr. Chairman and members of
15 the Southeast Regional Advisory Council. I really
16 appreciate you making some time for me to come in. I had
17 asked Tom Boyd when I was speaking to him a month or so
18 ago that if there was an opportunity I would like to come
19 in and give you a little bit of a briefing on where we
20 are right at this time dealing with the Stikine
21 subsistence fishery within the Pacific Salmon Treaty
22 process.

23
24 I had the opportunity to speak with this
25 Regional Advisory Council a number of times in the past,
26 but I've done so as a private citizen. I come before you
27 now as a deputy commissioner of the Department of Fish
28 and Game. Also as Alaska's commissioner on the Pacific
29 Salmon Commission.

30
31 As the commissioner for Alaska, I
32 participate on the US section of the commission, which
33 has commissioners from the Stevens/Palmer Treaty tribes
34 down in the states of Washington and Oregon and then also
35 from the states of Washington and Oregon. Those are the
36 voting members of the US section. We also have Federal
37 representatives on that section, but they don't vote.

38
39 So in dealing with an issue that's raised
40 by this Council, it comes to me as one member of the US
41 section, who then submits that to the US section for
42 their consideration. If the US section approves of the
43 proposal, it then goes to the bilateral commission. The
44 bilateral commission makes decisions based on consensus
45 process. There's one vote for the United States, one
46 vote for Canada. Both sides of the commission receive
47 advice from advisory panels. For the issues that we're
48 dealing with here, there's a Transboundary River Advisory
49 Panel that has a Canadian section and a US section.

50

1 Let me just spend a moment on the history
2 of treaty. I think what we have here is we have a
3 problem of getting this particular issue entangled in a
4 longer and broader history that is influencing the
5 decision-making on this issue in a fashion, from our
6 perspective, is not particularly appropriate.
7 Nonetheless, if we look back, what we see is that the
8 salmon treaty had its origins back in the 1960s when
9 people began to be concerned that fisheries in the other
10 nation were harvesting fish that originated in the other
11 country. So Canadians were concerned that we were
12 harvesting fish that came from Canadian rivers. By the
13 same token, people particularly in Washington and Oregon
14 were concerned that fisheries in Canada harvested fish
15 that originated in rivers and streams from that area.

16
17 It took us about 25 years to get to the
18 point where we finally signed a treaty and there was
19 tremendous discord and dispute along the way. The
20 government of Canada invested an awful lot of money in
21 creating fisheries that were designed to harvest stocks
22 that originated in the United States. They created and
23 fostered these fisheries in an effort to try to force the
24 United States to sign the treaty. Some of the fisheries
25 they created were on the Stikine River.

26
27 Prior to the time that the treaty was
28 signed, most of the harvest of fish that came out of the
29 Transboundary Rivers, the Stikine and the Taku, was taken
30 on the US side. The US had commercial fisheries, the US
31 had subsistence fisheries. There were Native food
32 fisheries on the Canadian side, but there was no
33 commercial fishery until about 1975, when Canada created
34 that fishery as a means to try to put pressure on Alaska
35 to sign the treaty.

36
37 When we did sign the treaty, one of the
38 principals that was involved in that treaty was the
39 notion of equity. The equity principal as stated in the
40 treaty said that each country was to receive benefits
41 equivalent to the production of salmon from its own
42 waters. This led Canada to take an ownership stance, to
43 say that any fish that spawned in a Canadian river was
44 then something that was owned by Canada. If it was
45 harvested elsewhere, then it was a taking of Canadian
46 property.

47
48 The United States never agreed with that
49 point of view. The point of view that we had was that
50 these resources were shared resources, that we had

1 responsibilities on either side of the border to assure
2 the conservation of these resources for the long-term
3 benefit of the people who relied on them.

4
5 The equity principal was largely laid to
6 rest in 1999. I mean it was something that -- you may
7 recall, for example, the blockade of the ferry Malaspina
8 down in Prince Rupert. The arguments over who owned the
9 fish was the fundamental irritant for Canadian fishermen
10 that led them to blockade that ferry. The claim that
11 Alaskan harvests were, in fact, a taking of Canadian
12 property.

13
14 The Transboundary Rivers are one of the
15 areas where we've had some of the greatest disputes in
16 the course of negotiating the treaty. In fact, right
17 after the treaty was signed in 1985, the negotiating
18 process in its first year came to a grinding halt in an
19 effort to try to figure out how we deal with harvest
20 sharing on Transboundary River stocks.

21
22 It has been a difficult area ever since
23 that time and it's one where the notion of ownership has
24 run very strong in the Canadians' perspective on things.
25 That is, in fact, one of the major problems that we ran
26 into this time around. We saw it in several instances in
27 our discussions with the Transboundary River panel. Was
28 the idea that fish that spawned in Canadian waters are
29 fish that belong to Canada.

30
31 To focus it back down on the particular
32 proposal that was originated by this Regional Advisory
33 Council. The efforts to create a subsistence fishery on
34 the Stikine River have been, of course, something that
35 you folks have been pursuing for some time and something
36 that we have been working with you as well. As I recall,
37 I think it was in the year 2000 that you first put a
38 proposal forward to the Federal Subsistence Board for
39 their consideration. At that time it was determined that
40 in order to finally authorize the fishery that it was
41 necessary to move it through the Salmon Commission
42 process.

43
44 As I recall, the original proposal that
45 went through I think was in 2002 and the Canadian section
46 of the Transboundary River Panel was troubled by a lot of
47 the particulars in that proposal. They were concerned
48 about how much participation there would be, what the
49 harvest levels might be, what the particular fishery
50 conduct would be in terms of where in the river it would

1 be prosecuted, times of year it would be prosecuted, how
2 it would avoid harvest of some species or targeting on
3 other species and how the fishery monitoring would take
4 place.

5
6 The subsequent proposal that was put in
7 last year was responsive in detail to each of the
8 particulars that Canada had raised. I mean it was in my
9 view the sort of thing that if Canada was going to
10 negotiate in a straightforward fashion on this issue that
11 we had responded to every single one of their concerns
12 and, therefore, if, in fact, those were their concerns,
13 then the proposal should have gone through. But what can
14 you say. If it didn't, then apparently there's something
15 else that's troubling them.

16
17 We find ourselves at this particular
18 point in having half a loaf. I mean we were successful.
19 Canada was willing to authorize a subsistence harvest of
20 sockeye consistent with the proposal that was presented
21 to them. They have refused to talk in any kind of really
22 productive fashion about either coho or chinook. The
23 issue became part of a real problem in their commission
24 negotiating process. We wound up having to have an
25 extraordinary session of the commission in April in an
26 effort to try to bring two issues to fruition, one of
27 them being the subsistence fishery on the Stikine, the
28 other one being an effort to try to do harvest sharing of
29 chinook salmon on the Stikine and the Taku.

30
31 You just heard Bob Larson describing the
32 kind of over-escapement that we saw on the Stikine River
33 this past year. This was something we were hoping to
34 forestall. It's also, to me, a little bit,
35 unfortunately, ironic that in a situation in which we're
36 asking for a few chinook for a subsistence harvest on the
37 US side that we see tens of thousands of fish going by
38 and that fishery not taking place.

39
40 We held the extraordinary session and we
41 were unable to come to a conclusion at that point. The
42 position that was taken by Canada is that they wanted to
43 link their commercial fishery with authorizing the
44 subsistence fishery. From our perspective, when we
45 advanced the subsistence fishery, what we were saying is
46 that within the allocation that Alaska has we want to
47 kind of shuffle around how it's going to be taken. We're
48 not reducing Canadian harvest in any fashion. We're not
49 impacting the resource in any deleterious fashion.
50 Instead of having the fish taken by the commercial

1 fishery, we want to have a certain number of fish taken
2 by the subsistence fishery.

3
4 Canada's response to this was, well, if
5 you want to do that, then we want an allocation for a
6 commercial fishery. In other words, we want to take some
7 fish away from the United States and harvest them over on
8 the Canadian side. We weren't very pleased with that
9 kind of linkage. We think that in the long term that
10 that's not a helpful thing to do. We don't believe that
11 Canada would be very pleased if we were to come back this
12 coming year and start linking our requests to management
13 of their Indian food fishery. At this point, we have no
14 intent of doing that. We believe that that's, as I said,
15 an unfortunate linkage.

16
17 Nonetheless, we were willing to be
18 forthcoming to some extent on that. That is we were
19 willing to allow some level of reallocation away from
20 Alaska and to Canada merely to have the privilege to
21 authorize the harvest for subsistence on the Stikine
22 River. The levels that we were willing to discuss were
23 not sufficiently attractive to Canada to get them to come
24 along with us.

25
26 Since the end of the extraordinary
27 session, we've taken a couple of other initiatives in an
28 effort to try to get this issue moving. One of the
29 things that was troubling in the course of the
30 negotiations is that as a standard matter of practice the
31 commission process works with the panels, taking the
32 issues at the outset and working bilaterally to try to
33 advance those as far as they can take them. When they
34 finally run into a roadblock, where they've covered all
35 of the issues that they can, made as much progress as
36 they believe they can, the issues then move to the
37 commission to see if there can be final resolution
38 reached there.

39
40 This issue was never moved into the
41 commission. This was a situation in which on a number of
42 occasions we went to Canada and we said we've gotten as
43 far as we're going to get on this in the panel. We need
44 to bring it in to the commission to try to get resolution
45 on this and Canada consistently refused to do that. I
46 found that particularly troubling and, as a matter of
47 fact, so did our Federal representatives, particularly
48 our representative from the State department, felt that
49 it was inappropriate for the commission to refuse to
50 grapple with this issue.

1 In any event, with the conclusion of the
2 extraordinary session, I had an opportunity on two
3 occasions to talk with the Federal commissioner from
4 Canada and to raise my concerns with him yet again.
5 Tried to again describe to him our views on this issue
6 and how we view on the one hand that this is not a
7 question of reallocation, that there is no cost to Canada
8 whatsoever for authorizing this fishery. And,
9 furthermore, just as a matter of international comity,
10 that is the matter of decent relations between
11 governments that have the kinds of close ties that Canada
12 and the United States have, that authorizing a
13 reallocation within the state of Alaska should be
14 something that they would pass off on immediately.
15

16 Furthermore, when you look at the treaty,
17 there's a provision that says that in our negotiations
18 we're supposed to avoid interfering with internal
19 decisions on allocation. That said, there's another
20 provision in there that says that to authorize a new
21 fishery, and by new fishery -- and I understand the sort
22 of heartburn that this raises here, but new in this sense
23 is a term of art. It doesn't have the common, ordinary
24 meaning that we would impute to that term. New in terms
25 of the treaty is a fishery that was or was not being
26 prosecuted in the past during the course of the period
27 that the treaty has been in force.
28

29 In any event, I had these conversations
30 with the Canadian Federal Commissioner and all I can say
31 is that he took my input on it and actually some of the
32 factual context I laid out for him was something that he
33 apparently had not heard the first couple of times that
34 we presented it to them.
35

36 After that the Federal representative,
37 who is the Deputy Secretary for Fisheries and Oceans back
38 in Washington, D.C., David Balton, he has an annual
39 meeting with Canadian Department of External Affairs.
40 The Department of External Affairs in Canada is the
41 equivalent of their State Department, doesn't deal with
42 Salmon Commission issues for the most part. They do deal
43 with international fisheries issues. So, for example, if
44 you're talking about whaling or if you're talking about
45 problems out on the Jorges Bank with the Spanish trawl
46 fleet or something like that, they will be involved in
47 those sorts of things. The Salmon Commission is,
48 generally speaking, left to the Federal representatives
49 with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in British
50 Columbia than with other members of their commission.

1 In any event, David Balton went to the
2 international -- there's an annual meeting where they
3 deal with fisheries issues of mutual concern between the
4 United States and Canada. At that meeting he raised this
5 as a point of concern. With the notion being that if
6 external affairs was alerted to the fact that we believed
7 that there was a problem here that the Salmon Commission
8 was not effectively dealing with, then perhaps they would
9 raise an inquiry with the Federal representative, John
10 Davis, and try to get a briefing from him and let him
11 know that this was the sort of thing that had been
12 elevated to our State department in Washington D.C. for
13 consideration there.

14
15 Where we stand now is that we will have
16 the executive session of the Salmon Commission this
17 coming month, the 19th to the 21st, and at that point
18 we'll set the agenda for the coming year. We've already
19 been talking with their folks on the Transboundary River
20 Panel. They passed us their draft of the work plan for
21 this coming year. Their draft of the work plan did not
22 include discussions of a subsistence fishery on the
23 Stikine River for coho and chinook. We informed them
24 that that would not be an acceptable work plan and that
25 we would be adding something to it, so we will, indeed,
26 be placing that on the agenda.

27
28 Furthermore, when we meet with our
29 Canadian counterparts in October, we'll raise this as a
30 matter that we believe deserves the immediate attention
31 of the commission. It's not clear to us that it's
32 productive at this point to move it back into the panel
33 process at all. We think that the commission should deal
34 with it at the earliest opportunity.

35
36 That said, there's very little likelihood
37 that it would be something that we would get on the table
38 at the executive session. As a matter of course, the
39 executive session is a housekeeping session where the
40 issues are tabled and a little bit of description and
41 clarification might take place, but there will be no
42 negotiating at that point. We will insist that the issue
43 be grappled with at the January session.

44
45 That's pretty much the state of affairs
46 as it stands at this point. I'd be happy to take any
47 questions you might have.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you for that
50 update. Council. Dr. Garza first.

1 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank
2 you so much for your report. It's sometimes difficult to
3 get information through the commission process because
4 you guys are fairly close-doored and I understand that.
5 I would like to say I really appreciate the efforts of
6 the Alaska Transboundary Panel. When we met with them in
7 January, they were 110 support of this whole process,
8 trying to figure out how to make it work. They did make
9 it work in part. I understand from your comments it
10 sounds like it's become a little bit of political
11 football that's beyond us now and it's up to you guys to
12 fix and I appreciate all the efforts that the
13 Transboundary Panel has done as well as the efforts that
14 you as a commission member has done. Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council
17 comments.

18
19 MR. BEDFORD: If I may, Mr. Chairman.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead.

22
23 MR. BEDFORD: Just a comment in response
24 to what you were saying, Dr. Garza. I'm sorry, I forgot
25 what I was going to say. I apologize. I got in late
26 last night. I was at a meeting down in Canada and I'm
27 not operating quite at 110 percent right now. If it
28 comes back, I'll bring it up then. I apologize.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Earlier I tried to
31 get some numbers from Mr. Larson. I was just interested
32 in the percentages, what we were asking for, and the only
33 one I could really tie down that I got was 84,000 kings
34 and I looked at 125 kings out of that. It was like .148
35 percent. So we appreciate that you know this is such a
36 small amount and we certainly appreciate you're fighting
37 on our behalf to get this through. We're frustrated too.
38 I want you to know that. We think it should slide right
39 through and we're glad you're on base with us. Is there
40 other Council that would like to comment or a question
41 for Mr. Bedford. Mr. Douville.

42
43 MR. DOUVILLE: I just appreciate the
44 information on the process that is very complex. I also
45 appreciate your effort. It's been a long road and
46 hopefully we'll get there eventually.

47
48 MR. BEDFORD: Well, we have every intent
49 of driving this to a conclusion. I appreciate your
50 positive comments to me. I want to tell you that the

1 patience I've exhibited on this is some small increment
2 of the patience that you folks have shown, so I really
3 appreciate the fact that you've stayed engaged on this.
4 That you came in with an initial proposal and that you
5 were responsive to the sorts of concerns that were
6 raised. I believe that your approach has been
7 unassailable. So, with that being the foundation, we
8 feel a responsibility to carry this forward with great
9 vigor.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Stokes.

12

13 MR. STOKES: I appreciate your
14 information, too. I might say that I don't believe we're
15 going to hurt the population. Three communities are
16 allowed 600 salmon, 600 sockeye for the season. One
17 family alone put in 10,000 sockeye in one week. He
18 admits to 40,000 plus for the season. The commercial
19 operation, they were making three trips a day to Wrangell
20 loaded with fish. I was told that the Tahltan people
21 were against our subsistence fishery, but everyone I've
22 talked to were all for it. I was able to get a permit
23 from the Canadian government, Canadian fisheries, that
24 allowed me 40 fish a day. It didn't specify the species.
25 I was allowed 40 fish a day and I didn't take advantage
26 of it. I just got the permit just to show the rest that
27 it could be possible.

28

29 I was told many years ago by my
30 grandfather that there was a treaty between US and Canada
31 that allowed members of the first nation to commute back
32 and forth between Canada and US and they were allowed to
33 go down into the salt water and harvest clams and cockles
34 and crabs, anything that was produced by the salt water.
35 We were allowed to go back up into Canada and harvest our
36 goats and sheep and the moose. The moose wasn't down
37 into the US until around the turn of the last century.
38 We were allowed all the privileges that they had up there
39 and they would like to see that established again, but we
40 haven't been able to find that treaty and several of my
41 friends up there are looking for it. That's all I've got
42 to say.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
45 Dr. Garza.

46

47 DR. GARZA: Just one final comment from
48 me. I think we still have an ad hoc committee of
49 Richard, myself and Cal and if there's any way we can
50 assist, either in presenting to any part of the

1 commission to help them realize how simple our request
2 is, I think we would be glad to.

3

4 MR. BEDFORD: Yeah, I'm glad you brought
5 that up, Dr. Garza. I was going to extend an invitation
6 that you visit with the Northern Panel and the
7 Transboundary Panel in December. We'll have our annual
8 tactical discussions at that point. Let's bring that up
9 at that point and see what people think. I mean I'm
10 willing to certainly look at somewhat unique approaches
11 at this point in an effort to try to get this issue off
12 the top dead center.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
15 Mr. Bedford, I'd like to just express on behalf of the
16 Council that we appreciate the State and your own
17 personal positive direction on this and help and we're
18 really pleased to see the State and the Fed all going in
19 one direction. Thank you very much for your
20 presentation.

21

22 MR. BEDFORD: Thank you very much for the
23 opportunity to address the Council.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're going to go
26 right back into 24 and 26, but the State said that they
27 had an answer to a question and they had just finished.
28 I'd like to have them come up and present that additional
29 information on 24 and 26 before we go to tribes.

30

31 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, members of the
32 Council, members of the public. Bill has joined me back
33 here as well. We did check the regulations regarding a
34 certain question that came up before the special order.
35 The subsistence and the personal use regulations are
36 parallel in that they do not allow the use of salmon
37 caught under each of those regulations to be used as bait
38 for commercial fisheries. The effect in Southeast is the
39 same for either one.

40

41 Bill, did you want to add to that?

42

43 MR. DAVIDSON: That's essentially
44 correct. The prohibitions are against use of either
45 subsistence or personal use for commercial use, but it
46 doesn't specify other types of use that might occur.

47

48 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, if I might add. In
49 general, personal use regulations do mirror the kinds of
50 provisions in subsistence regulations as well and this is

1 one example. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So if I was
4 to take a pink salmon and put a hook through it and catch
5 a halibut, you're not going to arrest me for that part,
6 but if I was to sell it to a boat, that's the part that's
7 against the law, is that correct?

8

9 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, that example is
10 correct. The sale would not be allowed under the
11 regulatory provisions. Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
14 final questions for ADF&G on 24 and 26. Mr. Davidson.

15

16 MR. DAVIDSON: There are separate
17 regulations for sportfish if that needs to be cleared up.
18 Mr. Brookover said that he would be able to explain those
19 regulations as sport-caught fish pertain to use of bait.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Does anybody want
22 that right now? I think we're fine. We appreciate your
23 presentation. Tribal governments, Proposals 24 and 26.
24 You can testify to either one or both. Tribal
25 governments.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Inter-Agency Staff
30 Committee comments.

31

32 MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Mr. Chair and
33 Council. I'm Steve Kessler with the Inter-Agency Staff
34 Committee and the Forest Service. Inter-Agency Staff
35 Committee believes that the salient facts for this
36 proposal are before you now and the committee supports
37 the preliminary conclusion of the proposal.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
40 questions for the Inter-Agency Staff Committee. They
41 support both proposals.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Fish
46 and Game Advisory Committee comments. Are there any Fish
47 and Game Advisory Committees present?

48

49 (NO comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Summary of written
2 public comments. Dr. Schroeder.

3
4 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we haven't
5 received written public comments on these proposals.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
8 members of the public present who would like to testify
9 on Proposals 24 or 26?

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's take five
14 minutes. We'll go into Regional Council deliberations.
15 If anybody wants to talk about these two proposals, this
16 is your last chance. Get a hold of me and we'll make
17 sure you get a chance to talk about it. Short break.

18
19 (Off record)

20
21 (On record)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're back in
24 session. We're at Regional Council deliberations. I had
25 a gentleman come in after we made the call for tribes,
26 Mr. Doug Dobbins. He would like to testify on behalf of
27 Sitka Tribe. Please come forward. Proposals 24 and 26.

28
29 MR. DOBBINS: Thank you and good morning.
30 Mr. Chairman, members of the Regional Advisory Council.
31 We are, as a tribe, in general support for these two
32 proposals. My name is Doug Dobbins for the record. I'm
33 the subsistence specialist for the Sitka Tribe of Alaska.

34
35
36 In looking at what you have in your book
37 about this, we see that there is need to be able to
38 manage for small systems of sockeye and have a default
39 number to be able to refer to. We're also in agreement
40 for not having numbers for pink and chum.

41
42 I do, however, want to bring up an
43 example where we would see the need to have cooperation
44 to be able to apply sockeye limits and I'm going to talk
45 just very briefly about the salmon lake system, which is
46 at the head of Silver Bay in Sitka. We have a depleted
47 run of sockeye there and we are concerned because the
48 numbers for the last few years -- we have a weir there to
49 monitor the run and we're in the hundreds of sockeye
50 salmon getting into that lake. I don't have the final

1 number for this year, but it's on the order of around 400
2 adults that are getting into that system and we feel that
3 there's habitat support over 10,000 sockeye in that lake.

4
5 One way to address this, we would have to
6 work with Bill Davidson as the manager there and request
7 with him that perhaps one way of addressing this would be
8 to have a closure for Salmon Lake sockeye for a period of
9 time. Another option might be, since we do have a weir
10 there for the next two years, to go to an abundance-based
11 measure similar to what we do at Redoubt and say it would
12 only be opened after we got a sufficient escapement into
13 the lake to be able to allow for a few fish to be taken
14 in this drainage.

15
16 I wanted to bring this up as an example
17 for your consideration and just say that the tribe has a
18 high level of concern because this is a local resource
19 and it is depleted and we would really hate to lose that
20 entirely because it is a genetic stock that has a high
21 degree of importance and a lot of proximity to Sitka. So
22 we would like to rebuild that run and do everything
23 that's possible to achieve that goal. That's all I have.
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
27 questions from the Council. Mr. Kitka.

28
29 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 Thank you for the talk, Doug. I was curious. Has there
31 been any numbers on the Salmon Lake as far as subsistence
32 and commercial and sport? Is there any way we can --
33 it's one of those places where they have the openings for
34 gillnetting and seining and trawling all in that area for
35 the chum recovery. I just was wondering if there could
36 be something worked out to where we had an idea what was
37 taken out in those parts. Thank you.

38
39 MR. DOBBINS: Mr. Kitka, I believe that
40 is a task that we should take on. I believe there are
41 some preliminary numbers, but whether we can actually say
42 that what we're seeing in that chum fishery are all
43 Salmon Lake fish or whether there's other runs that are
44 mixed in there, I can't for sure tell you that. This is
45 an issue that I'd like to work together with Fish and
46 Game Staff to be able to resolve. I think in terms of
47 taking action, for the sake of being on the precautionary
48 side, we may have to take an action and then fill in some
49 of the data as needed as we're able to.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Casipit, is it
2 possible to just direct the Staff to work with Sitka
3 Tribe as well as ADF&G to investigate Salmon Lake?
4 Apparently this is a conservation concern that's been
5 brought to our attention. Is it just possible to do this
6 by direction or are we out of bounds here?

7
8 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 Your direction is duly noted. I'm sure Terry will be
10 available to work with the tribe and Fish and Game to
11 work on the conservation issues there. We'd be more than
12 happy to sit down in a cooperative manner and figure
13 something out.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, thank you.
16 Hopefully that will address the concerns of the tribe.
17 Mr. Davidson is also listening in the back there and we
18 would expect that you would hopefully have something for
19 us. We can't add that to this particular proposal right
20 now, a closure in that area, but we'll certainly want to
21 see that later. Mr. Jordan.

22
23 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, I'm really
24 concerned. One of the things that Board of Fisheries has
25 is stocks of concern. I don't know if this is a listing
26 with the Board of Fisheries so that they're looking at
27 it. I'm concerned that within our jurisdiction and the
28 Federal jurisdiction what we're doing is -- what we're
29 likely to do is direct conservation actions solely toward
30 the subsistence users. In my opinion, there are at least
31 two new developments that could be affecting sockeyes
32 there. One, the cost recovery for king salmon in the
33 Silver Bay area by the Northern Southeast Regional
34 Aquaculture Association has greatly expanded in the last
35 year or two. Also, there's a \$5 million plan to bring
36 early cohos into the Blue Lake area, which would expand
37 both cost recovery and targeted fisheries in that area.
38 I don't know what we'd do as a Council to bring attention
39 to the department and the Board of Fisheries that we are
40 concerned about this issue, but I would hope that all our
41 efforts wouldn't be solely directed at the subsistence
42 users to try and alleviate these conservation concerns.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: By asking the
45 Staff to work with the tribe and the Federal government,
46 I would hope they would investigate all of the options
47 that are available and come up with some kind of a plan.
48 Do you see it coming down different than that, Mr.
49 Davidson? The State certainly would be able to look at
50 -- all options would be on the table if we have a

1 conservation concern, I would suspect.

2

3 MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman. Yeah, we
4 would be glad to work with Sitka Tribe and with Federal
5 Staff to try and valueate the different options that we
6 have in this case. That's certainly possible. What we
7 have been doing since we have the weir in place is
8 relying on weir counts and then taking emergency action
9 in-season if it becomes apparent that returns are low.
10 We don't have an escapement goal set yet for Salmon Lake,
11 so there's no hard and fast number to manage by. We
12 could revise our management next year under the authority
13 of our permit authority. My decision in that matter would
14 be the final answer with the input of Federal Staff and
15 STA staff. We could have the season closed and open it
16 if we had a certain number of fish in the lake, that sort
17 of thing. So it can be handled informally and it can
18 also be handled formally through the Alaska Board of
19 Fish.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan, does
22 that address -- I mean everything is on the table here, I
23 think. We've got to look at an obvious conservation
24 concern that I know of personally. It's also been laid
25 on the table officially on the transcript, so we can't
26 just bury this. We've got to take the action required.

27

28 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, I heard really
29 adequate response from Mr. Davidson in terms of the
30 subsistence fishery. I believe the problem goes beyond
31 the subsistence fishery. I don't know if we can look at
32 that, but I think those of us who are concerned in the
33 public and in the Sitka Tribe and others need to look at
34 that. If there's a resolution from the Council or maybe
35 even a proposal that comes up, April 10th is the Board of
36 Fisheries cycle deadline for proposals, if it would be
37 appropriate, and I know we deal with game issues in the
38 winter, but if the Sitka Tribe, for example, had
39 developed a proposal to maybe deal with those other
40 issues, would it be appropriate to have it on our agenda
41 in February so we could make a proposal to the Board of
42 Fisheries to deal with some of the other problems there?

43

44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: My short answer is
45 I doubt it. We normally don't bring up fisheries
46 proposals during the game meeting. Dr. Schroeder, would
47 you care to comment on that?

48

49 DR. SCHROEDER: Excuse me, I wasn't
50 listening closely.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Cal was listening
2 closely.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mr.
7 Jordan. This Council would be free to put in a proposal
8 through the Federal system. The call for proposals will
9 be in January and February, so that would be perfectly
10 acceptable for the Council to put something together for
11 the Federal side. The Council, as well, is perfectly
12 authorized to submit a proposal to the State Board of
13 Fish as well. That's part of the public process. In
14 fact, you've submitted a Council proposal, for instance,
15 for Prince of Wales deer registration permits. I think
16 the ability is there for you to submit proposals to both
17 of us as you see fit. Now whether or not we go on the
18 record and discuss a recommendation next spring or next
19 late winter, John was right, that is a wildlife cycle and
20 you're developing recommendations for the wildlife
21 proposals. Anyway, I guess that's enough.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's do this.
24 Let's have for the next meeting. We have U2 deer later
25 in the proposal, so it's not like we're really breaking a
26 precedence, but normally OSM doesn't like to see
27 fisheries proposals come forward outside that. They've
28 got enough to deal with. This is a conservation concern.
29 We expect some answers at the next meeting from Federal
30 Staff and that means you'll work with whoever is
31 associated. And we expect everything, not just
32 subsistence users. Under State law and Federal law,
33 subsistence is the priority. So we don't expect all the
34 burden to be laid on the subsistence users. Matter of
35 fact, we won't stand for that at all. Is that good
36 enough? Dr. Garza.

37
38 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 Perhaps another approach is that this newly created Sitka
40 ad hoc committee may come up with a proposal to the Board
41 and we would simply endorse it.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. So we'll be
44 looking for some action next meeting. It's really
45 outside of 24 and 26. We've got to get going, but we
46 expect some positive action. Mr. Davidson.

47
48 MR. DAVIDSON: Just one real quick thing
49 to add here. There was a question about the level of
50 harvest, I believe, for Salmon Lake. I've got four years

1 of harvest from 2000 to 2003 handy here. Harvest of
2 Salmon Lake sockeye for subsistence has ranged from 54
3 fish reported in 2003 to 255 fish reported in 2001. So
4 that's the level of subsistence harvest that's currently
5 going on there. Sockeye.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a problem.
8 I guess that's it. Any other questions.

9
10 MR. DOBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
11 just wanted to reiterate that we are in support of your
12 Proposals 24 and 26 and we saw this as a chance to bring
13 up an example for a small system of sockeye that would be
14 considered under the way that sockeye is addressed as you
15 have default numbers. Thanks again.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It was the
18 appropriate place to do it. We know about conservation
19 concerns. We certainly want them brought to our
20 attention and we will do whatever we have to do to
21 address them. Are there any other members of the public
22 or tribes who would like to testify before we take this
23 under Council, 24 and 26.

24
25 Okay, we're under Regional Council,
26 Proposals FP05-24 and 26. My recommendation is to
27 consider these separately even though the analysis was
28 prepared to cover both of them. I would look on page 98
29 for 24. After we take care of 98, we will move to page
30 99 and take care of FP05-26. We need a motion to adopt,
31 Council.

32
33 MR. STOKES: Mr. Chairman, I move that we
34 adopt FP05-24.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: As shown on page
37 98.

38
39 MR. STOKES: Yes.

40
41 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, I'll read
44 that. It was to add the bold language shown under the
45 proposed regulation and this is, again, 27(i)(13)(xviii)
46 If a harvest limit is not listed for sockeye salmon in
47 this section, the harvest limit for sockeye salmon is the
48 same as listed on State subsistence or personal use
49 fishing permits. If the stream system is not listed on a
50 State permit, the possession limit is 10 sockeye salmon

1 and the annual harvest limit is 20 sockeye for that
2 stream per household. Did I have a second in this?

3

4 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's the motion
7 before you, that language. Council's wishes. The
8 substitute language that I believe was recommended by
9 the Feds is as shown on page 104, the very last paragraph
10 in bold. That was the substitute language that they
11 recommended for the previous paragraph that I just read.
12 I think a motion to substitute that language would be in
13 order. Mr. Jordan.

14

15 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, Council members.
16 I move that we substitute the language listed on the
17 bottom paragraph of page 104 that reads: If a harvest
18 limit is not listed for sockeye salmon in this section,
19 the harvest limit for sockeye salmon is the same as
20 provided for State subsistence and personal use
21 fisheries. If a harvest limit is not established for the
22 state fisheries, the possession limit is 10 sockeye
23 salmon and the annual harvest limit is 20 sockeye for
24 that stream per household.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second
27 to that amendment.

28

29 MR. KITKA: I'll second it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
32 and seconded to adopt as an amendment substitute language
33 as shown on the bottom of page 104 and as previously
34 read. Is there any discussion on this issue. Mr.
35 Jordan.

36

37 MR. JORDAN: I support the amendment and
38 that's all I have to say on it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council.

41

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready for
46 the question.

47

48 (Council nods affirmatively)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question

1 before you is to substitute the language for FP05-24 as
2 shown on the bottom of page 104. All in favor please
3 signify by saying aye.

4

5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
8 same sign.

9

10 (No opposing votes)

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The language shown
13 on the bottom of 104 is now the substitute language for
14 FP05-24. Discussion. Remember, we need to cover our
15 four bullet points here. First, Mr. Hernandez and then
16 Mr. Jordan.

17

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 I'd like to speak in favor of this proposal. I don't
20 believe that this proposal addresses a conservation
21 concern. The effect of this proposal on subsistence
22 users would be to establish a season for sockeye salmon
23 that is consistent with what the practices have been in
24 the fisheries in the past. These numbers that we're
25 using are possession limits that most people are used to
26 using on the existing subsistence fisheries, so I don't
27 believe there will be any adverse effects on subsistence
28 users. Didn't really need much substantial data to
29 support this conclusion and I see no effects on other
30 users.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
33 Hernandez. Mr. Jordan.

34

35 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I agree with Mr.
36 Hernandez. I do believe that this does address
37 conservation concerns in general as it is precautionary
38 and it works to sustain the runs. I think it has a
39 beneficial use on subsistence users because it clarifies
40 the Federal regulations. I think the Staff has provided
41 more than substantial data to support the recommendation
42 and I think this will also benefit other users as we
43 manage these fish conservatively and to the benefit of
44 subsistence users.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
47 other Council.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That was really
2 well put by both of you, thank you. Are you ready for
3 the question.

4
5 (Council nods affirmatively)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
8 before you is FP05-24, the substitute language as shown
9 on the bottom of page 104. It reads as follows: If a
10 harvest limit is not listed for sockeye salmon in this
11 section, the harvest limit for sockeye salmon is the same
12 as provided for State subsistence and personal use
13 fisheries. If a harvest limit is not established for the
14 state fisheries, the possession limit is 10 sockeye
15 salmon and the annual harvest limit is 20 sockeye for
16 that stream per household. All those in favor of this
17 motion please signify by saying aye.

18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
22 same sign.

23
24 (No opposing votes)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The substitute
27 language is our recommendation. We're on Proposal 26.
28 The original language is shown on page 99. Council.

29
30 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

33
34 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 Move to adopt FP05-26 on page 99.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second.

38
39 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, it's been
42 moved and seconded to adopt FP05-26 and the language is
43 shown on page 99. Under the proposed regulation, the
44 language reads: There are no harvest limits for the
45 harvest of pink and chum salmon. The substitute language
46 as recommended by Staff is shown in your book on page
47 105. Discussion or amendments as needed. Mr. Hernandez.

48
49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I move to
50 use the substitute language on Page 105 which states:

1 Unless noted on the Federal subsistence fishing permit,
2 there are no harvest limits for the harvest of pink and
3 chum salmon.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second.
6

7 MR. STOKES: I second it.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
10 and seconded to substitute the language shown on the top
11 of page 105 for FP05-26. Is there any discussion. Dr.
12 Garza first and then Mr. Jordan.

13
14 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I have several
15 amendments to the substitute language. Do we vote on the
16 substitute language first or do I make the amendments
17 first?

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's accept this
20 as substitute language and then further amend it. Mr.
21 Jordan.

22
23 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chairman. I am, of
24 course, very interested in Dr. Garza's suggested
25 amendments. I also thought about proposing amendments to
26 provide limits. After thinking about it and discussion
27 and listening to the various reports, I have decided
28 conservation is best served by a diligent management of
29 particular streams through the permitting process. I
30 have discerned that limits, especially when they're
31 fairly liberal, as in this case, often become a target.
32 So I am not going to.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan, the
35 amendment before us is just to offer the substitute
36 language. We can debate the merits of that. As soon as
37 it's accepted, it would be in order to follow yours. All
38 we're doing here is just to say using this as a mark-up
39 vehicle. That's all we're doing at this time.

40
41 MR. JORDAN: Okay.

42
43 DR. GARZA: Question.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
46 further discussion. Okay. The amendment is to use as a
47 mark-up vehicle the language as shown on page 105. FP05-
48 26 substitute language will read: Unless noted on the
49 Federal subsistence fishing permit, there are no harvest
50 limits for the harvest of pink and chum salmon. All

1 those in favor signify by saying aye.

2

3 IN UNISON: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
6 same sign.

7

8 (No opposing votes)

9

10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The substitute
11 language is adopted. The motion before you now is the
12 substitute language on the top of page 105. First, Dr.
13 Garza.

14

15 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. We may have to
16 put this up on the board. I would recommend that we
17 amend this proposal to read: Except where noted in
18 regulation on the Federal subsistence fishing permit,
19 there are no harvest limits for the harvest of coho and
20 pink salmon unless clear conservation requires in-season
21 or pre-season measures.

22

23 DR. SCHROEDER: Could you read that
24 again, please.

25

26 DR. GARZA: The start of it, (xix) Except
27 where noted, and that replaces the unless, on the Federal
28 subsistence fishing permit, which is already there, there
29 are no harvest limits for the harvest of pink and chum
30 salmon, which is what's already in here, unless clear
31 conservation concerns require special in-season or pre-
32 season measures.

33

34 So the major changes, Mr. Chair, I took
35 out the word unless noted because, to me, that was a bit
36 ambiguous, and changed it to except where in regulation.
37 So that provides for if there's already a regulation on
38 an existing stream. We're not trying to supersede that.
39 That's the intent there. And the ability to do in-season
40 or pre-season measures is there, but I wanted it
41 separated from unless where noted because -- I need a
42 second first.

43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's look at the
44 screen.

45

46 DR. GARZA: It needs to be cleaned up,
47 but that's the intent.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is that your
50 motion?

1 DR. GARZA: Yes.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second
4 to that amendment.
5
6 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
9 and seconded to amend the language as shown on the
10 screen. Under discussion. Mr. Jordan.
11
12 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. My previous
13 comments were directed at why I would be able to vote for
14 using this as a mark-up. I really appreciate the
15 proposed amendment by Dr. Garza because I think it
16 addresses my conservation concerns better than I could
17 have myself.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We need to make
24 sure we cover our four points for this because this
25 substitute language as amended will be our final action.
26 So let's make sure we cover our four bullet points.
27
28 DR. GARZA: Floyd has a question.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.
31
32 MR. KOOKESH: I have a question on that
33 word measures. Would it be more appropriate to use the
34 word action? Isn't that more the terminology that's
35 played with in the system as opposed to measures?
36
37 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, Mr. Kookesh, Dr.
38 Garza. Yes, special actions would be more consistent
39 with our regulations on the subject. Either way, we know
40 what you mean.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's not going
43 to change it, so we're just going to make that special
44 action. I don't think it changes it at all. So the
45 motion before you is to accept this language. All those
46 in favor please signify by saying aye.
47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed

1 same sign.

2

3

(No opposing votes)

4

5

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The language has
6 been amended as shown on the screen. Further discussion.
7 And make sure we cover the bullet points. Mr. Jordan.

8

9

MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. After the
10 amendments to this proposal, it has addressed the
11 conservation concerns I have and I wanted to put on the
12 record that I thought about proposing daily and annual
13 limits. The amendments and the discussion I've had with
14 the Staff have convinced me that we do not need daily and
15 annual limits for these abundant species at this time,
16 especially when we will consider escapements and
17 permitting based on conservation concerns if needed.

18

19

I think this has a positive effect on
20 subsistence users, it clarifies the rules and I think
21 there's substantial data to support the recommendation
22 and I thank the Staff and the public testimony for that.
23 And I think this proposal has a positive effect on other
24 users. It clarifies what the regulations are for the
25 subsistence harvest.

26

27

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
28 Council. I think that covered it. If you're ready for
29 the question.

30

31

MR. KOOKESH: Question.

32

33

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
34 before you is to accept the proposed language for FP05-26
35 as shown on the screen. Would you please read that, Dr.
36 Schroeder, for the record.

37

38

DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. The
39 amended language reads as follows: Except where in
40 regulations governing Federal subsistence fishing
41 permits, there are no harvest limits for the harvest of
42 pink and chum salmon unless clear conservation concerns
43 require special in-season or pre-season actions.

44

45

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. All in
46 favor, please signify by saying aye.

47

48

IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed

1 same sign.

2

3

(No opposing votes)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amended substitute language is our recommendation for FP05-26. Proposal FP05-25. Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Larson will be presenting the Staff analysis for FP05-25.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, FP05-25 begins on Page 106 of your Council book. Proposal FP05-25 is submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and would allow non-Federally qualified sport and subsistence fishermen to harvest sockeye in Pillar Bay.

We have a fairly long history of experience with Pillar Bay and the issue of appropriate harvest levels and who can fish there. The Federal Subsistence Board restricted the harvest of sockeye salmon in Kutlaku Lake to Federally qualified users in the 2001 fishing season. ADF&G subsequently submitted a Request for Reconsideration, which was not adopted by the Subsistence Board. The Board funded a sockeye assessment project at Kutlaku Lake in 2002 and 2003. These studies produced a partial escapement estimate for 2002 and a total escapement estimate for 2003.

The 2002 sockeye escapement estimate was greater than 1,400 fish. This was an incomplete estimate. More of an index of a spawning location because it did not account for an unknown number of sockeye spawning in the stream after the survey and in the lake. As it turned out, there were late spawning sockeyes that occurred after they expected them in 2002.

2003 they accounted for these late spawning sockeyes and produced an estimate someplace between 7,400 and 8,400 fish. The most recent information I've heard is that the minimum sockeye number is about the same, but it could be a few fish higher possibly. Anyway, they're confident that there was 7,400 fish in this estimate and in subsequent analysis of the data.

If we look at Table 1 on page 108, you can see a long history of escapement estimates. There are index escapements in the middle column. Those are generally conducted in conjunction with pink salmon

1 surveys. They are index values only and they're not
2 meant to convey a total escapement. The mark-recapture
3 estimate column is a method to estimate total escapement
4 and you can see there's only one value in that table that
5 has a minimum value of 7,400 sockeyes.

6
7 There's only been one completed survey
8 that accounts for a total escapement, so there remains
9 some uncertainty in the data and an escapement goal has
10 not been established. Because of budget shortfalls and
11 changing priorities, there's no plans for continued
12 assessments at Kutlaku Lake.

13
14 The subsistence fishery has decreased
15 significantly since 2000 and recently annual harvests are
16 about one third of the long-term average. I direct your
17 attention to Table 3 on page 110. In this table there's
18 a little note at the bottom. The average sockeye harvest
19 for the period 1985 to 2000 is 766 and the average number
20 of permits fishing is 34. Since the 2001 fishing season,
21 the number of sockeyes has been decreased to 222 and the
22 total number of permits is 12.

23
24 The original proposal was entitled FP01-
25 31. That was submitted by the Organized Village of Kake
26 and the City of Kake and they requested that the Board
27 close the Federal waters draining into the three areas,
28 Falls Lake, Gut Bay and Pillar Bay drainages, to the
29 harvest of sockeye salmon by non-Federally qualified
30 subsistence users and eliminate possession limits at
31 those locations.

32
33 At testimony, the Organized Village of
34 Kake expressed local knowledge to the Southeast Alaska
35 Subsistence Regional Council that sport fishermen at
36 Falls Lake, Gut Bay and Pillar Bay are negatively
37 impacting the subsistence users in Kake. The Board
38 subsequently adopted that regulation. They did not vote
39 to eliminate the possession limits of these locations.

40
41 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game in
42 2002 responded to the conservation concern by closing a
43 large section of the bay near the mouth of the stream
44 leading to Kutlaku Lake. I'd direct your attention to
45 Figure 1 on page 112. That shows the location of Kutlaku
46 Lake and Bay of Pillars. It's on the west coast of Kuiu
47 Island. The lower section of that photo shows an inset
48 of the Bay of Pillars on the north side and Kutlaku Lake
49 on the south and in the center of the photograph you can
50 see a stippled area with some lines across it. The

1 southernmost line that encloses the stippling is the area
2 that is closed by the Department of Fish and Game on the
3 landward side. The stippled area with the line on the
4 north side is the outer boundary of the closed waters.
5 The line that runs across the middle of what looks like
6 the lower intertidal area is the area of Federal
7 jurisdiction.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Could we clarify
10 that and make sure everybody knows exactly what those
11 lines are. They're not in color here, so kind of hard to
12 see.

13
14 MR. LARSON: No, they're not. They're
15 printed in black and white and it's a little hard to
16 interpret that. I'll try it again here. The boundary of
17 the area that's closed to subsistence fishing is bounded
18 by fairly broad lines and enclosed by a stippled area.
19 So that is the area that's closed to subsistence fishing
20 by the State of Alaska.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Could we just
23 start on the outer line, the one that's the deepest
24 water, and work our way in and then just tell us what
25 that line means.

26
27 MR. LARSON: Okay. That line is the
28 outer boundary of a closed water section. If you go
29 south of that, there is a line across the middle of that
30 area. That's the line of Federal jurisdiction. If you
31 continue south, you can see where the trees are. That's
32 the southern boundary of the area that's closed. So that
33 area that's enclosed by the outer lines is closed to
34 subsistence fishing by the State of Alaska. The line in
35 the middle delineates waters under Federal jurisdiction.

36
37 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a question
40 on this first.

41
42 DR. GARZA: I really apologize, but I was
43 looking at the map on top and looking at these little
44 lines, so you need to tell me that again. When you said
45 trees, I went what?

46
47 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. Look at the
48 maps. There's two maps on Page 112. One is a vicinity
49 map that has a little gray insert box labeled Bay of
50 Pillars. The gray insert box is expanded in the lower

1 panel. In that box you have the Bay of Pillars on the
2 north side. The small arm that leads down into Kutlaku
3 Lake that's in the center of the picture, a little bit to
4 the right. At the very bottom you'll see a water body
5 and that is Kutlaku Lake. So Kutlaku Lake drains north
6 into the Bay of Pillars. There is an area that's
7 stippled at the head of that bay and it's bounded -- that
8 area that's stippled, bounded by those two lines, is the
9 area that's closed to subsistence fishing right now. Now
10 there's a line through the middle of that stippled area
11 and that delineates waters under Federal jurisdiction. I
12 think we're kind of oriented to the location of Bay of
13 Pillars and Kutlaku Lake. It's a little confusing
14 because depending on which document you're looking at,
15 those two names are used interchangeably.

16

17 If we look back at Table 1. Let's
18 reference the escapement data because a lot of this
19 discussion is going to revolve around that. You can see
20 that most years there is either a small escapement or
21 there's quite a few years of no surveys. The peak
22 escapement survey, and this is an index value remember,
23 it's 5,000 fish and it occurred in 1967. In 1999 they
24 had an escapement of 2000. In '96-'97 there were no
25 sockeyes observed, but that one survey likely could have
26 been for pink salmon and not directed at sockeyes. So we
27 don't know that. Anyway, the center column is the index
28 escapement, but we do have a total escapement number.

29

30 Based on other information that was
31 gathered during the course of the survey that besides
32 getting a total escapement number we did some limnology
33 work and based on the numbers of zooplankton observed,
34 Kutlaku Lake appears to have the potential to support
35 more juvenile sockeye than are currently observed during
36 the course of the study. We don't really understand why
37 Kutlaku Lake is producing the number of sockeyes that it
38 is. We do know that at least for one year we had a
39 number of sockeyes that seemed fairly significant and
40 that the current level of use by subsistence fishermen is
41 at a level that's not really impacting that number.

42

43 If we look at the effect of sport
44 fishermen, the numbers that are generated of total catch
45 is done with a statewide harvest survey and if there's
46 not a large enough pool of people fishing in a location,
47 then it's very difficult for them to generate a number
48 that talks about what would be the total harvest from the
49 sport fishery.

50

1 In future years we expect that outfitter
2 guides will need to report harvests and we will get catch
3 numbers from that group of people in the future.

4
5 Finally, we support the proposal and
6 would like to recognize that there's not a clearly
7 defined conservation concern at Kutlaku Lake. We do have
8 an escapement estimate that seems sustainable and at
9 historical levels of harvest we expect from the sport
10 fishery. We don't expect the sport fishery to really
11 have any effect on that escapement number. Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions for
14 Staff from the Council. Lots of data. Mr. Kookesh.

15
16 MR. KOOKESH: I have a question for you.
17 I kind of got confused about what you were saying about
18 where we were. I don't have any kind of knowledge about
19 this area and I was wondering if what I'm looking at is a
20 blown-up version of that little block that you have on
21 the upper page on page 112. What I was looking at, is
22 this a lake or is this where the sockeye spawn? Is that
23 what I'm looking at? And can people get in there with
24 their boats and stuff like that?

25
26 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. You are
27 correct, the lower panel of the maps on page 112 is a
28 blow-up of the little gray box that is labeled Bay of
29 Pillars in the top panel. If you look at the panel on
30 the bottom, the darker water body at the top of that
31 picture is marine waters and that is the upper end of Bay
32 of Pillars. They access Chatham Straits to the left of
33 that picture through those little islands that you see
34 there. Small boats can go through there most any time,
35 but it is a fairly good rapids area and larger vessels,
36 it's not comfortable for them to go through there. You
37 don't really see the spawning area in the lake. What you
38 see is two-thirds of Kutlaku Lake at the very bottom of
39 that panel. And spawning areas are confined to a lake
40 shore and to several small streams, some of which you see
41 in this lake shore and some of them which you can't.
42 That's correct.

43
44 MR. KOOKESH: That's the lake?

45
46 MR. LARSON: No. It's to the left of
47 that. That's the lake.

48
49 MR. KOOKESH: That's the lake?

50

1 MR. LARSON: Yes. The little white
2 dialogue box actually intersects the lake.
3
4 MR. KOOKESH: When you look at this
5 little thing to the left, it looks like part of the bay
6 here. That's why I was wondering if that was a lake or
7 part of the bay.
8
9 MR. LARSON: Yes, that actually is --
10 there's a little panel that that dialogue box is covering
11 that is an arm of the outer portion of Bay of Pillars.
12 So that's not the lake to the left. The lake is actually
13 to the right and extends further south off of this
14 picture.
15
16 MR. KOOKESH: Got it.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions
19 for Staff. Mr. Douville.
20
21 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 Bob, is this line here, the outside line, I know what
23 you're talking about, it's closed, you said, by the
24 ADF&G, right, for subsistence?
25
26 MR. LARSON: That's correct.
27
28 MR. DOUVILLE: What about outside those
29 lines, out farther in the bay, is that open or is that
30 not an area where subsistence is allowed?
31
32 MR. LARSON: No, that's the area where
33 the subsistence fishing is being conducted right now. So
34 this outer bay is the portion that is open to
35 subsistence.
36
37 DR. GARZA: State?
38
39 MR. LARSON: Yes, State.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead.
42
43 MR. DOUVILLE: Is there any Federal
44 permits issued to fish inside those lines in the Federal
45 water and has there been any fish taken there?
46
47 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. The permits
48 that we issued is a general Southeast permit, so there's
49 a number of permits that there's a possibility that they
50 could go there and report, but we have had no person from

1 Kake obtain a Federal permit and there's been no harvests
2 reported from Kutlaku Lake, Bay of Pillars area.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh first
5 and then Dr. Garza.

6

7 MR. KOOKESH: Where do the sport
8 fishermen basically come from?

9

10 MR. LARSON: There is a floating lodge
11 that's on the outer portions of Bay of Pillars. There's
12 also a number of yacht-type boats, not as frequently as
13 some places in Southeast, but there are people that stop
14 there cruising through Southeast.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

17

18 DR. GARZA: Just when I think I have it,
19 I lose it. So in the marine waters, which is on the top
20 half of the black and white picture on the bottom there
21 is a subsistence harvest through State means, is that
22 true?

23

24 MR. LARSON: That is correct. That
25 harvest is reflected on page 110, Table 3.

26

27 DR. GARZA: So you were saying that there
28 is no Federal subsistence harvest in the white portion of
29 the stippled area, is that true?

30

31 MR. LARSON: I don't know that that's
32 completely accurate. What we have is, we have had no
33 reported harvest from there on our Federal permit system.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions
36 for Staff.

37

38 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Hernandez.

41

42 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 I'm looking in the executive summary here on page 106 and
44 it looks to me like Bay of Pillar drainage is addressed
45 as having an individual sockeye possession limit. So
46 that seems to indicate to me that there would be a
47 separate permit issued for somebody who did want to
48 subsistence fish within Pillar Bay on Federal waters, is
49 that correct?

50

1 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hernandez.
2 We issue one general trout and salmon permit in Southeast
3 Alaska waters. With that one permit, a person, providing
4 they were Federally qualified, could fish in Kutlaku Lake
5 and stream.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Hernandez.

8
9 MR. HERNANDEZ: I see. But then they
10 wouldn't necessarily have to report that they had fished
11 in Kutlaku Lake, so you would have no way of keeping
12 track of that, is that correct?

13
14 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. Our
15 regulations provide that a daily accounting of
16 subsistence fishing activities be made on this harvest
17 calendar. So if they were subsistence fishing under
18 Federal regulations, they would account for that harvest
19 prior to leaving the fishing site on a daily basis and
20 that information would be conveyed to the Forest Service
21 at the end of the year.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead.

24
25 MR. HERNANDEZ: So I would infer from
26 that that nobody fished in Kutlaku Lake with a Federal
27 permit then this year.

28
29 MR. LARSON: Yeah, they did not report I
30 think is probably the best way to face that. I would
31 like to note that the State permit is also valid in fresh
32 waters and a State permit in this case provides for 50
33 sockeyes. You would have it valid in both marine waters
34 and fresh waters.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead.

37
38 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. And then getting
39 back to the Table 3 where you have numbers for
40 subsistence harvest, I don't know if you can answer this
41 question. Maybe I have to wait for State Staff. Do you
42 know where those permits were issued? I'm wondering if
43 most of those permits were issued to Kake residents. Do
44 you have that information?

45
46 MR. LARSON: I suspect, and I don't know
47 this for sure, but it is either all of those permits or
48 almost all of those permits were from Kake residents,
49 although under the State system you don't have to be a
50 Kake resident to fish there.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead.

2

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, another question on
4 your sockeye escapement Table 1. I understand the index
5 surveys in the middle column not backed up by any mark
6 recapture estimates for any of the years except for 2003.
7 In 2003 there was an aerial foot survey, showed about 500
8 fish. The mark recapture estimate was at least 7,500
9 fish or 15 times as many fish as were seen in the foot
10 surveys. Is it safe to assume that that value of like a
11 15 time factor could be applied to these other numbers
12 for the aerial foot surveys or is that just not valid at
13 all?

14

15 MR. LARSON: No, that relationship does
16 not hold true because we don't really know, based on this
17 information that you have in front of you, which is the
18 peak surveys for sockeyes, you don't know what time of
19 year that was, you don't know if they were directed at
20 sockeyes or not. There's no indication on this table
21 whether those fish were observed in marine waters or in
22 fresh waters. There's just way too much information
23 that's not available to anyone to make that link between
24 index and total escapement.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: No more?

27

28 MR. HERNANDEZ: No, thank you, Mr.
29 Chairman. I was just trying to kind of substantiate this
30 substantial data criteria we're supposed to meet. Thank
31 you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Larson, in
34 your best professional judgment, would you say that a
35 subsistence user in the Bay of Pillars harvest their fish
36 in the marine waters where it's much easier or do they
37 hike up to the lake to get those 25 fish?

38

39 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, I suspect
40 we'll have some testimony later from experts in that
41 regard, but I do have some experience there and I'm not
42 aware that there's any subsistence fishing in the lake.
43 There may be some in the stream at times, but those fish
44 don't seem to linger in the stream and the lake is a very
45 difficult place to get to.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, thank you.
48 Any more questions for Mr. Larson.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's it. Thank
2 you. ADF&G.

3
4 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, members of the
5 Council, members of the public. The Department submitted
6 and supports this proposal to remove the closure for non-
7 Federally qualified users in Bay of Pillars drainages.
8 During the 2000-2001 regulatory cycle the Federal
9 Subsistence Board approved a regulatory change that
10 prohibited non-Federally qualified users from harvesting
11 sockeye salmon in Pillar Bay drainages along with Falls
12 Bay and Gut Bay streams. Because there was uncertainty
13 associated with sockeye salmon stock status at the three
14 locations, a stock assessment project funded by the
15 Office of Subsistence Management was conducted for
16 Kutlaku Lake sockeye salmon during 2002 and 2003. The
17 field work for that project is now being completed.

18
19 The most recent escapement data estimates
20 from the Kutlaku Lake project contributes substantially
21 to help answer questions that are current about this
22 stock. These data indicate at this time that there does
23 not appear to be a conservation concern. The
24 interpretation of all combined harvest estimates suggest
25 that the degree of harvest is proportionately low
26 relative to escapement and is well within the range of
27 sustainable use. This would include a consideration of a
28 projected small increase in harvest that may result from
29 this particular proposal.

30
31 The State approaches these situations
32 conservatively and will continue to monitor harvest
33 information by all users as well as coordinate with
34 Federal land managers. Beginning in 2005, and I believe
35 this point was noted in the Federal Staff analysis,
36 additional information will be available regarding guided
37 sport harvest from the fresh water log books that are
38 going to be required, which was implemented in response
39 to the guide licensing law.

40
41 Additional harvest information and a
42 summary of the stock assessment that were conducted at
43 Kutlaku Lake are also available in a handout we provided
44 separately titled supplement materials. It's a one-page
45 summary. We also note that we have Meg Cartwright here,
46 who is the project leader for that work, and she's
47 available to provide information and answer questions
48 about the stock assessment project.

49
50 There are other kinds of data that we

1 urge you to consider about this particular proposal. If
2 you have any questions at all, we have Staff here from
3 our commercial fisheries and sport fisheries management
4 who are happy to provide additional information about any
5 of the supplemental kinds of questions that you may have
6 about this proposal. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there
9 questions for ADF&G.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Were you going to
14 go over this supplemental materials.

15
16 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, at this time I'll
17 have Meg Cartwright provide that information at the
18 pleasure of the Council.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's fine. Go
21 ahead. Now, has this supplemental material been made
22 available for the audience?

23
24 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, we brought a number
25 of copies with us. I hope there's enough. Yeah, Meg,
26 says there are.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, go ahead,
29 Meg.

30
31 MS. CARTWRIGHT: Mr. Chair, members of
32 the Council. I'll be glad to answer any questions you
33 have or proceed the way you want me to.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Well, we get these
36 kind of late in the game and it's pretty hard to digest
37 all this stuff, so I was hoping that you could -- what
38 does it all mean? Why did you give this to us?

39
40 MS. CARTWRIGHT: Mr. Chair, members of
41 the Council. The first page of your supplemental system
42 is just a summary of the stock assessment stuff. In a
43 nutshell, in 2002, we did not get an estimate, as Mr.
44 Larson stated. In 2003, we just go in and get an index
45 on study areas and I need to emphasize that is just an
46 index, but for purposes of the Council and just
47 considering, we think the estimate is somewhere between
48 7,500 sockeye and 9,000 sockeye. So if you want to use a
49 conservative estimate to consider this proposal, then I
50 would suggest that I think at least 7,000 came into the

1 lake.

2

3

4 The near shore area where we do our
5 survey is very shallow and it's very easy to count fish
6 around the lake, so we're fairly confident that 7,000
7 fish went into the lake in 2003. So that's what page one
8 tells you. And the limnology data, as Mr. Larson
9 indicated, all looks good in that system, so we think
10 it's a fairly healthy system to support sockeye.

11

12

13 Page two is a map of the commercial
14 districts in Southeast Alaska and so some of these
15 subdistricts in Chatham are on this map. Page three is
16 sportfish harvest and sportfish people would have to
17 address this. I'm not sure how this survey is done, so
18 if you have questions on that, other people in Fish and
19 Game should answer that.

20

21

22 The next page is a more detailed map of
23 Chatham Strait subdistricts for commercial. You can see
24 some of these commercial fishery harvest areas are very
25 wide. For example, 51 and 61 go from Point Gardener to
26 Coronation Island.

27

28

29 The next is the charter boat catch in the
30 area and Tom Brookover is up here now. He can address
31 any of the sportfish stuff. The next page is just the
32 breakdown of the commercial fishery by subdistrict.

33

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't think I'm
36 going to ask Mr. Brookover to present this stuff. I just
37 want to let you know that I'm really disappointed that
38 you give me a form like this just filled with data and
39 you expect this Council to digest this stuff. This
40 information was available a long time ago and we should
41 have had it in our Board book. I think it's unacceptable
42 and we're really running a tight schedule here and we
43 need to spend a half hour to an hour on trying to digest
44 what these numbers mean. Unless there's some point that
45 you'd really like us to get out of this, let's highlight
46 those points because we just don't have time to learn all
47 this stuff in here. Mr. Brookover.

48

49

50 MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair. You asked why
we submitted this packet and the answer is just to
provide the Council with the latest information we have
since the Federal Staff analysis was conducted. We do
have some new information regarding the Kutlaku project.
We wanted to be sure you had that on hand.

51

1 As for the sport and commercial harvest
2 estimates, we worked with the Federal Staff during the
3 drafting of the Federal Staff analysis. We sought to
4 provide you with more detail here than what was in the
5 Staff analysis in the event there are questions on things
6 like the potential sport harvest, where the commercial
7 harvest may be occurring. So this was intended for your
8 information, a little bit more detail and a little bit
9 more up to date than what was in the Staff analysis,
10 particularly if there are questions in those areas.
11 That's all.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any point
14 that you'd like to make clear to the Council, any
15 information in here that you would like to point out that
16 we shouldn't miss?

17
18 MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair. The only
19 point that comes to mind and it comes to mind because
20 it's been discussed in light of this issue in the past
21 and that is what the potential effect of this proposal
22 would have on harvest in Kutlaku Lake. To that end, we
23 provided the information on page 3 in the form of a table
24 that's labeled Kake, Petersburg, Wrangell, Stikine area
25 freshwater sport harvest of sockeye salmon. How much
26 sportfishing activity and harvest that occurs in the area
27 that's now closed by Federal regulation has been
28 discussed when the original proposal came up and then
29 again at the Yakutat meeting when the request for
30 reconsideration was brought up.

31
32 We put this together to give the Council
33 an idea of what the potential effect of this proposal
34 might be. As we've discussed in the past, we estimate
35 harvest pertaining to this issue in two important ways.
36 One is the statewide harvest survey. A statewide
37 questionnaire that's sent out to a proportion of all
38 households that have someone that obtained a sportfishing
39 license.

40
41 As we've talked about before, that type
42 of survey does a good job at estimating fishing
43 participation and harvest over large geographic areas.
44 Where it tends to fall down is small areas where there's
45 relatively low participation.

46
47 What the table shows is that for the area
48 encompassing Petersburg, which is also shown on the
49 preceding page on the map labeled boundaries of eight
50 harvest survey reporting areas. The area that pertains

1 to this table is area C. It encompasses Kake,
2 Petersburg, Wrangell, Stikine, Ernest Sound, Cape
3 Fanshaw, Wrangell Islands, Rainbow Islands, Mitkof
4 Island, Kuiu Island and Coronations Islands as well.

5
6 To obtain what we consider a reliable
7 estimate for a particular system requires at least 12
8 responses from the survey. What you see in the table as
9 far as the individual streams listed and the data for
10 those are places where we have what we consider reliable
11 estimates of harvest in this Petersburg area. As you can
12 see, Petersburg Creek has a reliable harvest estimate for
13 most years. Other systems have reliable estimates for a
14 sporadic number of years. For all years, you can see
15 that most of the harvest is not coded to particular
16 streams.

17
18 That other column second from the right
19 is what we would look at to say if we were going to
20 provide an idea of what harvest occurred in Kutlaku Lake,
21 we know that this level of harvest, for example 245
22 sockeye, came from the Petersburg area. Some of those
23 sockeye could certainly have come from Kutlaku Lake.
24 Previously, in 2001, that number was 571. Prior to that
25 225 in 2000. So a range of roughly two to six hundred
26 fish are taken in the Petersburg area that could
27 potentially come from Kutlaku Lake.

28
29 The Council and the Federal Board closed
30 the area to non-Federal use. To gauge an effect of that,
31 we could look at the time period prior to the closure up
32 through 1999 and 2000 and look at the harvest that
33 occurred after that time. Basically, the point I wanted
34 to make was that the harvest in the recent years since
35 the closure are within the range of harvest in the past.
36 Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I don't
39 think any of this is new. I just wish we had seen it a
40 lot earlier. We spent way more time. We're really
41 getting bogged down on this and I don't know if it's
42 going to be substantial to what we do on this proposal.
43 Council, do you have any questions for Staff. Go ahead.

44
45 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, I agree with you.
46 It's always good to receive information on a timely
47 basis, but having served on all kinds of Federal and
48 State things, as you have, we all know that a lot of
49 times the information is developed fairly recently. I,
50 for one, appreciate the information and it helped my

1 perspective on this issue. I thought it was well
2 organized and detailed. Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other comments
5 for ADF&G. We need to get moving here, folks.

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thanks.
10 Again, I'd just like to note, hopefully we could see
11 these earlier next time because it really helps if you
12 can sleep on these a night or two. Tribal agencies.
13 Tribal comments on Proposal 25. Mr. Jackson.

14

15 MR. KADAKE: Mr. Chairman, Henrich
16 Kadake, Sr., president of Kake OVK. We're opposed to
17 opening this lake to sports fishermen and even to
18 subsistence fishing. We feel the same as you people. We
19 had no sight of this information that Fish and Game
20 handed out until today and we would like to see this,
21 too, because year after year they've told us that the
22 stocks are depleting, the stocks are depleting, so we had
23 a real small annual limit in Pillar Bay and when our
24 users go there they find it true because they don't get a
25 whole lot of sockeye out of there. We're speaking
26 against it and I'd like to turn it over to Mike Jackson
27 to continue for our council.

28

29 MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
30 Council. I too would like to object to any kind of
31 supplemental information that is presented here, even
32 though it's in a well-mannered way of putting it. It's
33 organized, might be really organized, but to me and
34 speaking for the Council because they ordered me to come
35 to represent them, and along here with our president, it
36 shows to me, and it might not be, but it sure gives an
37 appearance of a small lake that isn't glacially fed of
38 our sockeye that we know of, we're the only customary and
39 traditional users of, where down there in the last 10
40 years there's this floating lodge that has been using
41 this system. All good and well. But on the other hand,
42 the conservation issues that we brought up that is
43 documented here in the history of it has been a
44 conservation issue.

45

46 When Lonnie Anderson was here, he would
47 speak up for it on the Council. But I see three people
48 from Sitka, two people from Petersburg. Where is Kake,
49 in the center of the heart of Southeast represented here?
50 Mr. Hernandez might be of Point Baker or Petersburg. Mr.

1 Bangs might be from Petersburg. But they've only been
2 there 100 years. The State has only been looking at this
3 thing since 1960.

4
5 When we put out our traditional and
6 ecological knowledge and work with Dr. Schroeder here, we
7 had doctors, professors in our culture talking with them.
8 They were our uncles and aunties talking about
9 traditional ecological knowledge. They told us to come
10 here and put a face to this Kutlaku Lake. When we come
11 here, we look at a really nice orchestrated presentation
12 by one of your own Staff, Bob Schroeder. We're lucky to
13 see him one year in Kake out of Petersburg or get a call
14 from him in one year.

15
16 DR. GARZA: Bob Larson.

17
18 MR. JACKSON: Bob Larson, I'm sorry. And
19 then we hear the longest comment of approval in this
20 catalogue, your book by the State of Alaska Department of
21 Fish and Game, followed up by a real nice supplementary
22 thing that we never got to look at much less even hear
23 from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game on their
24 proposal to open up this by coming down to Kake and
25 talking to us about it.

26
27 I heard it about two or three weeks ago
28 from Bob Larson that was their proposal. We saw it come
29 up and the Council was taken aback by it. We thought we
30 were building a group of people to work together. I
31 commend the Federal Subsistence Board and your Regional
32 Advisory Committee to work with all these agencies. But
33 you still get a drift of the people that do work for you
34 now, as I stated in Yakutat, that it was in 1960 when the
35 State Department of Fish and Game came on board. A lot
36 of these biologists are now working for you that come up
37 with these oppositions to all subsistence users,
38 specifically sockeye.

39
40 When it comes to sockeye, we're all
41 sitting here, and the concern of sockeye subsistence is
42 the conservation of it. Already, as you see on Table 2
43 on page 109, the commercial sockeye harvest has
44 substantially, as words of some people being used here,
45 of using the sockeye of our trilogy lakes, Kutlaku, Gut
46 Bay and Falls Lake, has really gone up around there. And
47 they have information on the sockeye for each of these
48 lakes. I've seen it and you can see the amount taken
49 from it.

50

1 Kutlaku is a very small lake. It might
2 look large on your diagram, but it's a watershed that has
3 no glaciers, like Gut Bay or Falls Lake. But our concern
4 is, and still is from our original proposal, of shutting
5 this down to all non-Federal subsistence users, as we
6 still stand by it, and that you continue. I'd like to
7 thank you and also the Federal Board of Subsistence of
8 continued funding because we are still finding out the
9 conservation issue, whether it's well-documented or not.
10 On page 108, Table 1, they have no history of this,
11 there's no survey. To me, that substantiates the four
12 questions that you're going to be addressing as you
13 deliberate.

14
15 Another thing that works against the Kake
16 people from going all this way down there, and if you
17 look on the map that they gave you, on the supplementary
18 information just on Figure 1 on page 2, you look at how
19 far Kake is away. It's up on the northwest corner of C,
20 all the way down to the Bay of Pillars, which is on the
21 southwest part of Area C, and the documentation here on
22 page 107 in your big book in the discussion. In the
23 middle paragraph of that discussion it says commercial
24 harvest of sockeye salmon in the lower portions of
25 Chatham Strait have significantly increased, but harvest
26 mixed stocks of sockeye and appear to allow adequate
27 escapements. We're addressing conservation. That's why
28 the Federal Board shut this down to non-Federal
29 subsistence users.

30
31 I was going to comment on the last, I
32 think it was number 26 and 24 of your part. Clearly
33 these three lakes I work with in our Kake area are
34 conservation issues. We appreciate Mr. Davidson for
35 working with us. Once in a while we get a call because
36 we call our concern about commercial fishing along the
37 coast of eastern Baranoff and he has shut them down from
38 certain areas in the past year.

39
40 We'd like to propose -- and if you are
41 going to bring up anything in your winter concern of any
42 kind of conservation issues because of Mr. Doug Dobbins,
43 the subsistence expert from Sitka, to consider these
44 three lakes about what commercial is doing because I've
45 heard here and I've heard it again that subsistence
46 should be on the top of this permit. The effect of it
47 should not be on the people who collect this for their
48 sustenance of living and their ceremonies and
49 spirituality. But we're at the bottom rung of this whole
50 thing and we're here begging for the subsistence part of

1 it. The part that it implies in the western language.
2 Eeking out, scratching out and begging you for a little
3 bit of sockeye that we have customarily and traditionally
4 gathered.

5
6 Something is wrong here. If the
7 fisheries are making money and there are taxes being paid
8 to do their continued study and encouragement of their
9 hatcheries of dog salmon, king salmon, sockeye, cohos,
10 for sportfishing in, say, downtown Juneau here, maybe we
11 can imply or put against another tax to fund the tagging
12 of all these sockeye, cohos, in these little streams that
13 are conservation concerns on the commercial fishery to
14 pay for.

15
16 Our clan name, my personal clan name is
17 Kaachudee. Mr. Stokes knows that the Kaachudees had a
18 tribal house upriver on the other side of what's now a
19 border between US and Canada. Kaachudee gets their name
20 from Kotch in a small lake that I just heard you put a
21 limit on sockeye on. We haven't told the Department of
22 Fish and Game, much less the Federal fish people, that
23 the sockeye go there, but now it's on the record. Kotch
24 means freshwater marked sockeye, which is the red/green
25 head/tail that comes from the north. Historically, we
26 know where we came from because that's spiritual, that
27 connection of our holy men, our spiritual men. These
28 days they call them shaman, medicine men, knew where
29 everything came from.

30
31 So the parts of the documentation and to
32 clearly look and it appears to me a complete conspiracy
33 for a small lake because of one charter boat in the Bay
34 of Pillars would like to take some people up there as
35 part of the Wilderness experience and guaranteeing them
36 some kind of fillet for their convenience of making a
37 dollar off of it.

38
39 Now we have here the availability of
40 conservation of Kutlaku Lake and Gut Lake and Falls Lake
41 of our history since time immemorial. We did not migrate
42 to this area that I know of. We were created here.
43 These people are coming back to this area because we know
44 that the visitors have come here to benefit from the
45 lands that we have, but we've never put a dollar amount
46 to it because we're stewards of the land and the water
47 and relate to them spiritually. We don't call them and
48 separate ourselves from whether it's fish, salmon, deer
49 or bugs in the forest or an eagle. We're a part of them.
50 We'll return to them. But these days some people like to

1 embalm themself to keep the bodily form that they do
2 have. I heard Mr. Larson say here, as well as he knows,
3 he calls himself an expert in this area, that there is no
4 Federal permit issued to any Kake people to fish this
5 area. We agreed to go along with the Alaska Department
6 of Fish and Game and Federal Board of Fisheries that you
7 guys agreed to work with them on permits. In fact, the
8 Organized Village of Kake, the Kake Tribe issues those
9 permits as a convenience to our tribal members and people
10 in Kake. Instead of calling up Petersburg and wait for a
11 week for the mail to come through if the weather is good
12 to go fishing. I'd like to thank them and the Feds for
13 agreeing to work with us on that because it's been
14 working real well. We'll tell Henrich, we'll go to
15 Henrich, knock, knock, knock, did you return your permit.
16 Whereas they'll send you a threat over saying you'll be
17 charged with a misdemeanor from Petersburg, but we go
18 right up to him, did you return your permit and they'll
19 go in search for it, tear their boat apart to get it. It
20 works.

21
22 But I do not know where Mr. Larson comes
23 off saying that there was no fishing there documented of
24 our people there at Kutlaku Lake. In fact, I don't know
25 if anybody here or other subsistence users on Kerr jar
26 lids, maybe it's a conspiracy by the Federal/State Fish
27 and Games, that they send us bad lids to Kake. But
28 there's been thousands of pint jars and half-pint jars
29 that gone bad because there was a minimal amount of
30 rubber coating around the lid. And it doesn't pop up to
31 give you that warning that it's not sealed because it
32 doesn't have to. All the air escapes from it. And it
33 continues to go bad. You don't know when it is until you
34 open it up and it stinks or your house stinks.

35
36 We're looking at taking legal action for
37 that, but guess where we went for this fall-back
38 fisheries. My uncle and my cousins went down to Kutlaku
39 Lake and got their fish. Like it's noted, it does come
40 back later in the season and we know that and they got
41 enough sockeye salmon.

42
43 So I would come before you and say that
44 we do object to this proposal even though the Forest
45 Service built a trail from the mouth of that creek to the
46 lake for the convenience of that one lodge owner down
47 there. I don't know if he was a past worker for the US
48 Forest Service. Maybe you'll start an investigation on
49 it. I wish they would spend a little bit of money in
50 Kake on our accessibility to these kind of places. But,

1 to me, it sure appears like there's an orchestrated way
2 of trying to get this one person to fish there. We don't
3 need for them to open it up to start a sport fishery
4 there to tell them that they're catching too much.

5
6 I'd like to see our representation from
7 Petersburg speaking on our behalf, their representation
8 if that's how it's going to go here on the Board, on your
9 Council. How do they know about the Kake area? How do
10 they know how we collect fish? Because I don't know if
11 Bangs or Hernandez are Tlingit or Haida or Tsimshian.

12
13 But I take very big offense and the
14 community of Kake on how Staff supports this, Department
15 of Fish and Game gave their longest presentation on the
16 support of it. For what? For one portable lodge that
17 could be easily towed over to another creek out of our
18 jurisdiction to do what he does.

19
20 But I sure object to what has gone on
21 here because people are going to see more and more of
22 this as you heard right from the beginning on the first
23 one, of the Hoonah conflict that's going on there in
24 Excursion and, for all I know, in Sitka. But this is
25 what's coming down the line.

26
27 I appreciate the time that you guys have.
28 I know it's going after noon. I'll cut it short. In
29 closing, I'd like to summarize. One, is there a
30 conservation concern? Yes. The Federal Board of
31 Subsistence agreed with us and thank you for arguing the
32 point when you went all the way to Anchorage to do that
33 in front of Mr. Demientieff and the other agency leaders.

34
35 Because of the conservation of these
36 areas, the commercial does play a big role in it. How
37 can we all work together in that area, commercial,
38 charter boats, people that fish there, and us, to come up
39 with the scheme of things? I don't know, but Mr. Jordan
40 has walked miles and miles of creeks and maybe he's
41 walked down this one and instantly, like anthropologists
42 do, become doctorates in these areas.

43
44 What is the effect on subsistence users?
45 It's a substantial one. Because, like you know, we had
46 to go back there as a fall-back position to get the
47 sockeye that we used in ceremony. Does substantial data
48 support this recommendation? I guess if you would call
49 this well organized, put together thing by Department of
50 Fish and Game as one, but it's as well to you a surprise.

1
2 And all the way through your big book it
3 says there's no substantial data justifying opening it
4 except for the 15 times the amount of a walk-through and
5 indexing in 2003 saying that there's 5,000 to 7,000 fish
6 in that lake. Anybody could have pulled that out of
7 their hat and said it. Oh, yeah, I walked it. Maybe Mr.
8 Jordan has some information on it if he walked that
9 stream.

10
11 What is the effect of other uses.
12 Primarily none because there's only one charter boat that
13 sits down there and gets a lot of halibut, ling cod, coho
14 salmon, sockeye, right at the mouth of this place because
15 it's a pretty nice drainage system and it's in our
16 customary and traditional use area. So I sit here with
17 Mr. Kadake putting a face to this area for conservation
18 reasons. Gunalcheesh.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Gunalcheesh.
21 We've let you run over, of course, I have, because we're
22 just going to have lunch across the street, hopefully. I
23 think I'd like you to come back. There may be some
24 substantial questions for you guys I think that we can't
25 handle in the next 10, 15 minutes. What I'd like to do
26 is start back with you back at the table when we bring
27 this back for discussion and certainly we'll have some
28 comments and questions for you, I believe, at that time.

29
30 So let's take a short recess. We have
31 lunch by Melinda Hernandez and her group across the
32 street. Immediately after that we're going to come back
33 at 1:00 o'clock. We have a special order which Mr. Doug
34 McBride and I believe Steve Klein is here with him, too.
35 They'll be making a presentation on FIS proposals and
36 after that we can have some testimony on FIS. We'll have
37 a short lunch and then at 1:00 o'clock we need to be
38 back.

39
40 (Off record)

41
42 (On record)

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting is now
45 in order. Please take your seats in the back.

46
47 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of
48 the Council. Thank you. My name is Doug McBride. I'm
49 with the Office of Subsistence Management, the Fishery
50 Information Services, which is a part of that

1 organization. I'm here to discuss two things with the
2 Council today. First, and what will take the vast
3 majority of the time, is the 2005 Fishery Resource
4 Monitoring Program. After we're done with that
5 discussion, then I have just a very brief update on
6 strategic planning for the Fishery Resource Monitoring
7 Program.

8
9 The material that I'll be discussing is
10 in your book. It starts on page 160. Mr. Chairman, I'm
11 going to spend a few minutes going through some of the
12 background material that starts on page 161. In the
13 past, we've skipped over this, but we have new Council
14 members and a lot of this has important information to
15 put the program and the recommendations into context.

16
17 On page 161, right in the middle of the
18 page in bold is the mission of the Monitoring Program. I
19 won't read it. I'll leave that to you, but I think it's
20 really important in that it states what we do and how we
21 do it. Clearly, what we're all about is providing
22 information needed to manage and regulate subsistence
23 fishing opportunity on Federal public lands. And then
24 the how of it is also part of the mission statement and
25 it speaks to a collaborative program, multidisciplinary
26 program. Unfortunately in the mission statement it's not
27 explicit when it talks about a high level of technical
28 expertise in the program, but that's why we do the things
29 that we do, is to ensure a high level of technical merit
30 in what is funded.

31
32 I mentioned the Technical Review
33 Committee or the TRC. If you look at the bottom of page
34 161, there's a brief summary of the project evaluation
35 process. We utilize a body called the TRC. They are
36 technical experts from a wide variety of all the agencies
37 on both the Federal and the State side who are associated
38 with this program. In fact, there are several members of
39 the TRC in the audience with us today. I'm sure the one
40 you all know the best is Mr. Cal Casipit. He represents
41 the Forest Service on that body. The head of FIS, Mr.
42 Steve Klein. He is the chairman of the TRC. Then the
43 other TRC member that I know is here today is Dr. Glenn
44 Chen. He's with the BIA. If I missed any of the others
45 that are here, I apologize for that. I'm trying to just
46 give you an idea of the kinds of people that are on the
47 TRC.

48
49 What is it that they do. Well, they
50 evaluate the project proposals that are submitted. We

1 put out a call for proposals and they evaluate those
2 proposals or project ideas and they do that through a
3 written investigation plan. That's a very, very key
4 document because what's in that investigation plan is the
5 method of evaluating the project.

6
7 If you turn to page 162, outlined there
8 are the four factors that the FIS staff and the TRC look
9 at in evaluating a project. It goes right back to the
10 mission statement of the program. The first factor is
11 strategic priorities. That defines the subject matter of
12 what's important. It has to have a very direct
13 relationship to what the Federal Subsistence Board or the
14 Federal managers are doing. That defines strategic
15 priority. Then the other factors get to the how we do
16 things.

17
18 The second one is on technical and
19 scientific merit and I think that speaks for itself. A
20 lot of the investigation plan is supposed to explain
21 things like study design, data collection, analytical
22 methodology and reporting. That speaks directly to the
23 technical and scientific merit of the program.

24
25 The third evaluation category is past
26 performance and administrative expertise. Particularly
27 for investigators that we dealt with in the past, we have
28 to ensure that they just have the administrative and
29 technical expertise to actually do the program.

30
31 Then the fourth and certainly not the
32 least important, but the fourth evaluation criteria is
33 partnership and capacity building. That speaks to the
34 collaborative nature of the program. What we're
35 interested in as we're gathering this information is to
36 do it in a manner that builds capacity for rural Alaska
37 Native organizations to meaningfully participate in
38 natural resource management, specifically the management
39 of subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands. That
40 is what that's all about. When you see the
41 recommendations that I'm going to give you, what they're
42 doing is addressing those points.

43
44 Okay. That's how business is conducted.
45 The next thing I'm going to go into on page 163 is just
46 the finances that we're looking at for this year for the
47 monitoring program. If you go to the bottom of page 163,
48 there's a small table, Table 1 down there. What that's
49 laying out is the amount of money available in 2005, so
50 that's what we have in front of us, our programs that

1 would start next year, and how much money is available.
2 As you can see, if you go to the bottom right-hand part
3 of the table, there's about \$2.1 million. Just
4 bureaucratic budget figures, we always do things in
5 thousands, so 2,094 is like \$2,100,000.

6
7 The real key part of that table are the
8 two rows that say Southcentral and Southeast Alaska. The
9 reason for that, obviously, we're dealing with Southeast
10 here, but I'll give you just a little bit of the
11 administrative, down in the trees of this program. What
12 we have annually for the entire monitoring program is
13 about \$6 million. About two million of that comes
14 through the Department of Agriculture or through the
15 Forest Service. The other four million or so comes
16 through the Department of Interior through the Fish and
17 Wildlife Service.

18
19 The reason that that is important is even
20 though this is all going into Federal subsistence
21 management, the individual agencies and the Federal
22 departments have to be cognizant that the money that they
23 spend is spent on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.
24 So the way this program is actually funded and
25 administered is the Forest Service funds go to Southeast
26 and Southcentral Alaska because that's where the Tongass
27 and the Chugach National Forests are, and then the
28 remaining money that comes from Interior is spent
29 elsewhere in the state and that's where the national
30 parks and the refuges and the BLM lands are.

31
32 So that's a really important
33 administrative consideration, the amount of money
34 available. You can read those for yourselves. But any
35 flexibility in the program in this part of the world, in
36 Southeast region, is only flexible within the amount of
37 money that the Forest Service has available.

38
39 Then if you look at just the overview of
40 what has been recommended by the TRC based on those
41 evaluation criteria that we talked about, that's on page
42 164 and spills over to 165. Overall, we've recommended a
43 program that nearly approximates the amount of money
44 available for the Southeast and Southcentral program. It
45 equals the amount of money available. There is no
46 additional Forest Service money available beyond what is
47 recommended for Southeast and Southcentral Alaska.

48
49 If you look at that pie chart on 165,
50 overall you can see the breakdown by Federal, State,

1 Alaska Native and other organizations. Again, that
2 speaks to what we're trying to do in terms of a
3 collaborative program. There's policy sideboards in
4 terms of trying to get at least half the money to non-
5 Federal sources and those kinds of things. Overall,
6 that's how the Statewide recommendation breaks down.

7
8 Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to pause
9 really briefly because now what I'm going to do is I'm
10 going to go right into Southeast, but I'll just ask if
11 the Council has any questions.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
14 questions from Council on what we've had so far.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Keep going.

19
20 MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 Then going to page 166, we now get into the program for
22 Southeast. At the top part of the page are the issues
23 and information needs. What we have done to date is we
24 have worked with each of the Councils for their
25 respective regions to identify strategic priorities. I'm
26 sorry. Dolly.

27
28 DR. GARZA: What page, I've lost you.

29
30 MR. MCBRIDE: Page 166 is where I'm at
31 right now. What we have done is worked with the Councils
32 and Staff and other members of the public to provide
33 input in terms of the strategic priorities for that
34 region. You can see there we've bulleted the main points
35 for the Southeast region. In fact, I think it was just a
36 year ago or two years ago that we added the fourth one to
37 look at particularly steelhead and eulachon as a
38 strategic priority for the Southeast region.

39
40 I think before we get into what's on the
41 table for 2005 I'm just going to real briefly cover what
42 we've already funded and what we're funding right now.
43 That's what this big table is on page 167. That's simply
44 a table of everything that the Fishery Resource
45 Monitoring Program has funded in Southeast Alaska since
46 the inception of the program in the year 2000.

47
48 The way to read that table, if you look
49 at the columns, the far left are the project numbers.
50 That's just an administrative thing. The second column

1 is the data type. Those acronyms, SST, means stock,
2 status and trends. Those are projects that look at, by
3 and large, fish populations. We're estimating abundance,
4 composition, migratory timing, those kinds of parameters.
5 Then the other acronym is HMTEK. That stands for harvest
6 monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge. Ms.
7 Garza.

8
9 DR. GARZA: Just quickly. So on the
10 project number, the first two numbers tell us what year
11 it was initiated?

12
13 MR. MCBRIDE: Exactly. That's how those
14 are coded. If you look at those project numbers,
15 anything that says 00 that was a year 2000 monitoring
16 plan project and then we just give it a unique number.
17 What you'll see there are projects that go through the
18 year 2004 and that's what we did a year ago.

19
20 The third column is just the project
21 title. Then under investigators those are all of the
22 investigators associated with each project. The first
23 one is the principal investigator and then the subsequent
24 ones are the co-investigators for that project.

25
26 Then the financial information is on the
27 far right of that table and it's all organized by year.
28 So, for instance, if you want to look at what's being
29 funded right now in 2004, if you go to the 2004 column,
30 any project that has a number in the year 2004 is
31 something that's going on right now. So if you look at
32 the very first one, that's project 02-012, which is the
33 Neva, Pavlof sockeye stock assessment. We've talked about
34 that. That project, as you can see, is in the third and
35 final year of the commitment for that project.

36
37 The same for the next one, the Redfish
38 Bay project that's being conducted by the Sitka Tribe of
39 Alaska, and that's in the third and final year of study.

40
41 The next group of projects down there,
42 what you'll see for those projects, those are all 04
43 projects. That means they're part of the 2004 monitoring
44 plan. Those are the ones that were approved this time a
45 year ago. Most of those projects then have a three-year
46 commitment. So you can see there's a big block of them
47 right about in the middle of the page. Then at the
48 bottom of the page there's also two harvest monitoring
49 TEK projects that were started in 2004, again with a
50 three-year commitment.

1 The one exception to that is the very
2 first one of that block, project 04-604, the Klawock Lake
3 sockeye assessment. You'll see it just has one number in
4 2004. That's \$171,600. The reason for that is it was
5 our recommendation and this is what carried through both
6 the Council and all the way through the Board when they
7 approved the 2004 monitoring plan last December, is we
8 only recommended committing to a single year for Klawock,
9 not because we didn't want to commit to it in the future,
10 but there were some technical and cost concerns with that
11 project and we wanted to work with the investigator to
12 fix those. So we only committed to one year for that
13 project. What you're going to see in just a minute is
14 then they addressed those concerns and came back with a
15 revised investigation plan and that's part of the 2005
16 monitoring plan that I'm going to go over right now.

17
18 If you flip the page, starting at the top
19 of 168 and then on 169, here are the projects that are on
20 the table for 2005. If you look at Table 2, which is the
21 top of page 169, there are five projects that are on the
22 table for 2005. Three of those projects are SST or
23 stock, status and trends projects. There are addressing
24 assessment of sockeye in Kook Lake, addressing sockeye in
25 Klawock Lake and also a project to address assessment of
26 steelhead on Prince of Wales Island.

27
28 Then there are two harvest monitoring TEK
29 projects. One that addresses customary trade in the
30 Southeast region and another one that looks at a reason
31 why subsistence fishing patterns are changing
32 specifically due to changing participation of the rural
33 community in the region's commercial fisheries.

34
35 The information that's presented in Table
36 2, there are a couple things budgetary-wise that we look
37 at that I know has been very important to this Council in
38 the past and you've very specifically asked about this
39 information. In Table 2, one of the things we look at
40 project by project is how the total project amount is
41 budgeted by various types of organizations. So that's
42 what you see in that table.

43
44 What we do is look at -- for example,
45 Kook Lake. We look at how much money is budgeted to go
46 to an Alaska Native organization, how much of that total
47 project would go to the State, the ADF&G, a Federal
48 agency, and then if there's another organization,
49 basically a non-government organization that wouldn't
50 fall under any of those prior categories. So you can see

1 for yourselves how at least those projects are planned
2 out and how that money would be distributed if they're
3 approved for funding.

4
5 Table 3 looks at a couple other financial
6 parameters. Specifically, how much money goes to local
7 hire and then how much matching money there is. Local
8 hire is part of the project budget that is part of the
9 cost that we're looking at for this program. Matching
10 funds are funds that would be in addition to the amount
11 of money requested of this program. So, in other words,
12 if an agency or organization is bringing other funds to
13 bear on the total cost of the project.

14
15 There is a mistake in Table 3 because, if
16 you'll notice, there is nothing listed for either the
17 harvest monitoring TEK projects and there is a local hire
18 component to both of those projects. For the first
19 project, project 651, what should be in there is 9.9.
20 So, in other words, there's about \$10,000 worth of local
21 hire for that project. For the next one, project 653, it
22 should read 6.0 or about \$6,000 for local hire. The
23 matching part of the table is completely correct.

24
25 One of the ones I guess I would point out
26 that I think is a really big deal, if you look at the
27 Prince of Wales steelhead project, the various agencies,
28 primarily BIA and ADF&G and the USDA Forest Service, are
29 bringing a huge amount of matching funds for that
30 project. The total cost of that project is what's being
31 requested of this program plus those matching funds and
32 those matching funds are largely Staff costs that they
33 are contributing, so that's why that figure is so high.

34
35 What I'm going to do now is get into the
36 actual recommendations that have come through the TRC.
37 If you turn the page to 170, the first thing I'm going to
38 address is the stock status and trends projects. We
39 recommend funding all three of the stock status and
40 trends projects. If you look at Table 4 in the middle of
41 page 170, that's why you see under recommendation for TRC
42 it says yes for each one of those projects. I'm going to
43 just real briefly speak to all three of those projects.

44
45 The first one is Kook Lake sockeye. That
46 is a sockeye system relatively close to Angoon and Hoonah
47 and I think utilized by both those communities. There
48 are some conservation concerns with that system. We have
49 funded work in there in the past, but they had a lot of
50 trouble getting credible estimates of escapement. What

1 we tried to do is do it with a mark recapture or a
2 tagging study. It didn't work particularly well.

3
4 If you remember some of the prior
5 discussions of that project, particularly by Mr. Ben
6 VanAlen with the Forest Service, I believe that's the one
7 where part of the outlet system actually goes
8 underground. The bottom line though is they've had a lot
9 of trouble finding the fish in the system to do the
10 tagging study. So what they've come back with is a
11 proposal to basically put a weir in the system. I know
12 that all the investigators for that project are very
13 confident that that system is weirable. So that's what
14 that project is about.

15
16 The second one is the one we've talked
17 about here just recently and funded since the inception
18 of this program, which is assessment program for Klawock
19 Lake. This project was part of the 2004 monitoring plan,
20 but we only committed to a single year because there were
21 some technical and cost concerns with that project. The
22 investigators, who are the Alaska Department of Fish and
23 Game, and the Klawock Cooperative Association have
24 addressed those concerns and they've come back with an
25 investigation plan for two additional years of study.
26 The reason for that is that the matching funds for that
27 project are coming from the Southeast Sustainable Salmon
28 Resource Fund and that's how much matching funds we have
29 secured through that program. So I thought it made sense
30 to line that up with the matching funds.

31
32 I would also add for that program, in
33 addition to the matching funds we got, basically to cover
34 some staffing costs for that project, we also got what
35 I'd call a capital construction budget for that project
36 to improve the weir and those improvements were done this
37 last year. From everything that I have seen and been
38 told, I think those capital improvements really helped
39 that weir a tremendous amount.

40
41 One of the things that really caught my
42 attention was when they put the weir in and started
43 counting fish this past year and 2005, the first thing
44 they noticed was that they were getting a whole bunch of
45 dolly varden in their trap, which they had never gotten
46 before. What that told me is that that weir was, in
47 fact, fish tight as far as salmon because they were
48 stopping dollies moving up the system. So I think the
49 improvements helped a lot.

50

1 The third project is the Prince of Wales
2 steelhead project. And if you remember back to a year
3 ago we had a steelhead proposal in front of us and I
4 think by any measure the steelhead work on POW Island is
5 of immediate strategic importance for what is going on
6 here in both the regulatory and the management forums.
7 We did not recommend funding last year's proposal because
8 there were some technical and cost concerns with that
9 project. At the recommendation of the TRC they did not
10 recommend funding that last year because of those
11 concerns. What has happened in the ensuing years is we
12 didn't fund the study last year, but we did work with the
13 investigators. I would say that the investigators really
14 took those concerns to heart. In fact, they went beyond
15 what I thought they would do.

16
17 The Forest Service stepped up and funded
18 a pilot study this past year completely outside of the
19 monitoring program. They did some work on Twelvemile
20 Creek on POW Island. They addressed and looked at some
21 of the questions that we were raising about whether
22 tagging was appropriate, how long was the migratory time,
23 those kinds of things. They learned a tremendous amount
24 about how to try to effectively assess steelhead in these
25 systems. Based on their experience on that pilot study,
26 they revised their program and they've come back with
27 this investigation plan. I would say, and I know the TRC
28 would say, that they have very fully addressed every
29 concern and every question we had from a year ago.

30
31 The other thing I would add about the POW
32 steelhead project is that just here at this meeting I
33 think the partnership and capacity building aspect of
34 that program has been enhanced. What I mean by that is
35 in the investigation plan and the executive summary
36 that's in your book. What you'll see in there is that
37 the tribal partner for that project is the Organized
38 Village of Kasaan and they are still a co-investigator
39 for this project. But the Hydaburg Cooperative
40 Association has expressed a lot of interest in being a
41 part of this project and the principal investigator, who
42 is Dr. Glenn Chen, who I believe is in the audience, he's
43 spoken with the leadership of Hydaburg Cooperative, who
44 is here, Tony Christianson, and they are going to be a
45 cooperator on this project.

46
47 So, for those reasons, all of those
48 projects are recommended for funding. They are all
49 strategically important, technically competent, the
50 administrative expertise of the organization is already

1 proven, we've dealt with all of them before, and they all
2 have a very strong partnership and capacity building
3 component.

4
5 Now I'm going to go to the harvest
6 monitoring TEK part of the program. If you turn the page
7 to page 172, you'll see at the top there Table 5 and the
8 two projects that are under consideration and the TRC
9 recommendation for those projects. You'll see under the
10 TRC recommendation for both projects we are not
11 recommending either of those programs for funding at this
12 time.

13
14 I'd like to go into the reason for that
15 because that's an obvious question given the strategic
16 priority of that information type and the subject matter
17 of both proposals. We looked at the strategic importance
18 of both projects and they rate very high, particularly
19 project 651, the customary trade proposal. As far as
20 subject matter, that is exactly on the mark. That's the
21 kind of information that is needed here with the Council
22 and certainly with the Federal Subsistence Board. So,
23 from a strategic importance standpoint, both projects are
24 exactly on the mark.

25
26 The place where these proposals was found
27 wanting was in the next category, the technical merit
28 part of it. When I say that, as you'll read in the
29 narrative of this, that conclusion is debatable. And the
30 reason I say that is because not everybody on the TRC saw
31 it the same. Almost all the time when you get a
32 recommendation from the TRC it is a unanimous
33 recommendation. In this particular case it was not.
34 Most of the TRC had some significant questions about the
35 technical merit of the project. Those questions revolved
36 around largely study design. In other words, how was the
37 sampling going to proceed, what was the sampling design.
38 Basically what was planned for that project, some of the
39 real important details of the methodology and study
40 design.

41
42 Most of the TRC had those questions.
43 Some of the TRC, however, read the same investigation
44 plan and basically said, yeah, there are some questions
45 but they're relatively minor, so they did not have the
46 same level of concern with the technical merit of that
47 project. So that is why there's a split, if you will,
48 and that's why I say that conclusion of what I said about
49 the technical merit of it is, by definition, debatable
50 and arguable because people on the TRC saw it

1 differently.

2

3

4 The majority of the TRC, however, said
5 the technical issues associated with that project are of
6 sufficient enough magnitude that their recommendation was
7 to fund the three SST projects, not fund either of these
8 projects at this time. However, they followed that up by
9 recommending that the subject matter, particularly of
10 project 651, be highlighted in the upcoming 2006 call for
11 proposals and that will happen in November. And then
12 work with these investigators or perhaps any other
13 investigators that submit proposals on that subject
14 matter so that this time next year we can come back with
15 an investigation plan about customary trade that the
16 entire TRC recommends for funding.

16

17

18 I guess the analogy that I would draw on
19 that, I think we're exactly at the same place with these
20 projects that we were one year ago with the steelhead
21 project. Where, from a strategic standpoint, there's no
22 question that we want proposals and studies that address
23 that subject matter, but we need to do some additional
24 work on the investigation plan so we can get a very good,
25 sound, tight investigation plan and then recommend that
26 for funding in the ensuing year.

26

27

28 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my
29 presentation and remarks and I'd be happy to answer any
30 questions.

30

31

32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I have a couple of
33 questions for you. Could you summarize and maybe pick
34 one of the charts so we can write down what that total
35 project cost. And then on the last sentence on page 173,
36 and if you look back in the graphs you can see that also,
37 we're basically giving up \$43,000 to Southcentral. This
38 Council has gone on record before that we didn't want to
39 give any money to interregional. We are at a funding
40 shortfall here. We know that. So I think you need to
41 clarify what we are giving \$43,000 to Southcentral for.

41

42

43 MR. MCBRIDE: Certainly. Mr. Chairman,
44 probably the best place to look at total project costs
45 are Tables 4 and 5. For instance, if you go to Table 4,
46 I'll take the first one again, Kook Lake, the total
47 project cost in 2005 is 78.6 and then you can read across
48 year by year. What drives our decisions, when I say
49 available funding, I'm looking at the year 2005, so
50 that's the key figure. Even though that's a three-year
51 project, when I'm talking about available funding, what

1 I'm really looking at is that 2005 number. That is the
2 total project cost. It has no matching funds associated
3 with that figure right there.

4
5 For instance, for Kook Lake, that's 78.6.
6 If you turn to prior tables, you can see that Kook Lake,
7 that 78.6, nearly \$50,000 is going to an Alaska Native
8 organization, 3,600 is going to the State and 25.1 is
9 going to the USDA Forest Service in this case. That's
10 how that money would be split up. By the same token,
11 32,000 of that, if you go down to Table 3, is actually
12 funding local hire for that project. In this case, that
13 would be through Angoon Cooperative Association. So
14 that's how those tables all interact.

15
16 Mr. Chairman, specifically in answer to
17 your question, the total dollar amount for each project
18 is on Table 4 for the SST projects and if you turn the
19 page to 172, Table 5, total dollar amount for the two
20 HM/TEK projects are in that table.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm still unclear
23 where Table 3 comes into this. Let's just stay on Kook
24 Lake. We have 32,000 for local hire, 20,000 for
25 matching. Is that in addition to or part of the 78.6? I
26 want the total dollar for the project.

27
28 MR. MCBRIDE: The total dollar for the
29 project is 78.6. That's the total cost to this program.
30 The local hire component is part of that 78.6. In other
31 words, those three investigators would be making hires of
32 rural residents to conduct that project. In this
33 particular case, most if not all of that local hiring, is
34 being done by Angoon Cooperative Association and that's
35 what that 32,000 is. So, of the 49.9 in Table 2 that's
36 going to Angoon Cooperative, probably 32,000 of that is
37 going for local hire. So that's all part of the project
38 cost to this program.

39
40 The matching funds, the \$20,000, if I
41 remember that project correctly, that is the staffing
42 cost that is being borne by the Forest Service above and
43 beyond anything they're asking from us. That matching
44 column is additional money being brought to the table by
45 the people proposing the project and it's a total cost to
46 the project, but it's not a cost to us.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think I have it
49 then. In other words, if we were to look at Table 4, the
50 total cost of Kook Lake is 78.6 plus Table 3, 20,000, is

1 that correct?

2

3 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, that is
4 correct. And 78.6 is what would be borne by us.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. And then if
7 we're looking at POW steelhead, we have 127.7 plus 231.2,
8 is that correct?

9

10 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, that is
11 correct.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, that's fine.
14 Maybe the last question I had.

15

16 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, in terms of
17 the second question and the interaction between Southeast
18 and Southcentral Alaska, that's why I highlighted upfront
19 one of the real administrative hard points, if you will,
20 of this program. The money that comes through the Forest
21 Service on the DOA side has to be spent on Forest Service
22 lands. So, by definition, that's going to be Southeast
23 and Southcentral Alaska.

24

25 The way we view the target dollar amounts
26 that I talked about earlier is we view them as soft
27 targets. They're a starting point for the level of
28 program that we're trying to achieve in a particular
29 region. Those dollar figures I think are pretty
30 reflective of the level of issues, if you will, or the
31 information needs of that particular region.

32

33 In other words, if you go back to Table 1
34 on page 163, what you'll see is that Southeast Alaska
35 gets nearly 20 percent of the entire program. What
36 that's reflective of are the level of issues in Southeast
37 Alaska. For instance, roughly 40 to 50 percent of the
38 regulatory load statewide happens here right in Southeast
39 Alaska. It's certainly on par with the amount of money
40 that goes to other really high profile, if you will,
41 regions like the Yukon River.

42

43 But particularly in a moderate or low
44 money year, which this is, what we've got available for
45 new projects in 2005 is about \$2.1 million statewide,
46 about \$700,000 of Forest Service money that can be spent
47 between Southeast and Southcentral. Our ability to hit
48 those target dollar amounts on the head is very
49 difficult. The reason for that is there's a very finite
50 amount of money and we work with the investigators to

1 bring to all the Councils and the public the best budgets
2 that we can, but when it's all said and done, we've got
3 what we got.

4
5 For Southcentral Alaska, three projects
6 are being recommended for funding. They all address the
7 Copper River salmon, which is the 800-pound gorilla, if
8 you will, for Southcentral. In total, those three
9 projects fund a little bit more, whatever it is, 40 or 50
10 thousand dollars more than the target dollar amount for
11 that region.

12
13 So when we look at the recommendations
14 for Southeast and Southcentral, there is some ability to
15 slide Forest Service funds across those two regions
16 because of the presence of both the Forest in those
17 regions. When it was all said and done, the Southeast
18 dollar amount came in marginally below the target funds
19 for Southeast and the total dollars for Southcentral came
20 in marginally above their target dollar amount.

21
22 At this point, Mr. Chairman, that's the
23 best we can do. Our ability to hit those target dollar
24 amounts is much greater in the large money years because
25 there's more money available and it's much easier for us
26 to do that.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I still don't
29 think you answered my question, but I'd like the other
30 Council questions first. Any questions. No one has any
31 questions on the FIS program? Mr. Kookesh.

32
33 MR. KOOKESH: I have a question on your
34 strategic priorities on Page 162. I notice that on
35 reading on page 166 it says on the first paragraph for
36 the Southeast Region the Council recommends projects that
37 address, in order of priority. The TRC, do they follow
38 that format that we lay out or does the TRC follow it
39 based on the strategic priority that's laid out on page
40 162?

41
42 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kookesh.
43 The TRC looks at both. If you go to what was laid out on
44 page 166, specific to Southeast Alaska, they clearly look
45 at that. I mean they were quite cognizant of the fact
46 that TEK studies were identified as the top priority for
47 the region, yet they didn't recommend either of the TEK
48 studies that were on the table for funding this year. So
49 they are clearly looking at this.

50

1 In addition to that, what we asked the
2 investigators to do is to address the general concept of
3 strategic priority and those are defined on page 162.
4 Kook Lake is a good example. Is there a conservation
5 mandate? Well, yes, there is. We're concerned about the
6 number of sockeyes that go into Kook Lake. The
7 investigators made that case in their investigation plan
8 and it clearly addressed that. And you can look at those
9 other bulleted criteria on page 162. That's how the TRC
10 evaluates strategic priority.

11
12 I guess to summarize, they look at what's
13 laid out on page 166, which is done through the Council,
14 as a specific subject matter. In addition to that,
15 they're looking at these things. We get multiple sockeye
16 projects, so you have to be able to discern between those
17 projects and that's how they do it, is they look at those
18 criteria. All that is used to evaluate strategic
19 priority.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead, follow
22 up.

23
24 MR. KOOKESH: And then my next question
25 is, if you go to page 171, it shows what the TRC
26 Committee recommends and it recommends -- just following
27 based on page 166, the last sentence in the first
28 paragraph, and what it does is it kind of reverses
29 steelhead and sockeyes. Is this standard stuff?

30
31 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kookesh.
32 I probably should have covered that when I was going
33 through the whole thing. What you're looking at are the
34 three SST projects in recommended order of priority on
35 page 171. What the TRC is doing there is they're looking
36 at all evaluation criteria. They're looking at strategic
37 importance, technical merit, partnership and capacity
38 building, administrative expertise. They're taking the
39 whole thing and they're then at that point subjectively
40 saying, okay, if the funding amount changes, how would we
41 either add or subtract projects within this region. So
42 they put them in order of priority.

43
44 Let's just say for the sake of argument
45 we had five SST projects on the table instead of three.
46 They would put them in order of priority and then they
47 would draw the line at however much money was available.
48 If more money became available or if you wanted to
49 evaluate the relative merits of an SST project versus an
50 HM/TEK project within that region, what they would do is

1 use that order of priority to say, okay, here's the next
2 most important project say in the SST category. How does
3 that rank against the lowest priority project on the
4 HM/TEK side. That's why they do that.
5

6 When they're put in order of priority, at
7 least recommended order of priority, it's done looking at
8 all four evaluation criteria. Basically what they're
9 saying is that if we were going to consider funding say
10 an HM/TEK project, what would fall off the table on the
11 SST side because something would have to fall. There
12 isn't enough money to just add another project. The
13 TRC's recommendation would be to not fund the Kook Lake
14 project if that became the recommendation that ultimately
15 went to the Board. Of the three, they found that the
16 third priority.
17

18 I mean that's obviously arguable. It's a
19 subjective discussion or subjective assessment, but it's
20 trying to look at all four of those evaluation criteria.
21

22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I remember when we
23 came up with these original four that are shown on page
24 166, and also they added one, number four, when we added
25 steelhead and hooligans. It's probably time for the
26 Southeast Council to either reaffirm that, change that or
27 do whatever it is. They should be reviewing what the
28 strategic planning is and let you know because clearly
29 you haven't followed what we told you in the past. In
30 other words here, on this one, we recommended TEK to be
31 the highest and you've put a steelhead project, which is
32 the lowest, above a sockeye project. So we're not
33 following it. Maybe we're not being clear what we want
34 because this may or may not be where we want to be, this
35 Council. So we need to do that. I don't want to do it
36 at this meeting. We just can't develop that strategic
37 planning, but we're going to have to have some input,
38 maybe a subcommittee or something like that to work with
39 you and then we can kind of hash this around at the next
40 meeting. But we need some direction there.
41

42 As far as I'm concerned, this is still
43 the will of the Council right here on page 166. That's
44 the last action that we took action on. It may not be
45 true now, but that's why I want to get it reviewed, but
46 that's the will of the Council at this time. If you could
47 explain the process. We've done this before. We've
48 taken things that you recommended to us, particularly in
49 the first year, and just changed everything. I mean we
50 didn't hardly agree with anything that you particularly

1 recommended that year. I do commend the FIS program for
2 responding to us. We've been really good and the
3 capacity building has been excellent. You've responded
4 to our strategic goals, but I don't know if they're
5 completely accurate anymore.

6
7 Would you explain to the Council if we
8 don't like this and we don't want to put -- say we wanted
9 to get rid of something and we don't want to get rid of
10 Kook Lake, maybe we want to get rid of steelhead, how
11 does this Council interact to make that happen?

12
13 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. Okay, I'll
14 certainly try to address those questions. First of all,
15 let me just say when you look at the information on 166,
16 the four strategic priorities in order of priority, I
17 don't think there was any -- there's certainly no
18 question on my part or I don't think any question on any
19 member of the TRC's part in terms of what that
20 information meant. I mean they understand order of
21 priority.

22
23 But what this relates to is the
24 evaluation criterion of strategic priority. I mean they
25 clearly get and I clearly get that a TEK project in
26 general is more important than a sockeye stock assessment
27 project which, in general, is more important than a
28 steelhead project or a eulachon project. There's no
29 question about that. So in terms of strategic priority,
30 that is crystal clear.

31
32 In addition to the strategic priority,
33 what the TRC looks at are the other evaluation criteria.
34 They look at technical and scientific merit, they look at
35 administrative expertise and they look at partnership
36 capacity building. All of that goes into the final
37 recommendation for what to fund and what not to fund.

38
39 In this particular case, the study design
40 of the two HM/TEK projects was highly debatable on the
41 TRC. In fact, most of the TRC found some significant
42 questions with the technical and scientific merit of
43 those two projects. For that reason, they didn't
44 recommend them for funding. I think the trap to be aware
45 of here is we certainly don't want to be in a situation
46 where you take a study that has some concerns, either
47 it's poor capacity building or it has poor scientific
48 merit or maybe the investigator has a really poor track
49 record administratively. Just because they propose
50 something of high strategic importance, we automatically

1 go ahead and fund it. I think that would be a really bad
2 trap to fall in.

3

4 I guess to summarize, I don't think
5 there's anybody on the TRC that doesn't fully understand
6 the order of priority of these projects. The reason why
7 you're seeing a steelhead study ahead of a sockeye study
8 and all of those SST studies ahead of all the HM/TEK
9 studies in this year is because of the other evaluation
10 criteria.

11

12 Mr. Chairman, in answer to your other
13 question about how to update and change this, maybe I'll
14 just really briefly talk about strategic planning for the
15 monitoring program, which I was originally going to cover
16 at the very end of all this. There's just a real brief
17 written one-page summary at the end of this on page 194.

18

19

20 One of the things that we have recognized
21 in OSM is that we need to go through a rigorous strategic
22 planning process for each region. Clearly, what's
23 happening is the total amount of money is remaining
24 static, which basically means it's going down and I say
25 that because there's inflation. So the cost of doing
26 business next year will, in general, be higher than the
27 cost of doing business this year.

28

29

30 As the money becomes tighter, what we
31 need to do is really concentrate on keeping this program
32 focused on the highest priorities. So what we have
33 initiated is a strategic planning process and our plan is
34 to do this on a regional basis and we started that this
35 past year. In fact, the very first reason we started
36 doing it was Southcentral Alaska.

36

37

38 In a nutshell, what we did was FIS held a
39 workshop, we coalesced a work group of what I would call
40 regional professionals that included two Council members.
41 We explicitly asked for two from the Southcentral
42 Council. Basically what we did was identified research
43 goals, objectives and information needs for Federal
44 subsistence management within that region and then
45 prioritized those. We wrote that up into a draft
46 document and that document -- in fact, I'm going to be
47 presenting that to the Southcentral Council in two weeks.
48 That's going to get publicly reviewed through the Council
49 and then we're going to use that to update and refine
50 strategic priorities for that region.

50

1 So one of the things that we're going to
2 want to be doing in the next year or two, and I strongly
3 suspect it's going to happen this coming year here in
4 Southeast, is to go through that exact same process for
5 Southeast Alaska. What I'll probably be doing when we
6 meet again is, if we're going to pull that workshop
7 together for Southeast, I'll be coming to the Council and
8 asking for two Council participants for that work group.
9 I think that's a very explicit mechanism to do I think
10 exactly what you're talking about doing, Mr. Chairman

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

13

14 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
15 thank you, Mr. McBride. I think it's a very good report.
16 I understand your evaluation method versus our priority
17 method and the two aren't always going to meet.

18

19 I do have a couple questions since, of
20 course, we don't have enough money to fund everything we
21 need. You're quite aware that I certainly do favor TEK
22 and harvest monitoring projects, so it's difficult to
23 accept the recommendation of not supporting those final
24 two, but I do have questions with them.

25

26 In comparing on page 169, Table 3, where
27 it shows local hire, the stock status and trends project
28 certainly demonstrate to me that they have local hire,
29 which, to me, equates to capacity building. I mean
30 that's my version of capacity building. You did add
31 numbers for the harvest monitoring, but those numbers
32 seem fairly low to me compared to the total budget. The
33 other thing I couldn't find in the summary of the harvest
34 monitoring TEK projects was what was the involvement from
35 the tribes for those four communities. Did they say,
36 yes, we want to be involved with this project and we'll
37 include it as part of our ongoing community or tribal
38 efforts? Are you aware of that?

39

40 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Garza.
41 If I remember correctly, the harvest monitoring TEK
42 projects have an Alaska Native organization. I believe
43 it's the Tlingit Haida Central Council. If I remember
44 that investigation plan correctly, they were going to go
45 to the communities that were being studied and then
46 attempt to hire locally interviewers. They did not say
47 they were going to work with Hoonah Indian Association or
48 anything like that. I suspect they were going to be
49 hired through the Central Council. That's the most
50 complete answer I can give you on that right now.

1 DR. GARZA: Okay. It doesn't really
2 matter to me who they're hired through but whether or not
3 Hoonah Indian Association or Kake Tribal or Angoon or
4 Hydaburg were contacted and said, oh, yeah, we think
5 that's a great idea, we'd like to have that done in our
6 communities. That's a logical step in looking at those
7 four communities. It's not indicated in here that it's
8 been done, so, to me, that's an important question to
9 ask.

10
11 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. Dr. Garza.
12 I don't have any other information in addition to that.
13 I don't remember explicitly the investigation plans.
14 That doesn't mean my memory is perfect though. I
15 certainly don't remember explicitly that those
16 organizations -- I mean they're certainly not on as
17 co-investigators. I'll put it that way.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We might ask them.
20 Other Council. Mr. Jordan.

21
22 MR. JORDAN: I was looking at your
23 strategic planning update and I've also been looking for
24 several years through the Federal subsistence proposal
25 books. I notice Southeast usually has a vast majority of
26 proposals and seems to be often referred to as a model
27 for some of the rest of the state and yet I see here
28 we're either the last group or next to the last group to
29 receive help in strategic planning. I wonder how that
30 priority was set.

31
32 Also, in a previous life, I used to work
33 as a planner, actually prepared comprehensive plan for
34 the region. As a result of that, I've been involved in
35 the school district and other groups working on strategic
36 plans. My experience with strategic planning is that you
37 want it to be as inclusive as possible.

38
39 It would be my opinion, and I want to ask
40 you, if you were going to do strategic planning with the
41 Southeast Regional Advisory Council, you would want to
42 involve all the Council and the Staff to try and do
43 strategic planning. With two people from the Council and
44 some of the Staff would appear to me to not be inclusive.
45 Anyway, I can't imagine strategic planning with just part
46 of your group. How do you see that?

47
48 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Jordan.
49 Let me first address how we selected regions. We just
50 started this process just this last year. We held two

1 workshops, one for Southcentral, one for Bristol Bay.
2 One was done in April, one was done in May. We had draft
3 reports. They're going in front of the Council. So we
4 are very early in this process. I strongly suspect that
5 Southeast will be in the upcoming year. I don't think
6 you're going to be dead last at all.

7
8 In terms of how we conducted business,
9 there are quite a few models on how to do strategic
10 planning and I'm not a professional planner, but I
11 certainly helped and looked at different models for doing
12 it. What we selected to do was hold a workshop and form
13 a work group and we also brought in a professional
14 facilitator/planner, Dr. Peggy Merritt. She does this
15 for a living. What she very strongly recommended was
16 that when we build the work group, in her recommendation,
17 she said to try to hold it to no more than 15 people.
18 That wasn't just a hunch on her part. They've actually
19 done a lot of looking at how many people do you have to
20 have to get the diversity of what you're looking for.
21 Basically what they have found is that if you have a work
22 group of up to 15, you represent the diversity and
23 logistically you keep it a manageable number. For the
24 sake of discussion, having a work group of 50 people
25 wouldn't be particularly helpful or would be hard to work
26 with.

27
28 At any rate, what we did for
29 Southcentral, I think our work group was about 17 or 18
30 and what we've recognized in the strategic planning is
31 that clearly we need to work with and involve the
32 Council, so it was a subjective decision on our part.
33 What we asked the Southcentral Council to do was provide
34 two of the 15 seats for that work group so that we had
35 direct Council participation, recognizing that once the
36 workshop was done and we wrote up the product, that that
37 would then be brought to the full Council for their
38 review and recommendation. So we were going to get that
39 input on the part of the full Council. Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan.

42
43 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I think I've
44 been really educated here. I've been involved in
45 strategic planning and actually given the opportunity to
46 facilitate a number of groups. I think your facilitator
47 is right. Fifteen or so is a real ideal number.

48
49 I think in Southeast what we ought to do
50 is have the 13 Council members and invite two Federal

1 Staff and let the Federal Staff figure out who they send.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Let's just
4 remember we're talking two different strategic plans
5 here. We're talking the strategic plan for the region,
6 which OSM is talking about giving us where it's going to
7 involve everybody. And we're talking about the strategic
8 plan of what this Council thinks is a priority, not what
9 Staff thinks. I'm talking about what this Council has
10 given directions to Staff. That's what we do. Every
11 Council member will have input on that. But we're
12 talking two different things here. We're going to tell
13 them what we want, not them tell us what we want.
14 There's two different strategic plans here, is that
15 correct? In other words, that's the way I look at it. We
16 have our strategic goals and priorities. OSM has
17 strategic priorities and they could be two different
18 things.

19

20 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, they
21 certainly could be two different things. I guess it
22 would certainly be my hope that there aren't multiple and
23 conflicting strategic plans for a region. The path we're
24 going down in the Bristol Bay and Southcentral Regions is
25 to try to do a more rigorous job, if you will, in terms
26 of identifying strategic priorities by bringing in
27 agencies, organizations and the Regional Council to look
28 at all that and come up with a plan. We've produced a
29 very professional document that's going to get reviewed
30 publicly through the Southcentral Council.

31

32 We're trying this on for size, so we want
33 to get all the way through the process before we go
34 elsewhere and the process, as we've identified it, for
35 Southcentral for instance, will culminate basically by
36 November or December. What I'm hoping is to bring back
37 to you the full experience of Southcentral. I guess all
38 I can tell you is so far I think it's worked quite well
39 in the Southcentral Region. The Council members I've
40 spoken with seem pretty pleased with it.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We've gone
43 quite a ways from where we should have been. I don't
44 want to exclude any Councilman from any talk on strategic
45 planning and goals and objectives of this Council and we
46 won't. If we have to have another meeting like we had on
47 June 1st and notice that, that's the only way we can
48 discuss things, is to have a noticed meeting, we will
49 call another noticed meeting and we will discuss what our
50 goals and objectives are as a Council so that you're

1 clear with what we think.

2

3 I fully agree, you're going to go far
4 away from where we go. You know, the conservation
5 mandate, allocations, all these other points that you
6 guys will touch, that's not what this Council is probably
7 going to tell you. They're going to tell you TEK 1
8 sockeye or something like that. If we have to do this in
9 a teleconference, we'll get there.

10

11 So I want to go on with this here so we
12 can get to some of the presenters. Does any other
13 Council have questions.

14

15 MR. MCBRIDE: Okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, the Council
18 is going to have to do a couple things here. One, we're
19 going to have to either bless what they said or we're
20 going to have to do something different. For history, we
21 certainly have done something different. Since I've been
22 on here we've changed these quite a bit. We have also
23 worked with investigators. I want to ask the Council
24 what they'd like to do. We can either vote these
25 straight up and down or you can hear from proponents.
26 Dr. Garza.

27

28 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I
29 did have one more question for Mr. McBride. In the past,
30 when we've looked at these proposals, and especially
31 because they've become sort of allocation of funding
32 issues, demand being greater than supply, one of the
33 things you've provided in the past is how would it affect
34 future funding.

35

36 One of my greatest interests right now is
37 that through our project that we funded last year with
38 Sitka Tribe we have four, five or six tribes with us that
39 are learning the process of how to apply for grants and I
40 am hopeful that they will just flood us with grants,
41 which will keep you busy, but will give us an opportunity
42 to find out what their priorities are. So I would be
43 quite concerned if we fully funded the projects for the
44 next three years that we would have limited funding
45 starting next year for possible grants to the tribes in
46 terms of their TEK or harvest monitoring or the SST.
47 Thank you.

48

49 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. Dr. Garza.
50 Yeah, that is a very real concern that we're aware of.

1 Realistically, the way this program works, the first full
2 year of funding really was 2001. The program started in
3 2000 with some start-up funds. The first real year of
4 funding was in 2001.

5
6 The original vision of the program was to
7 try to hold a third of the money available every year so
8 you had an equal amount of money every year, but that's
9 proven basically impossible to do. So, really, what's
10 happened is starting in 2001 we allocated all the money
11 we had. A lot, but not all of those projects are either
12 two or three-year projects, so money becomes available in
13 2002 and 2003. By 2004 all of those 2001 obligations
14 expired. So basically what we've had is a case where
15 basically every three years you have what we call a big
16 money year and then the other two years become
17 progressively smaller.

18
19 That can be both good and bad. I mean,
20 obviously, if what you're trying to do is have a constant
21 amount of money available every year, it's not
22 particularly good. In my opinion, it's actually worked
23 out quite well and the reason that I say that is every
24 three years what it gives everyone the opportunity to do,
25 the Councils, Staff, the Board, is the opportunity to
26 stand back and say, okay, almost all of the obligations
27 have expired. What's really important and what do we
28 want to launch over the next three years. We do that and
29 then in the ensuing two years you have less money but
30 you're really making your important strategic decisions
31 in 2001 and 2004. That's, in my view, what we did last
32 year.

33
34 Now, for next year, we're anticipating
35 very little money available statewide. Probably on the
36 order of half to three-quarters of a million dollars. To
37 address that concern, the TRC majority recommendation is
38 to fund what we've recommended to fund, the three SST
39 projects, but to highlight as a strategic priority
40 customary trade, which certainly could and should be
41 addressed through the HM/TEK project for 2006. The
42 reason we're saying that is, if you look at that amount
43 of money statewide with everything on the table as far as
44 strategic priorities in all regions, it's a pittance,
45 it's not that much money. But if you focus that money on
46 selected subject matter, like customary trade, then it
47 becomes a significant amount of money.

48
49 So that is part of the TRC
50 recommendation, is for the Council to go back to your

1 list on page 166 and help us focus what's important for
2 Southeast Alaska and the majority TRC recommendation is
3 to very much highlight specifically customary trade. Mr.
4 Chairman.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Follow up, Dr.
7 Garza.

8
9 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10 Thank you, Mr. McBride. On page 170, Table 4, we have a
11 list of the funding requests.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's what we'll
14 vote on.

15
16 DR. GARZA: I know, but I have questions
17 on it. So we have the total amount, 370, 384, 238, for
18 the next three years. So you're saying that in 2005
19 there would be half a million statewide or 2006? And
20 then how does that roll into 2007?

21
22 MR. MCBRIDE: When I say the next year,
23 what I'm talking about would be 2006. What's under
24 consideration now are projects that would start in 2005.
25 That's what's in this book. 2006 will be a very low
26 money year and that's what we're recommending to the
27 Southeast Council, is to highlight customary trade as the
28 only subject matter that we're taking proposals on for
29 2006. There's a very limited amount of money, but we can
30 get much more bang for that buck if we focus what we're
31 looking for.

32
33 In 2007, all of those '04 funding
34 commitments will be done. So even though there will be
35 some funding commitments, the vast majority of the
36 available money will be available in 2007 because all
37 those '04 funding commitments that we did last year will
38 be expired. At that point, it would be a big money year
39 and the opportunity to really steer the ship, if you
40 will, in terms of what's funded.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Follow up.

43
44 DR. GARZA: No, I lost it.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, I have a
47 comment here. You've never come to us and told us we got
48 more money, folks. I hope that lesson is not falling on
49 deaf ears out here. We have a lot of members of the
50 public and tribal councils here that can help themselves

1 here in these outgoing years by making sure that this
2 program is fully funded. Mr. McBride is an employee and
3 we're advisors. We can't be telling anybody, anybody to
4 get more money for us, but others could. So I hope that
5 lesson is being learned. We would love to fund all of
6 these.

7
8 You can see the fight within the TRC
9 themselves. They have to take this choice because
10 there's no money. We're going to have to take the choice
11 up here and make some selections too because there's no
12 money. So this would make it a lot easier on us if we
13 had enough money to fully fund what we're doing because
14 clearly we don't have enough money to fund our good
15 projects and we should be funding more of these.

16
17 The reason we got into jams, we were
18 funding three-year sockeye projects and everybody knows
19 three years is not a sockeye life. You're only getting
20 half the information. So there's a reason why this money
21 is all disappearing that we thought we'd have after three
22 years is because we're trying to learn enough information
23 about these stock status to make an informed decision.
24 We need more money. Any other Council.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The Council needs
29 to decide what they'd like to do. Table 4, if you look
30 on page 170, those are the recommendations from Mr.
31 McBride and the TRC to fund. If you look at Table 5,
32 those are the recommendations what not to fund. So you
33 can either accept that somewhere in between or you can
34 hear from the investigators. We need to get moving on
35 this. Mr. Jordan.

36
37 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I think we ought
38 to consider them one by one. The reason I suggest that
39 is because people may favor one project, but not another,
40 so if you look at them one at a time then we can decide
41 on the merit of that project. Just starting on Table 4
42 with the first one, which is number 05-601, the Kook Lake
43 sockeye salmon assessment, which has been recommended for
44 funding by the TRC, I recommend that we fund that at the
45 suggested level of 78.6 for 2005, 79.6 for 2006 and 81.6
46 for 2007 if that's appropriate to suggest funding for
47 multiple years. If just for one year, then I'll leave it
48 at that.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'll just note for

1 the record that's exactly opposite of the priority
2 recommended by the TRC. The TRC recommended that Kook
3 Lake was number three. If you look on page 171, those
4 are the recommendations of the TRC. If that's what you'd
5 like to do, I don't have any problem with it. We still
6 need a second. Mr. Kookesh.

7
8 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman, I thought I
9 heard you say we could go any direction we wanted to go
10 and understand that Mr. Jordan was going in the direction
11 he felt we should go.

12
13 Also, I don't know what year it was that
14 we put our TEK and our harvest monitoring and our salmon
15 assessment and our steelhead priority list together, but
16 I have to tell you that from listening earlier to the
17 gentleman from Kake and from my experience, I believe we
18 have a valid concern for sockeyes.

19
20 To tell you the truth, I never believed
21 that TEK was important in terms of a priority because I
22 felt that yesterday's knowledge can be eventually
23 documented, but saving the resource today, to me, that is
24 the most important. But just hearing your earlier
25 statement that we could go whatever way we wanted to go
26 and based on what Mr. McBride told me, I felt that the
27 recommendations or the guidelines that the TRC was
28 following, I think they're right on.

29
30 I don't believe, even though we set these
31 priorities before, it should be about us winning or our
32 pride. I think this should be about taking care of that
33 resource. I don't know who doesn't have priority for
34 sockeye because I only know from my experience in my own
35 community. I can't exactly speak for every community
36 because I only live in one, but I would say this that
37 sockeye is a big thing in our community.

38
39 We're at odds now with Kanalku. I'd like
40 to hear where Kanalku is. I know that it's not doing
41 very good, which is my own back yard, and I'm probably
42 part of the blame. I'm not going to deny that. But we
43 also have other resources that are available to us. Like
44 I said, we did listen to the gentleman from Kake and we
45 do have problems here with sockeye and I'd like to
46 believe at some point we should set our priorities again.

47
48 I've always been of the opinion that if we're going to
49 deal with TEK, we should just spend all our money on TEK
50 right now and get that out of the way and get down to

1 doing some sound management of the fisheries and get on
2 the program and start doing our job the way we're
3 supposed to.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: For the record, I
6 don't believe I ever told Mr. Jordan he could not go that
7 way. I said I just want to bring to your attention
8 what's shown on page 171 that you're taking the opposite
9 tack of the TRC and if you're aware of that, charge on.
10 Mr. Douville.

11
12 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 I just want to make a comment. It's been thoroughly
14 discussed and pointed out. However, I feel the TEK
15 projects are very important for one reason. A lot of the
16 documentation for that is going away, meaning the old-
17 timers. I feel that it has a higher priority than how
18 many steelhead are in Twelvemile. It isn't going to make
19 a difference to anybody's opinion that's in opposition to
20 the subsistence steelhead fishery. I have not discussed
21 the proposal in great detail or looked at it. If there's
22 some shortcomings in it, it probably could be fixed. In
23 my opinion, TEK is a priority. Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

26
27 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
28 guess I have a concern going from the first proposal in
29 the packet to the last proposal and deciding yeah or nay
30 because we have limited funds and then the last proposal
31 just won't get anything. So I think we need to have the
32 five on the board so we can see them and figure out what
33 we want to do. I certainly don't think it's our
34 obligation to vote exactly as was presented to us, but I
35 understand the technical review is important. As Mr.
36 Douville pointed out, I think that the TEK is incredibly
37 important. In Craig, we lost the only Kaigani Haida
38 chief that we have and that was a wealth of knowledge
39 that just instantly disappeared. Had we interviewed him
40 last year, we would have much more knowledge than we do
41 now.

42
43 But I do have concerns with that proposal
44 as well and I wasn't sure, Mr. Chairman, if we had the
45 opportunity to bring any of the people forward. I see
46 several of the faces that belong to some of these
47 proposals. If we have questions specific to the
48 proposal, if we can ask them or if we're just looking at
49 what information is provided in front of us. Thank you.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: No, my
2 recommendation would be as you discuss each one of them,
3 say we're talking about Kook Lake, if there's anybody
4 here that would like to speak for that program, I would
5 recommend that they come forward and do that at that
6 time. Let's take them up as we vote them. When we bring
7 them on the floor, they can come up and either speak for
8 their program or not. Unless there's someone who wants
9 to speak to just the program or something, they can do
10 that at any time.

11
12 We can address these any way you want.
13 There's no bottom, there's no top. Let's get this
14 straight. We don't have to do what the TRC recommends,
15 so you can go from the bottom up. I would recommend we
16 take a five minute at ease and you guys can figure out
17 how you would like to do that.

18
19 (Off record)

20
21 (On record)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting will
24 come back to order, please. What we're going to do here
25 is we have some proponents here specifically of the TEK
26 projects, Tlingit and Haida. What I'd like to do is give
27 them a few minutes to make their speel. We have a 3:00
28 o'clock deadline. We're supposed to go into WIS. We're
29 not going to have time to debate the recommendation for
30 funding until after the special order. I have some
31 requests from other tribes to do that but I'm not going
32 to take them at this time. We will come back to this
33 immediately after we finish the WIS 3:00 p.m. wildlife
34 proposal.

35
36 MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
37 My name is Gordon Jackson. I am the manager of business
38 and economic development for Tlingit and Haida Central
39 Council. With me is Steve Langdon, our principal person
40 that's going to be working on these projects.

41
42 Just a word about the projects. We
43 provide Staff support to the Southeast Intertribal Fish
44 and Wildlife Commission. The projects came from our
45 needs assessment and discussion on the Board. The
46 Intertribal Fish and Wildlife Commission is composed of
47 every single tribe except for about three in Southeast
48 Alaska.

49
50 One of the projects came together as a

1 discussion regarding how the boats that once fished as
2 family boats in communities are having an impact on the
3 harvest of subsistence fishing in the communities. For
4 instance, I was talking to Mike Jackson just a few
5 minutes ago, not about this project, but remembering the
6 family used to go on the family boat Seabound for seaweed
7 to Pillar Bay and things like that and the whole family
8 got on board and went and did this subsistence gathering.

9
10 The downturn in the fishing industry and
11 the selling of limited entry permits, there's been a real
12 big decline in family boats. For instance, in the
13 community of Kake they had 27 permits, limited entry
14 purse seine permits, when they first started in 1980s.
15 They now have six and the boats have diminished. In the
16 community of Angoon, they had about the same, 27, and
17 they have one large boat and one very active permit. The
18 community of Hoonah had about 54. They now have four
19 active boat permits.

20
21 How does that have an impact on the
22 harvest of subsistence? Do the folks now go on outboards
23 and fast boats and did it diminish that? And a number of
24 other questions that were asked.

25
26 The second one relates to sockeye.
27 Basically I'm going to provide information through Mr.
28 Langdon here. He is very capable, professional. He's
29 done a lot of research in Southeast Alaska and I've known
30 him for about 30 years. His son Trajan and my sons
31 played together. His son played basketball and my sons
32 played baseball. Sometimes I wonder about my sons'
33 priorities. Anyway, Steve will provide information
34 relating to the projects.

35
36 MR. LANGDON: None of the foregoing
37 conversations about sports have any bearing on our
38 discussions today.

39
40 (Laughter)

41
42 MR. LANGDON: I'd like to talk in
43 response to two items, particularly about the customary
44 trade proposal, which has been highlighted both by Mr.
45 McBride and a wide variety of parties as being a very
46 significant dimension and lack of knowledge that exists
47 in Southeastern Alaska. Having worked in villages over
48 30 years and lived in villages for over five years of my
49 life, I am attuned to a wide variety and an
50 extraordinarily complex picture that is associated with

1 this bureaucratic term called customary and traditional
2 trade. Sometimes I think because of the conflicts that
3 have grown up around this between the State and Federal
4 jurisdictions that it tends to be pushed aside and not
5 thought of as being of very great significance.

6
7 Just as a matter of personal history and
8 involvement with these issues of customary and
9 traditional trade, I was brought in on the very
10 significant and controversial case concerning the herring
11 roe on kelp trade out of Sitka a number of years ago,
12 which was a very significant court decision that found
13 under the Federal statute that that constitutes a form of
14 customary and traditional trade. I provided expert
15 testimony in support of that position.

16
17 So this is an area that is prone to a lot
18 of misunderstanding and a great deal of, from my vantage
19 point, lack of information. The purposes of the proposal
20 are to do two things and the first of all is to provide a
21 detailed characterization and description of the manner
22 in which the different products -- and this is one thing
23 that people don't understand, is the wide variety of
24 products that are produced in the context of the
25 subsistence salmon economy and how each of those products
26 has its own demand functions, production functions and
27 exchange functions. Some products are necessary for
28 particular ceremonial occasions, which I understand was a
29 matter for discussion earlier during your meetings. So
30 that's the first and primary consideration, is to do
31 that, provide an accurate description and
32 characterization by conducting the research in four
33 specific communities.

34
35 Now that reaches down to the issues that
36 were raised by Mr. McBride over the split in terms of the
37 technical review committee's evaluation of the
38 methodology. You have to have a variety of different
39 methodologies to answer different kinds of questions. So
40 when I designed a methodology to track the limited entry
41 permits and their movement out of rural hands in
42 Southeastern Alaska in 1979, that was a specific kind of
43 methodology, a methodology that has been adapted and
44 utilized over the 25 years since to understand how
45 limited entry influences communities and regions. That
46 methodology was adopted as well by the National Marine
47 Fisheries Service in terms of their reporting on the
48 manner in which IFQ quantities were once again moving
49 from communities. So that's a specific kind of
50 methodology that can provide you with certain kinds of

1 understandings.

2

3 Another kind of methodology is what I
4 would call a one-shot survey type of instrument. That is
5 where you go and interview a person with a fixed kind of
6 identification and basically you ask them to go from
7 memory and provide you answers to a number of questions.
8 In this case, for example, how much fish did you send as
9 fresh fish, did you trade, or how much did you send as
10 frozen product.

11

12 The methodology that I chose was not a
13 survey methodology and, as such, it does not meet that
14 particular standard that some institutions like to use.
15 Instead, the methodology that I chose is a detailed,
16 ongoing monitoring methodology in which we will have
17 researchers hired and they will be engaged with local
18 producers on an ongoing weekly basis throughout an
19 entire production season, basically from June until
20 December of the year.

21

22 Through face-to-face interactions and
23 weekly interactions record the kinds of products that are
24 being produced, where they're going and the circumstances
25 under which their uses are being requested, what's coming
26 back in exchange for those kinds of materials. So it
27 deals with a very precise characterization and a very
28 precise delineation and it is not a survey-type
29 methodology. It's built upon identifying primary
30 producers, one of whom is here in the room today who I'm
31 aware of from my familiarity with certain communities.

32

33 So that speaks from the vantage point of
34 the methodological disagreements, at least from my
35 vantage point, and why it is the methodology that I chose
36 to pursue differs from perhaps one that might be more
37 statistically standard.

38

39 I'd like to address Dr. Garza's question
40 about local facilitation. Indeed, through Tlingit and
41 Haida, acting as the primary conduit for contact with the
42 tribes, this is the methodology for making arrangements
43 with local communities. However, working as a co-
44 investigator, I have made informal consultations with
45 three of the tribes, Hoonah Indian Association, Organized
46 Village of Kake and Hydaburg Cooperative, have all been
47 contacted and I've discussed this with each of those
48 communities. We've not yet had the occasion to discuss
49 the project with the community of Angoon.

50

1 So what I've tried to do then is address
2 what my vision of what the need is about this particular
3 project in terms of an understanding and a
4 characterization of the variety and the complexity of
5 this issue, the specific methodologies that I chose to
6 use in order to get as clear a picture as possible and
7 identification of the contacts that have been undertaken
8 to date.

9
10 Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to answer any
11 questions.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any questions from
14 the Council. Mr. Jordan.

15
16 MR. JORDAN: It's not a question, but I
17 just wanted to advise Gordon that I saw Trajan Langdon
18 hit a home run in Sitka to go with the shutout pitching
19 performance to win a state baseball title, so your friend
20 Steve has been holding out on you on Trajan's baseball
21 abilities.

22
23 (Laughter)

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
26 other questions.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You characterized
31 the main disagreement as the methodology and the
32 deliverables. Where is the main disagreement in your
33 estimation?

34
35 MR. LANGDON: It is in the methodologies
36 with regard to the acquisition of data about customary
37 trade. By placing a researcher in the community and
38 using calendars to get ongoing information throughout
39 that cycle of production, that provides us with a far
40 greater, more precise and complete description of what's
41 going on than to utilize a household survey instrument
42 with a one-time asking people to remember what amount of
43 product is going across the entire spectrum. So that
44 constitutes what I would say was the division within the
45 TRC about the suitability.

46
47 The subsistence division people are very
48 familiar with that methodology, having used that kind of
49 approach in other communities on this question, whereas
50 it might not be so well utilized by other researchers in

1 biology. So that's what I would characterize as why that
2 split was 8 to 4 over methodology.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The other question
5 is if, in fact, the TRC was to ask you to revise that, do
6 you believe that it's possible for the two of you to come
7 to some consensus on how to adapt the methodology if they
8 did require it to be changed? In other words, are we so
9 set there that we can't change or can these be adapted?

10

11 MR. LANGDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
12 for the question. The methodologies have to be
13 complimentary. They have to work together to give the
14 best possible view. Given what Mr. McBride was saying
15 about priorities that are coming forward in the next
16 year, that certainly represents the opportunity to marry
17 different methodologies and to produce both a
18 comprehensive view as well as a numerical statistical
19 view. The approach that I wanted was to characterize as
20 precisely as possible the entirety of the range of this
21 process.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

24

25 DR. GARZA: I certainly wouldn't question
26 your methodologies. You've been a researcher for a
27 number of years. My greatest concern is in capacity
28 building. When I look at these proposals and I look at
29 capacity building, what I expect to see is the tribes
30 involved. My position is they need to be part of that
31 power, they need to be part of that database, they need
32 to be part of the process so that they can step beyond
33 this small little pot of funding and say, okay, you guys
34 are way too small, we can do bigger projects, we're
35 moving on. So when I looked at this, I did not see where
36 Hydaburg was on board, where Angoon was on board, where
37 these other guys were on board and that's very important
38 to me. When I looked at the funding, \$10,000 or local
39 hire for four communities doesn't, to me, represent
40 capacity building. So that's the sort of thing I look
41 at, although Council members certainly have other
42 priorities when they look at it. Thank you.

43

44 MR. LANGDON: Well, first of all, Mr.
45 McBride's number reporting was a little under. It's
46 probably on the order of \$15,000 as opposed to what he
47 said. Certainly I think that Gordon and myself
48 recognized the importance of that and would be responsive
49 to moving in that direction as part of a revised proposal
50 or project should that be the desires of the Board.

1 MR. JACKSON: That's correct.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
4 We're going to go over a minute or two if we need to. We
5 have a special order, but let's just get this done here.
6 Mr. Douville, did you have a question?
7
8 MR. DOUVILLE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I
9 have a question for Mr. Langdon. From what you said,
10 you're not really focused on any past customary trade,
11 you're looking more at what's happening in modern day.
12
13 MR. LANGDON: Well, certainly the past
14 will be part of it as well in terms of how people
15 recognize the changes that have gone on. Yeah,
16 absolutely.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council
19 questions.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let me explain
24 what we're doing here. We have a special order and we're
25 going to go into that and take care of it. We're going
26 from FIS to WIS, wildlife information, hopefully
27 developing a similar type program with more money.
28
29 Once we finish that part of our agenda,
30 we're going to come back and go into the FIS projects,
31 debate these and choose these for funding. If you'd like
32 to stay for that, that's fine, but I just wanted to make
33 sure you had an opportunity before we spend an hour or
34 two on this. We'll probably go to 6:00 tonight. I
35 appreciate your comments.
36
37 MR. LANGDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 More than happy with the Council or the Staff in terms of
39 revising the projects to meet the kinds of concerns or
40 issues that make sense from your vantage point. So thank
41 you.
42
43 MR. JACKSON: And we appreciate the time
44 that you've taken to ask questions. That's what we want
45 to do, is answer these questions. Thank you very much.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you,
48 gentlemen. The next item is wildlife. Is the presenter
49 Mr. Johnson? I'd let Dr. Schroeder intro.
50

1 DR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 We have a number of items to cover concerning wildlife.
3 Even though this is a fisheries meeting, this is our
4 opportunity for the Council to hear about issues of
5 concern and also to develop proposals to the Federal
6 Subsistence Board and to decide on how they'll deal with
7 proposals that may be submitted to the Federal
8 Subsistence Board as well. So this is the suggested
9 order for this discussion. Mr. Johnson is up first.

10
11 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 My name is Dave Johnson. I'm the subsistence coordinator
13 for the Tongass National Forest with the Forest Service.
14 You have in front of you some information regarding
15 several things. The first thing we're going to deal with
16 is the actual update on the Unit 2 deer subsistence hunt
17 this year. If it's appropriate, Mr. Chairman, I'd like
18 to call up Anthony Christianson, Mac Demmert, Richard
19 Peterson and Dennis Nickerson.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We don't have that
22 many chairs, but they can stand behind you. But
23 certainly they can come forward and address us as needed.

24
25 (Pause)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Make sure Council
28 has copies, which is the same as on the screen. We're
29 now at number one, which is Dave Johnson facilitating the
30 update on subsistence hunting as well as the tribal
31 representatives. Mr. Johnson.

32
33 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Council. I
34 will give deference here in a moment to the folks that
35 are here with me at the table and let them provide their
36 own comments with respect to the requirement for
37 mandatory reporting for deer hunting in Unit 2.

38
39 This is the second year for requiring
40 Federally qualified hunters to pick up subsistence deer
41 hunting permits from the Forest Service. I would just
42 like to report that at this time there have been 274
43 permits issued by the Craig ranger district, 10 by
44 Wrangell, 225 by Thorn Bay and six by Ketchikan and those
45 are primarily Saxman hunters that qualify under the
46 program.

47
48 In spite of the very warm season we had,
49 there was still a number of subsistence hunters that did
50 come in and get permits. I personally went to Edna Bay

1 and there were about 15 people waiting for me at the
2 grocery store there to get their permits. They wanted to
3 be in compliance with the program and get their permits.
4

5
6 Also, I can tell you I don't have
7 specific data at this time. Mr. Brainard, who is
8 handling the database, is currently on a caribou hunt and
9 I don't have the exact numbers for the Petersburg permits
10 that were issued. We also anticipate additional permits
11 being issued as we move into the rut for the
12 Wrangell/Petersburg folks.
13

14 Also, for the second year, the tribes
15 were involved to a degree, but not to the extent that's
16 intended they be involved in this particular aspect of
17 the program. Let me give you my rationale why that is.
18 Last year we had some problems in terms of how the
19 permits were crafted. It was a new program and we had a
20 system that required four pieces of paper for each
21 hunter, so instead of having one report, one permit, we
22 had four and that was something less than desirable by
23 the Federal hunters.
24

25 Secondly, there were a number of
26 criticisms internally and externally about the ability of
27 requiring mandatory reporting on a voluntary basis and
28 what kind of results we would get and whether or not we
29 should involve the tribes. We didn't feel that it's fair
30 to the tribes to have to deal with that kind of
31 criticism. Since it's a Federal program, we felt we
32 needed to have the bugs worked out of this thing before
33 we pass it on to the tribes.
34

35 Another problem was the postage and the
36 address where the permits were to be returned to. We've
37 gotten portions of that fixed. For the most part, the
38 reports are being returned to the Petersburg office and
39 we don't have to put stamps on the report.
40

41 It is the Forest Service intent and it is
42 my intent that in coming years the tribes on Prince of
43 Wales Island and Saxman would be the ones to actually be
44 involved in issuing the permits. We would still have
45 Forest Service offices there to issue permits, but the
46 tribes would be the ones on the island, particularly to
47 those that are closest to the villages where they live to
48 issue the permits.
49

50 So, at this point I would like to turn

1 the mike over to the four fellows here with me and they
2 can make their own comments in any order they would like.

3
4
5 going first?

6
7 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I guess I'll take the
8 initiative. Good afternoon. Anthony Christianson with
9 the Hydaburg Cooperative Association. Along the lines of
10 what Dave is talking about, about the issuance of
11 permits, I've been adamant about tribes issuing permits
12 for all Federal or State, whether it's fisheries or game
13 management, due to, in Hydaburg's instance, our remote
14 location from the district ranger office or even the
15 permitting office in Craig for sockeye harvest
16 monitoring. We have been issuing State permits for the
17 past four years for the Fish and Game out of our office.

18
19
20 It seems to be a good service to the
21 community members and they have been very happy with us
22 issuing those permits and have questioned us on why we
23 don't have more permits for all of the things that
24 pertain to harvesting of the subsistence resources.

25
26 I feel that it's important that we issue
27 permits out of the tribal office so that our members
28 aren't criminalizing themselves when they are
29 participating in these harvesting activities and also
30 that we can get better data so that we can manage the
31 resource according to some actual numbers and we've
32 proven that through some of the projects that we've
33 funded through this Board that was for sockeye.

34
35 I think that people in the community feel
36 a little more comfortable telling another community
37 member about actual harvest levels, fearing telling
38 somebody from outside of the community that some kind of
39 law-breaking might be going on if they were to actually
40 tell somebody they shot more deer than they should of,
41 they're shooting a sex they're not supposed to, all of
42 the things that go into reporting.

43
44 The only part I have a problem with on
45 that is the mandatory reporting requirement and losing
46 your ability to subsist the following year if something
47 like this was instituted because that, in itself, might
48 deter some of the local members from even applying for a
49 permit and it might put us back into the same position of
50 not getting accurate data due to maybe losing your

1 privileges due to the fact that you may not be able to
2 get this permit in the future. I do agree that we should
3 have reporting requirements attached to them to get the
4 numbers. But that's the only concern I would have with
5 the mandatory, is it may deter and people may lose their
6 right to subsist on a resource when I don't think you
7 should lose that right or even put it out there to even
8 lose it. I mean that's a big thing to put on our
9 membership.

10

11 So I would like to just comment that HCA
12 is in favor of issuing and is ready to issue any permits
13 that deal with subsistence harvest and creel survey and
14 to get actual data. The only problem I have is the
15 mandatory, but in this instance with deer I think it
16 might be crucial to the steps that are being taken to get
17 a management plan in and have some of the issues cleared
18 up with that Unit 2 deer harvest. So that's where we're
19 coming from. Thanks.

20

21 DR. GARZA: Okay. We have a couple
22 questions for you. Mike.

23

24 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
25 Road kill, aren't we already required to report, and I
26 believe we are. It's the non-rural that we're adding
27 this reporting requirement to. Am I correct?

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Mike,
30 Council. Also, if you'll recall -- we'll reference this
31 a little later, but in the letter that came from Forrest
32 Cole, we stated in that letter that Federal regulations
33 require mandatory reporting of all deer taken by
34 subsistence hunters and we have had excellent response
35 from subsistence hunters. Anthony's point is well taken.
36 The law enforcement folks and the managers have been
37 fairly understanding in terms of this reporting
38 requirement. If people are calling in or telling someone
39 in a conversation like this what they took and where they
40 hunted, we felt that meets the requirement for the
41 mandatory reporting.

42

43 I think where we're heading here very
44 quickly, as we move into this third year, that if it's
45 someone's second or third time to not provide any
46 information, we may be looking at some other kind of
47 restriction in terms of how that may affect future
48 hunting. Like I said, we're getting excellent reporting
49 for the most part.

50

1 DR. GARZA: We do need to hear from the
2 other people before us. Perhaps we can hear from them
3 and sort of compile all our questions if that's okay.
4 Rick.

5
6 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Dr. Garza. I
7 completely concur with Anthony's statements. I feel that
8 the tribes have been working very diligently to build our
9 capacity and infrastructure so that we would be able to
10 do all of the issuing of permits and take a more active
11 role in the management of our own resources. I think
12 that's the step we need to be taking and working in that
13 direction.

14
15 A concern I have and I hear often in our
16 community is that if we're required as subsistence users
17 to report, why are other users not. I think that's
18 something we need to address. If we're going to get data
19 that's going to be relevant, we need all user groups to
20 be able to do the same reporting. That's all I have to
21 say.

22
23 DR. GARZA: Mr. Nickerson.

24
25 MR. NICKERSON: Dennis Nickerson from the
26 Craig Community Association. I too agree with what Mr.
27 Nickerson and Mr. Christianson have said. Mr. Peterson
28 brought up the same thing that I was going to bring up,
29 about the regulations on the subsistence. It does seem
30 like the guidelines are set on the wrong people. As a
31 whole, it seems like we've always been more than
32 cooperative when it came to regulations. When the
33 out-of-staters come out here to go hunting, they do
34 everything they can to not follow the regulations. That
35 was all I had to say. I do agree with what Hydaburg and
36 Kasaan have to say.

37
38 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Nickerson.
39 Mr. Demmert.

40
41 MR. DEMMERT: I also agree with what the
42 gentlemen have said here. We have been issuing our
43 permits for a few years. If I remember correctly, the
44 Klawock people started issuing their permits for
45 subsistence sockeye here and also had a monitoring
46 program. I've always felt that our people are more
47 reluctant to talk to non-Natives than they are to talk to
48 Natives because they might be ridiculed or they might be
49 giving out some knowledge that they don't want to give
50 out.

1 If we were to take this all over and
2 start running these programs, it would be a capacity
3 building program. I also think that if something such as
4 this here would develop, that the Inter-island Tribal
5 Committee could take a real good look at it and they
6 could help set up guidelines for the island itself.
7 Thank you.

8
9 DR. GARZA: Okay. I guess I want to hear
10 from at least one of you guys. The two questions that I
11 have is for which resources are the tribes able to issue
12 permits on Prince of Wales? Is it State or is it
13 Federal?

14
15 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Currently the Hydaburg
16 Cooperative Association issues permits for the State of
17 Alaska subsistence sockeye fishery at Eek mainly and then
18 we have issued permits this year for the steelhead
19 subsistence fishery. Needless to say, we only issued two
20 permits and part of that is because a majority of the
21 fishers of the steelhead are between ages 12 and 21 and
22 they're not really apt to come in and file for a permit.
23 I brainstormed an idea to go up to the school next year
24 and actually issue those permits to the kids so that we
25 can get some information for the steelhead harvest to
26 actually reflect what is being harvested in our
27 community.

28
29 One fall we did issue the Federal permit
30 for deer and as Dave has stated, due to the stringent
31 reporting requirements, more paperwork, that was not
32 offered to us for the past two years. I guess we're in
33 the process of receiving those now. Currently, that is
34 what we have issued and we would like to issue more
35 permits for our tribal members so that we can get that
36 data. I think that is the information that is going to
37 document our need, show the use and, like I said, we'll
38 get real numbers if the people are speaking to somebody
39 they feel comfortable with.

40
41 DR. GARZA: Are there other permits that
42 any of you issue?

43
44 MR. NICKERSON: As far as I know, Klawock
45 does the State subsistence permits for sockeye and we go
46 down to the Klawock Cooperative Association building and
47 pick up our permits there. I go out beach seining with a
48 lot of guys in Klawock and in the past few years I've
49 noticed they've been more than cooperative in returning
50 their ticket permits back to the tribes. I see a lot of

1 positive feedback from that. They're more confident
2 sending it back to the tribe and have them send it to the
3 State and Federal.

4
5 MR. PETERSON: Dr. Garza, this is Richard
6 Peterson again. At Kasaan we had the deer permits, but
7 because of the time that we got them, our community
8 members were a little frustrated and decided against
9 getting them. We're actively working to this next year
10 be able to issue our sockeye permits in Kasaan.

11
12 MR. DEMMERT: I would like to say that we
13 encourage our people to report accurately, so that way we
14 could have a record system to keep track of what's going
15 on and try to keep an accurate record. We've gotten good
16 results.

17
18 DR. GARZA: I guess I have one final
19 question. In terms of how the U2 deer is working out,
20 the question that we have for the future is are the needs
21 being met?

22
23 MR. DEMMERT: I never saw any paperwork
24 for this year turned in. I don't think those needs are
25 being met because I think, by nature, a lot of our people
26 have a tendency to boast about their hunting skills. I
27 only know a few that will really step up. For the
28 majority, you never hear of -- you hear of these guys
29 going out and coming back and saying, well, we never got
30 anything yet. It seems that, you know, the needs are not
31 being met at this time.

32
33 MR. PETERSON: I think in Kasaan our
34 needs are being met, but the issue we're trying to push
35 is that we accurately reflect what we're harvesting so
36 that we can get an accurate show of our need. I think
37 that's something that has been poorly represented in this
38 system so far and people just report what is by law
39 allowed, but that doesn't mean that's what they're taking
40 and we want to work hard to get that straightened out.

41
42 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Anthony Christianson
43 here. As far as needs being met for the deer harvest, I
44 guess I couldn't speak at this time on behalf of the
45 community because we're still in the process of meeting
46 those needs for this year. As far as the system that we
47 had in place with the regulation change in early harvest
48 through a survey we conducted last year with the users, a
49 lot of them did state their needs weren't being met even
50 with this new regulation in place.

1 The biggest response to the survey was
2 that, sure, it was nice to have this earlier hunt, but
3 that was not the customary traditional hunting time for
4 our people and when they got to their customary
5 traditional time, there was a depreciation in their area
6 because it's in October, well after the rural hunt that
7 was instituted happens in the month of July when our
8 community members aren't up on top of the mountain,
9 they're in the mouth of the stream.

10
11 So our concern is just that, our
12 customary and traditional hunting time is at a different
13 time other than what we were allotted through the
14 regulation change. If anything, the community expressed
15 they would like to see their opportunity increased during
16 the customary traditional time of harvest and not at the
17 front end of the season. That's all I have to say.

18
19 DR. GARZA: I think we're wrapping up
20 here. Just one comment to the four of you. I appreciate
21 you guys being here. It's very important to have Prince
22 of Wales represented. Just to let you know, we do have
23 the Prince of Wales Unit 2 deer subcommittee and the next
24 meeting is November 18th, 19th. Don Hernandez is the
25 chair and we would like to see as much of Prince of Wales
26 participate in the public portion of that meeting, so
27 we'll probably try and send you some information.

28
29 MR. DEMMERT: Is that meeting going to be
30 on Prince of Wales?

31
32 DR. GARZA: (Nods affirmatively)

33
34 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Those meetings are
35 open to the public?

36
37 DR. GARZA: Yes. The U2 meetings will
38 alternate between on island and off island. All of the
39 meetings are open to the public. Don is the lead guy on
40 that.

41
42 MR. PETERSON: Dr. Garza, I just wanted
43 to point out that obviously it's a very important issue
44 to us, but it's also during the same time as another
45 important issue and that's the subsistence fisheries that
46 Tlingit Haida is hosting here in Juneau. As you are
47 aware, in most communities there's only a few of us that
48 are actively involved with working for our rights, so I'm
49 going to be in Juneau for that fisheries meeting, but
50 I'll try to have some representation there.

1 DR. GARZA: What's next?

2

3 DR. SCHROEDER: Madame Chair. The Chair
4 would like to call Don Hernandez and Jan Caulfield to
5 give us a brief on what's going on with the Prince of
6 Wales deer planning subcommittee and what's ahead.

7

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Dr. Garza.
9 You guys are far more intimidating from this perspective.
10 Just to give everybody a quick review of where we are in
11 the Unit 2 deer planning process and hope to answer some
12 of the tribal member questions there. We held a meeting
13 in June, an organizational meeting to try and set our
14 goals. We established a goal statement, we put together
15 a tentative agenda for the types of topics we might be
16 discussing, we established our ground rules for how we're
17 going to be conducting our meetings, we set a tentative
18 meeting schedule although we'll try to adhere to it for
19 five meetings to take place.

20

21 Meetings will be Prince of Wales Island,
22 Ketchikan, back to Prince of Wales Island to a different
23 community. We hope to have a meeting in Wrangell because
24 we have Wrangell representation on the subcommittee and
25 we will be discussing Unit 2 deer in Petersburg at our
26 winter meeting, so we'll be talking about what's going on
27 with the subcommittee at that meeting.

28

29 I guess that's what we accomplished at
30 our June meeting. The first meeting will be in Craig on
31 November 18th and maybe I'll ask Jan to give an update.
32 I believe we have a full committee but I'm not quite
33 sure. She probably knows more about that than I do. I
34 guess I should also say that since that June meeting
35 Shineberg & Associates has been hired to facilitate our
36 meetings, so they will be helping us with the
37 organization. Kind of taking over the role of what our
38 regional coordinator does, I guess, kind of a private
39 contractor set up. Jan.

40

41 MS. CAULFIELD: Hi. I appreciate the
42 chance to be here. I'm Jan Caulfield with Shineberg &
43 Associates. As Don said, I had a chance to work with the
44 subcommittee at their meeting the end of May when we made
45 the progress that Don was just describing. I'm happy
46 that I'm going to be able to keep working with the group
47 through the five meetings that are going to come up
48 between now and April or May.

49

50 I also had the experience of interviewing

1 about 30 people on the island and in Ketchikan last fall,
2 sort of a preliminary assessment to this work, so I
3 really have taken a fair number of people's time learning
4 more and getting down on paper what some of the issues
5 are that people care about with regard to this. I'm glad
6 to be able to continue working with the project.

7
8 One of the other things we did accomplish
9 at the meeting the end of May was talk about full
10 membership on the subcommittee and expanded that
11 membership to 11 people. I think we have 10 out of 11 at
12 this point. Bob Schroeder actually has been tasked with
13 getting the subcommittee fully formed.

14
15 Another piece that I thought I'd mention
16 is the importance of having public participation in the
17 process and making sure that the public is really fully
18 aware all along the way of what the subcommittee is
19 discussing. So, in addition to the fact that all the
20 meetings will be open, I've been tasked with generating
21 two newsletters during the process, invite public
22 participation and report on what the subcommittee's been
23 accomplishing along the way. So there will be two
24 fancier newsletters and I think then there's a
25 requirement for two fliers which are simpler, but to also
26 get information out.

27
28 The Forest Service is going to help by
29 putting a project web site up so that we can feed
30 information into that and people can track what the
31 subcommittee's progress is by going on the web site. And
32 then just asking all the subcommittee members to
33 continually do informal outreach with all the people that
34 they bump into in their communities all the time.
35 Everything, of course, will be public notice in the paper
36 and that sort of thing. So the goal is really to get
37 information out so the public can track what's going on
38 and knows what their opportunities are to come and bring
39 issues in front of the subcommittee for discussion.

40
41 I think that's about all I had to say.
42 I'm looking forward to getting going in November. Our
43 very first task actually is to pull together written
44 information, technical information to get out to
45 subcommittee members ahead of time so everybody has a
46 chance to review basic information about deer populations
47 and ANILCA requirements for subsistence and all the
48 different things you can imagine that are aspects of
49 these issues so that the subcommittee has sort of a
50 shared understanding of this technical information before

1 we start in November. So that's my immediate task.
2 Thanks.

3
4 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'd like to add also for
5 the information of the people that are here from the
6 Prince of Wales Island that will hopefully be attending
7 our meetings, our goal of this subcommittee is to be less
8 formal than the way we operate here. We really need to
9 have a lot of give and take in this whole process and we
10 want to listen to people. There's going to be a
11 discussion as well. We may or may not make any final
12 recommendations and decisions, that remains to be seen,
13 but we will certainly be talking about a lot of things
14 and hopefully all learn a lot from each other.

15
16 DR. GARZA: You have a short question?
17 Mr. Jordan.

18
19 MR. JORDAN: I just want to say I had the
20 opportunity to work on a task force in Sitka at our local
21 hospital in health care and it was a very rewarding
22 experience and I applaud the Staff and the Council and
23 the committee for hiring a professional facilitator of
24 the caliber of Ms. Caulfield and I'm sure it will be a
25 good experience for all those involved and I look forward
26 to the reports.

27
28 MR. CAULFIELD: Thank you.

29
30 DR. GARZA: We are running out of time
31 and this Council is actually fairly sick of U2 deer. So
32 if we could move on. Steve Kessler.

33
34 MR. KESSLER: Madame Chair and Council
35 members. What I'm going to talk about today is sort of a
36 corollary to the Fisheries Information Services except
37 what we're calling this now is Wildlife Information
38 Services.

39
40 As we have implemented the Federal
41 Subsistence Program that began in the early '90s, we have
42 been trying to develop the best information we can for
43 wildlife for use for the regulatory process. In many
44 cases, that information has not been particularly
45 strategic and we have not had a lot of money to be able
46 to spend on those types of projects.

47
48 When the fisheries program was begun just
49 a few years ago, one of the parts of that fisheries
50 program that was developed was this FIS. We felt it was

1 necessary to develop something similar for wildlife and
2 in the appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005, which
3 starts on Friday, we're anticipating a \$500,000 increase
4 in the amount of money that we and the Forest Service
5 receive to administer this program.

6
7 After taking a look at our strategic plan
8 on how we would spend money, we identified that probably
9 the most important thing to do with this increase that
10 we're anticipating for 2005 is to develop a program
11 similar to the FIS program with the purpose of
12 strategically taking a look at what sort of wildlife data
13 collection compilation analysis needs we have across the
14 national forests. So that would be the Tongass down in
15 Southeast and the Chugach in Southcentral.

16
17 Some of the types of projects that come
18 to mind are what we've been talking about on Unit 2 deer,
19 the information that is needed for the regulatory process
20 for cooperative deer planning and others. Those are the
21 types of projects that could be undertaken.

22
23 The FIS program we believe has been very
24 successful, so what we propose is that we model this
25 program very closely after the FIS program. In this
26 handout that you have you'll see that as you follow
27 through it, it's very similar to the FIS program except
28 that it's Forest Service specific. Other agencies at
29 this point would not be contributing funds or be involved
30 such that we would be implementing projects on other land
31 ownerships.

32
33 I don't want to go into too much detail,
34 but if you haven't had a chance to review this, you might
35 want to just take a quick look at the program structure
36 on page two. It's very similar to what's in the FIS
37 program with a role for the Regional Advisory Councils,
38 but approval in this case by the regional forester
39 instead of the Federal Subsistence Board.

40
41 On page three are a series of guidelines
42 and this is all draft I might add. If you have any
43 comments on this, I certainly would appreciate them. We
44 can incorporate and utilize those comments in finalizing
45 this program, assuming that we do, in fact, get the
46 funds. There are a number of guidelines on page three
47 under IV. For instance, if you look down near the
48 bottom, I think the second bullet from the last, enhanced
49 capacity building among local organizations. We want to
50 do something very similar to what we've been doing here

1 in Southeast with the fisheries program where capacity
2 building is a major emphasis. At the same time getting
3 information, developing information that is needed by the
4 Regional Advisory Councils and the Federal Subsistence
5 Board.

6
7 At the bottom of page three, time line,
8 this all depends on the Congressional appropriations. As
9 of yesterday, the interior appropriations bill, which the
10 Forest Service is part of, has not yet passed the Senate,
11 but it did pass the House. The Senate Appropriations
12 Committee has recommended the same level of funding to
13 the Senate. Assuming that that goes through and the
14 Conference Committee agrees with that same level of
15 funding, we should be seeing that increase.

16
17 Right now the anticipation is that
18 there's going to be an eight day continuing resolution
19 into October and then if they can't pass that
20 appropriations bill, then the appropriations bill will
21 probably wait until November, till the Lame Duck Session
22 there. So we won't really know if this is going to be
23 funded until sometimes in November or December.

24
25 If you take a look at page four, there's
26 some objectives that we have for the first and second
27 year. We want to complete developing this program
28 direction, exactly how this program will be formulated.
29 We want to undergo a similar strategic planning as being
30 done in the fisheries program. That's item two. We want
31 to complete that this fiscal year. We would award
32 project eventually based on that strategic planning.
33 Probably we couldn't start that until fiscal year 2006.
34 And number five on here is we would likely detail a
35 Forest Service employee to work on developing this whole
36 process.

37
38 Right under that, September/October 2004,
39 that's where we are right now. Presentation of this
40 concept to the Southeast Council. I'm interested in any
41 comments you have on the process, support that you would
42 have for it. I was thinking that you might identify some
43 preliminary priorities for fiscal year 2004 since we
44 don't think we'll be able to use the benefit from
45 strategic planning for 2004. But Bob and I were talking
46 about this and if, in fact, we want to do that, probably
47 the right thing would be to identify a couple of Council
48 members to work with us and think about what those
49 priorities for some of these funds for 2004 might be.

50

1 So that's a very quick overview. Again,
2 it's an opportunity to try to give some of the rigor to
3 information development that we have in the Fisheries
4 Information Services to the wildlife side of the program.
5 We're pretty excited about it and I hope you are too.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I'm
8 real excited. I think it's a good deal. You're asking
9 us right now to identify a couple Council persons? Is
10 that what you're requesting?

11
12 MR. KESSLER: I think that will be a good
13 idea because I don't see that you'll be able to really
14 get a comprehensive look among all of you today. You
15 received this two days ago, but you probably haven't
16 given a lot of thought to this yet, so maybe it might be
17 best just to task a couple Council members to work a
18 little more closely with us.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think we can do
21 that. Also, I think we can have a teleconference meeting
22 at some time if we have to for the whole Council to weigh
23 in on this like you suggest further on. Council's
24 wishes. I'm looking for some comments on this and then
25 I'm prepared to ask for a couple volunteers. Dr. Garza.

26
27 DR. GARZA: Totally awesome, great,
28 marvelous. Support it 100 percent. Probably what will
29 immediately surface, of course, is U2 deer. But the
30 other thing that pops up in my mind is traditional uses
31 of bear products. Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That means you
34 want to serve on that committee?

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 MR. KOOKESH: The pay is not much, but
39 the glory is immense.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do we have a
42 volunteer over here, Mr. Kookesh? If you're interested
43 in serving, three, that's cool too. I don't think it's
44 going to be overly burdensome, 20 meetings or anything
45 like that, but just to try to sketch something what you
46 think the Council would do. Dr. Garza.

47
48 DR. GARZA: Also, Mr. Chair, we have
49 missing Council members. If they are interested in
50 serving, I certainly would step down. I'm not trying to

1 hog committee memberships.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan.

4

5 MR. JORDAN: I think it would be great if
6 my partner, Mr. Kitka, would volunteer to serve and if
7 you schedule the meetings for the first couple weeks of
8 July.

9

10

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

11

12 MR. KOOKESH: I believe we have Council
13 members up for review, so you might want to be a little
14 careful about volunteering if you're not going to be here
15 next time.

16

17

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: None of us know
18 whether we'll be here next time. I don't have any
19 problem with that. If it doesn't work out, we can always
20 grab another Council person. Have we got two people
21 right now? Dr. Garza and Mr. Kitka, do you feel
22 comfortable working together with Mr. Kessler? Is there
23 another? Floyd, would you like to do this?

24

25

MR. KOOKESH: Floyd who?

26

27

(Laughter)

28

29

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.
30 Sorry, sir. Would you like to be involved in this with
31 them?

32

33

MR. KOOKESH: Hey, I don't mind.

34

35

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is that
36 unworkable, Mr. Kessler?

37

38

MR. KESSLER: No, it's not unworkable. I
39 just want to make sure that the expectations for how
40 these three people would be used aren't overly broad
41 because of the situation with FACA where we've got to be
42 very careful about developing new committees with Council
43 members outside of their official role here on the
44 Regional Advisory Council.

45

46

So, for instance, if you take a look at
47 the Technical Review Committee on page two, at this point
48 there are no Regional Advisory Council members on that
49 because of the FACA concerns that have surfaced. So what
50 I envision right now is just coordinating with these

1 three Council members, having them review this, taking a
2 look at this, giving us some preliminary ideas on what
3 might be some funding priorities for this fiscal year.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: First off, we
6 don't have the money. When Mr. Schroeder calls me, we
7 don't have to put that in the Federal Register, nor do I
8 expect it to be in the Federal Register when you look at
9 these members assisting Staff. We're not having a
10 meeting or anything like that. But that's a possibility
11 later and I'd like to involve the whole Council. Now
12 that would be the possibility for that. Mr. Bangs first.

13
14 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
15 just curious as to how dependant this program is on this
16 appropriations funding.

17
18 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Bangs, unfortunately
19 it's very dependant on that. We do spend on both of the
20 national forests, Chugach and Tongass, some money every
21 year in similar types of endeavors. For instance, you
22 may be aware of the moose project up in Yakutat for the
23 last couple of years. Part of that has been funded out
24 of these subsistence dollars. Otherwise we'll start
25 losing Staff if we were to fund it without the increase
26 or have to take it out of the FIS project, for instance.
27 So right now the Forest Service contributes \$2 million a
28 year to the FIS program. We want to maintain that level
29 in the fisheries. If we were to fund this without
30 additional dollars, it would have to come from somewhere
31 like that.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I understand you
34 need to be funded and I would not support at all taking
35 it out of FIS. We've already said we're not fully funded
36 right now. We need more money there, so I would expect
37 that you wouldn't raid that. We have three Council who
38 will work with you. My understanding is this is Staff
39 type work. We're not having any kind of FACA meeting or
40 anything. So just for the record it's not a FACA
41 function.

42
43 MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
46 other action items you would request from us at this
47 time?

48
49 MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Johnson.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Council.

4 Also, if I may, just for a brief second, digress back to
5 the Unit 2 reporting this year. We did have good
6 cooperation from the OSM in the second year and required
7 a number of additional changes. In July, when they were
8 getting ready to do permitting for the rest of the state,
9 the early July hunt, along with regulations going to the
10 printer and the addresses of where these things were
11 being sent, created some of the logistical issues that we
12 were able to work through and I feel we're making some
13 progress.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead, Mr.

16 Johnson.

17

18 MR. JOHNSON: At this time I would like
19 to again reference your handout that you received earlier
20 in the week with regard to the letter from the Forest
21 Supervisor and the proposal that this Council submitted
22 to the Board of Game, Proposal No. 1 that's currently on
23 the table. I just wanted to let the Council know that
24 the Forest Supervisor has made a commitment to providing
25 Staff support to the Council for this and whatever the
26 wishes may be for the Council with regards to support for
27 that board meeting coming up in November.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: For the record,
30 that's as shown on page 51 in the Board book, is that
31 correct?

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Mr.

34 Chairman.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Has everybody had
37 a chance to look this over? We had an earlier in
38 discussion. We're going to need two people to go
39 November 2nd to the 5th in Juneau to make a presentation
40 here. I would suggest at least Mr. Hernandez is chair of
41 the committee. But Council's wishes on this. We need
42 two volunteers.

43

44 (Pause)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Maybe I could ask
47 for volunteers. One would be Mr. Hernandez and the other
48 would be Mr. Douville, both closely associated with U2
49 issues. Would that be acceptable?

50

1 MR. DOUVILLE: No, it would not.

2

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman, it makes
4 for a pretty full slate of meetings this fall for me. I
5 hesitate to commit to another meeting. I know, as you
6 mentioned, Mike and I would be the logical people,
7 but.....

8

9 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You're already on
10 a committee. I understand completely. I don't know if
11 the audience knows this. We don't get paid for this.
12 This Council is sitting up here and they're not getting
13 paid for this. They've donated their time for this. I'm
14 certainly appreciative of all the volunteers on this U2
15 deer committee. I mean we've got like five meetings or
16 something. I shouldn't have even asked you. I'm sorry.
17 I appreciate already your commitment to the U2 deer.
18 I'll go if you want me to go to Juneau to do that, but I
19 get burned out on these after a while, too. Mr. Jordan.

20

21 MR. JORDAN: I hadn't raised my hand, but
22 I think it would be great if you went, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
25 comments.

26

27 DR. GARZA: I will be at another meeting,
28 so I will not be able to make it.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Bangs, if you
31 could commit for that time as being on the Council, you
32 could relay the newest and latest information from the
33 Council.

34

35 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
36 would try my best to do it. This is right in the middle
37 of my season, which starts Monday of this next week and
38 it carries on to Christmas, but I have made provisions
39 to go to the Unit 2 deer meetings and I could possibly
40 make that early November meeting, but I'll have to check
41 the schedule to find out what days it is and how much
42 fishing time I'll lose by going. I would commit to
43 looking into it at this point and seeing if it will work.

44

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would
47 characterize that as a solid maybe.

48

49 (Laughter)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville, you
2 declined?

3
4 MR. DOUVILLE: I did, yeah.
5

6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just so everybody
7 understands, it is hard to do this and everybody here has
8 another job of some type. I appreciate whatever you do.
9 I'm not feeling bad about you not volunteering at all.
10 We'll just put down Mr. Bangs as well as myself. If you
11 could let me know if that solid maybe turns into a no or
12 a yes relatively soon.

13
14 Mr. Larson, could you come forward,
15 please, and explain how this testimony works at the Board
16 of Game.

17
18 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 For the record, my name is Doug Larson. I'm with the
20 ADF&G, Division of Wildlife Conservation, and I serve as
21 the Regional Supervisor for Southeast Alaska. The way
22 the process works for the Board of Game, which, as you
23 said, is the 2nd through the 5th here in Juneau, but the
24 way it works is public testimony leads off, so whoever
25 would come in this instance to testify on this proposal
26 or other proposals would be given first charge in terms
27 of their time. So that would happen on the 2nd and I
28 think the 3rd. The road map for the meeting is in the
29 process of being developed, but I do know that the
30 testimony comes first. Whether it will be one day or two
31 days I'm not sure. So what that means is whoever would
32 be volunteering to participate could come and do their
33 testimony up front and have that in the record and then
34 they wouldn't have to necessarily stick around for the
35 Board's deliberations. So it would be shorter than the
36 whole 2nd through the 5th.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I
39 think that clarifies it. We're not going to be here for
40 the whole 2nd through the 5th. How much time are we
41 going to have? Are we going to be given any extra time
42 as Regional Advisory Council? Normally they have a very
43 short time period. I think perhaps we could expand that
44 a little.

45
46 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, there's a
47 couple things. One is, in addition to public testimony,
48 there are opportunities afforded agencies for Staff
49 reports. I know that the Forest Service has been invited
50 to attend the Board of Game meeting and to provide a

1 Staff report and that might be an opportunity to go into
2 more detail if the Regional Advisory Council was so
3 inclined to have something more put in the record at that
4 time.

5
6 As far as the testimony from the RAC,
7 that's a Board support question and I honestly don't know
8 whether they would afford a RAC additional time or not.
9 I know typically public testimony is limited to a fairly
10 short time. I think three to five minutes.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I hope
13 that clarifies it. Mr. Bangs.

14
15 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
16 was requested to attend that meeting to represent the
17 Petersburg Fish and Game Advisory Committee. At that
18 point I didn't think that I was able to attend, but
19 beings there's an additional importance to me and if it's
20 the Council's wishes, I'll try my best to make sure I'm
21 there. Transportation-wise, we'll see how that works
22 out, but I think I can make that.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That just leads me
25 to there's not any conflict between your testimony
26 between the Petersburg Fish and Game Advisory Committee
27 and the Regional Advisory Council, is there?

28
29 MR. BANGS: In the past I have changed
30 hats, so to speak, and spoke on behalf of one
31 organization and then on behalf of myself or another
32 organization. If there's a conflict, I can forego the
33 Advisory Committee representation.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think it would
36 be pretty hard to serve two masters there. It has to be
37 one or the other. I think it would be inappropriate.

38
39 MR. BANGS: In the testimony for the Fish
40 and Game Advisory Committee, I'm not speaking on behalf
41 of myself. I'm speaking on behalf of the committee, so
42 my testimony doesn't reflect my own feelings. I reflect
43 what was carried on in the meeting, which I would do here
44 as well.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: A solid maybe.
47 Let's talk about that a little bit. Thank you. Mr.
48 Larson, could you spend maybe a minute or two more with
49 us. You're certainly familiar with the proposal. You
50 have a copy of that in the book. The Council has already

1 had this under the teleconference meeting. I guess we're
2 looking to see if you see any big road blocks or
3 something that we're going to run into here or maybe your
4 feel for how this will go down.

5
6 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman and Council
7 members. I guess I can't tell you how it will go down.
8 I mean that will be up to the Board. But I can tell you
9 that the Department of Fish and Game has some concerns
10 with this proposal and, frankly, our recommendation to
11 the Board of Game will be to not adopt. The reason for
12 that is not that we think getting better harvest data is
13 inappropriate, in fact I think it's fair to say that we,
14 like the rest of the individuals who are dealing with
15 Unit 2 deer or any other wildlife population, are very
16 interested in getting the best information we can.

17
18 Our concern is twofold at least. One is
19 the process. We just talked about the Unit 2 deer
20 planning team, which the department fully endorses. In
21 fact, I will be participating in that effort and I know
22 the Forest Service has Staff participating in that
23 effort. It seems to us that, number one, we have an
24 excellent opportunity as a planning team to identify the
25 issues specifically and then to look at ways to address
26 those issues. Registration permits, which is the
27 proposal, is certainly one way to go about it.

28
29 Now it's not a way the Fish and Game
30 Department has used registration permits in the past.
31 Not to say that it couldn't be done in the future for the
32 reasons that have been identified, but we think that
33 there is a lot of other opportunities out there that
34 could be more cost effective, they could be less onerous
35 on hunters. I mean we heard some people earlier testify
36 about not liking the idea of mandatory reporting.

37
38 So that, Mr. Chairman, is what we will
39 tell the Board of Game. Again, just so I'm clear, it's
40 not that we don't want better harvest data, it's just
41 that we think we can get there through this planning
42 process in a better way.

43
44 I might just add that the other thing is
45 even if the Board of Game was to support this, pass this
46 proposal, it wouldn't go into effect until July 1 of '05
47 and then you wouldn't have information for several months
48 after that for the first year. Meanwhile, this planning
49 team, as we've heard, will be meeting November through
50 April or May, so the information won't even be available

1 if the committee wanted to use that in some way to help
2 in its deliberations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Well, I won't
5 debate you yet. I would like to point out that
6 specifically we didn't turn in this Federal permit. We
7 agree with you. We've never said that it would be
8 mandatory lose your license. I believe the Council has
9 gone on record as saying may. In other words, there are
10 always reasons why somebody can't turn in their permit.
11 But we've had good success with POW already. That's been
12 demonstrated. But we're not going to automatically just
13 make sure you can't hunt ever again if you don't turn in
14 a permit. That was never our intent. Just to clarify
15 that for the record.

16

17 Any members have any questions. I don't
18 want to debate this too much, but are there any
19 questions.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
24 Larson. No. 5, Dave Johnson, Council proposals to the
25 FSB. Dr. Garza.

26

27 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, we have several
28 fishery proposals. We have a bunch of Prince of Wales
29 guys that need to leave in regards to the steelhead
30 proposal. In the past, we have talked about our next
31 year's proposals more toward the end of the meeting. Is
32 there any reason why we have to do that now and can we
33 get to Proposal 25 and then 29 today?

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: How long is this
36 going to take, Mr. Johnson?

37

38 MR. JOHNSON: Very briefly.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Charge on. Make
41 sure it's very briefly.

42

43 MR. JOHNSON: The question to the Council
44 is with regard to the Federal Subsistence Board
45 proposals. Does the Council have any wishes with regard
46 to formal proposals from the Council to the Federal
47 Subsistence Board for the current cycle that will be
48 ending October 22nd?

49

50 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to

1 discuss something, but I think it would take longer than
2 very quick.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very
5 much, Mr. Johnson. We'll put you on the agenda later
6 tomorrow afternoon somewhere. Under agency reports
7 perhaps.

8

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

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That was pretty
13 quick, wasn't it? Where are we on the agenda? First I
14 would like to allow Mr. Archie Cavanaugh to address the
15 Council. He's asked for some time. Is he here? And
16 then I believe we're going back to 25. Mr. Cavanaugh,
17 you have time to address the Council.

18

19 MR. CAVANAUGH: Chairman John Littlefield
20 and Dr. Garza, vice chair. I promise to tell the whole
21 truth, nothing but the truth so help me God. My name is
22 Archie Cavanaugh. I'm the vocational training and
23 resource center director, also known -- this building is
24 known as a haka kusahede (ph), which means our uncle's
25 house. In recognition of all those village, State and
26 Federal members who are meeting here today to discuss
27 historical and significant issue affecting subsistence of
28 our people, we'd like to present cups to the Regional
29 Advisory Council and pens to the village staff as an
30 expression of our appreciation for meeting in our
31 facility for this important event and to encourage the
32 continued collaboration toward solutions deemed important
33 to all of us.

34

35 I'd like to close with a wisdomess phrase
36 from Mr. Walt Whitman known to non-Natives or Walt
37 Whiteman, known to Indian people. It is from the
38 fruition of success no matter how great comes a necessity
39 for an even greater struggle. Gunalcheesh and thank you
40 guys very much.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Gunalcheesh.

43

44 DR. SCHROEDER: Just on behalf of Staff
45 who have been working with the center here in putting on
46 this meeting, I'd really like to thank Archie for having
47 such an excellent facility and to really commend the
48 Staff that we work with here. This meeting has gone on
49 flawlessly with respect to the facility and we really
50 appreciate the good service that we've received.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: On behalf of the
2 Council, Archie, we'd like to thank you for these gifts.
3 I think you even got the members that aren't here, so I
4 appreciate all that. Was there anything else?

5
6 (No comments)

7
8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We'll start with
9 Mr. Jackson. There will be questions for you.

10
11 MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
12 think I ended my presentation and just up for
13 questioning.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, that's my
16 recollection. No one in the Council was able to ask you
17 any questions. We'd run out of time up here. Are there
18 any questions from the Council on the presentation that
19 was exactly 180 out from what we had earlier presented?
20 There should be some. Mr. Kitka.

21
22 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.
23 Jackson, thank you so much for your presentation. We
24 wanted for a long time to hear from these communities on
25 their subsistence and whether their needs are being met
26 and whether things are going the way they want.
27 Sometimes we operate with just what's available to us on
28 information and you provided us with some information
29 that we really needed. Thank you very much.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh, then
32 Mr. Hernandez.

33
34 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Jackson, I really want
35 to thank you for taking the time to do the four criteria
36 to evaluate proposals. I think that was very well done.
37 I appreciate that. I was hoping you would do it because
38 I was looking at Henrich and I kind of slid my paper in,
39 but you already knew the moves there.

40
41 My question is, in your community, are
42 your subsistence sockeye needs being met for the
43 community?

44
45 MR. JACKSON: Not really because, as you
46 know, Gut Bay has pretty much gone the way of Salmon Bay.
47 The Gut Lake sockeye population has gone down
48 tremendously and it's one of the larger lakes there and
49 it's glacial fed. It's really well watered. Over the
50 years, since Port Armstrong and king salmon hatchery, I

1 think that's the port there, there's been king salmon
2 showing up there more and more. As the Fish and Game
3 enforcement officer has been there, he also noticed over
4 the years that more and more kings are being caught there
5 going up the lake, returning. We're short just this
6 year.

7
8 A lot of people did lose their sockeye
9 and trying to get all the way back down to Kutlaku
10 because of the weather and because of the long run, it's
11 75 miles all the way one way from Kake to it and you have
12 to go right down open Chatham Straits and it's quite a
13 thing what Gordon was trying to bring up of a larger boat
14 going down there what we usually took.

15
16 MR. KOOKESH: Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Hernandez.

19
20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 Mr. Jackson, I'm trying to get a better idea of just what
22 the sports fishing impacts are on that area. I'm looking
23 at Table 4 and I see Tongass National Forest visitor days
24 for sports fishing and they go down for sockeye harvested
25 at Kutlaku Lake, Bay of Pillars and it's all no data, no
26 data, no data, right down the list there, so it really
27 doesn't give us a very good idea, so maybe you can try
28 and help us out here just what the level of fishing is
29 there. I heard mention that there is a sport fishing
30 lodge operation in the area. I heard mention that there
31 was yachts passing through. I know in my area that could
32 be literally hundreds of boats. We get lots and lots of
33 boats coming through our area that stop and fish at all
34 the local spots.

35
36 I also know that there is a logging camp
37 at Rowan Bay, which is very close to Bay of Pillars. I
38 know it used to be a very large operation. I worked
39 there myself in 1975 and I know there were a lot of
40 sports fishing activity associated with that camp. I
41 don't know how many people are there now. I know there's
42 logging operations ongoing. Can you give me a better
43 idea of just how many sports fishermen are using that
44 area?

45
46 MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez,
47 Mr. Chair. The use of that area by sportfishing has
48 grown over the years and especially with the lodge
49 station out there and the participation of private yachts
50 coming through. Like you know, they like to poke around

1 into different bays, look at the beautiful scenery and
2 test their ability to get up into that tidal lake.
3 Especially when the Forest Service has a log transfer
4 site at Rowan Bay and it's the primary designated one for
5 Kuiu Island. You are right. There is quite a presence
6 of loggers on their off time cruising through there
7 because they do go all the way down to use that facility
8 where we fish too for sockeye and it does impact our
9 ability to set the nets because the yachts are tied up
10 there and/or there are crab pots set all the way through
11 there. So the impact is double by commercial fisheries,
12 different types, but also the presence of people up and
13 down that coast, especially in that one terminus area for
14 sockeye. The road for the logging camp does go right
15 along the north mountain. That access is right to the
16 lake or they can easily get on their boat and access the
17 sockeye area.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there other
20 council questions for Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jordan.

21
22 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chairman, really quick.
23 Mr. Jackson, in your testimony you asked if I had walked
24 that particular creek. I have not. I spent a lot of
25 time in Pillar Bay when I was growing up and my father
26 has actually been on that creek, but I personally have
27 not.

28
29 But the question I have for you -- I
30 don't know if you saw this data Fish and Game presented
31 to us. If you look on Table 2 there, they talk about the
32 charter salmon fishing effort and from the charter log
33 books they have Bay of Pillars for 2000 and 2003 and
34 you'll notice they have no sockeye harvest out of the
35 Pillar Bay area. If you look at that Chatham Strait,
36 there's only one in 2000 and then in Tebenkof Bay only
37 two in 2001.

38
39 Based on the testimony I've heard and
40 other comments, I'd like to hear your opinion of the
41 wholeness of this information.

42
43 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chair, Mr. Jordan. The
44 information here is relatively brand-new to me looking at
45 it. But if you're there in the presence of these people
46 that are at the terminus waters, whether it's Falls Lake,
47 Gut Bay or Kutlaku, I don't know what they call
48 sportfishing, but with a rod and a weighted treble hook
49 on the end, standing there on their yacht with a cocktail
50 by the crew member holding their cocktail while they toss

1 these weighted lures off to the side to try to snag, snag
2 the sockeye, is what you'd call sportfishing, I don't
3 know if it does or not. But that's what's happening at
4 these places. And I don't know if they document it as
5 such versus going up there in their fully outfitted L.L.
6 Beans or Eddie Bauer suits and braving the bears and the
7 timber with their fly rods to get up to the lake. But
8 we've seen them along the way and that's primarily how I
9 see the sportfishing at Kutlaku Lake. I don't know if
10 it's exactly reported here or not without us
11 investigating it any further.

12

13 MR. JORDAN: Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'd remind
16 everybody that these numbers, we didn't get a chance to
17 digest them, but then again they're just numbers. We're
18 not expected to look at them as being the Gospel truth.
19 They're all weighted in some way and this only is
20 representing what they got a hold of at that time. We
21 know it's not the full story. Any other questions.
22 Mr. Douville.

23

24 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 I look at some of these graphs and they indicate there's
26 several permits issues for them, but really there isn't
27 that much sockeye take. The numbers are not very high.
28 In your opinion, what is the reason for that? As an
29 added comment, there's one here that says there's seven
30 or 8,000 fish escaped into that system, but on previous
31 years before that it looks like the numbers are very
32 small, like 2,000 would be a high number, so I just
33 wondered what happened last year. They had a big
34 escapement but still nobody caught very many fish. If
35 you divide 31 into 680, it's still not very many. That
36 seems to be a lot of effort for very few fish in my
37 opinion, but I'd like to hear yours.

38

39 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Douville.
40 The catch there -- it's very interesting to meet with the
41 other tribes. We met prior to this meeting and talking
42 with Mr. Turek there and other Federal Subsistence Staff
43 or ADF&G Staff about the permit system. You heard a young
44 gentleman from Prince of Wales talk about the permit
45 system, of reporting their deer and being permitted by
46 Federal Subsistence to hunt. Whereas in our area I know
47 we don't have to comment other than get our sportfishing
48 and tags, whether we hunt on Kupreanof Island, Kuiu
49 Island or the six over at Admiralty.

50

1 What I heard down there, sharing what
2 we're doing and trying to index and survey the amount of
3 returns in our lakes. Way down there, the lake that we
4 primarily use as a fall-back lake, especially when the
5 bigger boats go down there, they take a lot of young men
6 back down, say on a trawler, like my uncle's boat, and we
7 tow along a small aluminum boat to haul the seine up to
8 where we want to fish, the fact that we're using people
9 and it's not allowed by law to proxy fish and you look at
10 the household amount, the 50 fish allowed, and thanks the
11 Board for allowing that for that one lake and harvest.

12
13 But we harvest for a lot of people. We
14 don't just harvest for ourself. In fact, we harvest for
15 the elders first who are not able to go down there. We
16 try to mark it on their permit, but sometimes there's
17 other people that we do harvest for and do not mark those
18 down, but sometimes we'll get more than enough and we
19 don't have all the permits there that we're proxy fishing
20 for and we mark it down and try not to break the law. We
21 don't want to get busted on it. But if there's a way that
22 we can work on the community harvest on certain areas, I
23 think that would be a real good -- you'd get real good
24 numbers back on how plentiful they're there.

25
26 But, to me, we always knew -- when you
27 look at it, the size of sockeye at Kutlaku, they're the
28 size of a humpy. You notice that in some other areas.
29 But the size that they are at Gut Bay or Falls Lake,
30 they're double that size or triple. Our preference is to
31 either get it from Gut Lake or Falls Lake. This year
32 Kutlaku came through because of our fall-back on it. So
33 the reporting isn't accurate.

34
35 We'd love to work with all concerned to
36 build up the capacity building and the management of it
37 like I did with Mr. Kadake here, knock on their door and
38 get those numbers or have a person right down on the
39 beach to get those numbers. Because it is one of the
40 lakes that we want to study, but, as Meg Cartright said,
41 there's not that much information on it.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay, are we ready
44 to wrap this up here? I know we have a short time, but
45 Mr. Jackson did have some information that was opposite,
46 so if you want any other information, I'll allow another
47 question or two. Anybody else. Okay. Thank you, Mr.
48 Jackson.

49
50 We're still at tribal agency comments.

1 I'm going to give anybody that wants to testify here
2 about five minutes each because we're going to run out of
3 time. So you have five minutes testimony and then we'll
4 hopefully keep the questions down to a minimum.

5
6 MR. DEMMERT: Mac Demmert. I don't think
7 we would support a proposal such as this here. Mainly
8 probably conservation problem and an environmental one as
9 well. That area is transited by a numerous number of
10 boats and to qualify subsistence users as we have now, I
11 think you'd probably deplete that resource. You probably
12 have a lot of people that do the fishery and because
13 they're not allowed to have a permit to get those,
14 they're not going to report them. So I think it's kind
15 of like everything is kind of being silent and a lot is
16 getting by the State and the Feds don't know about what's
17 going on there. The people that have the local knowledge
18 seem to have a pretty good handle on it. I don't think
19 this proposal is a very good one. Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
22 questions for Mr. Demmert.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
27 other tribes that would like to testify at this time on
28 Proposal 25. Any tribal governments.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Interagency Staff
33 Committee.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman and Council.
38 I'm Steve Kessler with the Forest Service and the
39 Interagency Staff Committee. The Interagency Staff
40 Committee reviewed the information provided in the Staff
41 analysis. Based on that information, the Interagency
42 Staff Committee supports the preliminary conclusion. Of
43 course, I do note that there's additional information
44 that's been presented today and I have no idea based on
45 that additional information what the position of the
46 Interagency Staff Committee would be with that new
47 information.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. It was
50 new to us, too. Any questions for Interagency Staff

1 Committee.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, sir.
6 Any Fish and Game Advisory Committees present who would
7 like to testify.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Summary of written
12 public comments. Dr. Schroeder.

13

14 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we don't
15 have any written public comments on this proposal.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Anyone else want
18 to testify on this, any member of the public. Mr. See.

19

20 MR. SEE: My name is Michael See. I'm
21 out of Hoonah. I'd like to go on record as supporting
22 Mr. Jackson. I have seen where you have people come in
23 from like logging camps and what have you and what they
24 can do to a fishery. We have a stream in Hoonah where
25 these guys go in with dipnets and they'd take 50 cohos a
26 day. It doesn't take very many people like that to
27 really cause an effect on a stream. I'd just like to go
28 on record that I do support him. Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any questions for
31 Mr. See.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, sir.
36 Any other members of the public that would like to
37 testify at this time on Proposal 25. Last call.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. At this
42 time we're at Regional Council deliberations,
43 recommendations, justification. The language starts on
44 page 106, FP05-25, starting on page 106. Need a motion.
45 Mr. Hernandez.

46

47 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll try, Mr. Chairman.
48 I move that we adopt Proposal FP05-25 with the language
49 on page 106 which actually deletes the language listed
50 there on the page.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second.

2

3 MR. KOOKESH: Second.

4

5 MR. STOKES: I'll second.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved
8 and seconded to adopt the language of FP05-25 as shown on
9 page 106. The new language will read only Federally-
10 qualified subsistence users may harvest sockeye salmon in
11 streams draining into Falls Lake Bay and Gut Bay. In the
12 Falls Lake Bay and Gut Bay drainages, the possession
13 limit is 10 sockeye salmon per household. In the Pillar
14 Bay drainage, the individual possession limit is 15
15 sockeye salmon with a household possession limit of 25
16 sockeye salmon. Discussion. Dr. Garza.

17

18 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I will be
19 voting against the motion. The possession limit for
20 subsistence users is 10 sockeye per household or 15
21 sockeye per household for Pillar Bay. That's low. That
22 demonstrates to me that there is a conservation concern.
23 I remember this fishery from when we first looked at
24 implementing Federal regulations based on State
25 regulations. We met in Kake some number of years ago.
26 Mr. Jackson was there and he absolutely pushed that we
27 needed to have higher levels for that area because it is
28 a long run to get from Kake and you can't go down there
29 for just 10 fish. We were very conservative in our
30 approach in providing them more opportunity because of
31 conservation concerns. So, with that conservation in
32 mind, whatever conservation we support here should be for
33 subsistence, not to expand to a broader range of people.

34

35

36 Is there a conservation concern? Yes, I
37 think there is. What is the effect on subsistence users?
38 It will increase competition on what I understand is a
39 very small resource. Does substantial data support the
40 recommendation? The data I think has been confusing, but
41 what I understand is that Kake is not getting their
42 subsistence needs met as is and we're adding competition
43 to that. What is the effect of this proposal on other
44 subsistence users? It does not provide them that
45 opportunity, but they have opportunity in other areas.
46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr.
49 Garza. I have one thing I'd like to add on the
50 information. Several people brought this up and what is

1 good data and what isn't. One of the things that I found
2 over the years is suspect data. To me it's shown on
3 Table 3 on page 110. This is very similar data to you'll
4 see just about everywhere in Southeast Alaska. In
5 particular, I'm thinking of Redoubt, which has like 30 or
6 40 years of data. When you compare the number of permits
7 to the limit that's there, you're going to find that it's
8 pretty much that way. What I have found is that when
9 we're seeing evidence of a failure at that stream, we
10 start to see the numbers decrease. Instead of expecting
11 to see 400 with 20 permits, we'll see 350, we'll see 300.
12 When there's good fishing, we're going to see 450 or
13 something like that. Don't base everything on this data,
14 but if we were to base anything on it, if I look at that
15 last number, 203, that looks like they're getting 17 fish
16 or something like that, isn't it, a piece, roughly? I
17 believe it's 20 that you can take down there. So that's
18 indicative to me of something gone wrong there because
19 you're not fulfilling your permit. In every other case
20 people normally put down, well, I got my limit, 20. I
21 just wanted to bring that up.

22
23 Also, another key thing that I want you
24 to remember that was made, I heard the statement our
25 needs are not being met and that's what we're up here
26 for. So we've got to remember that. Other Council. Mr.
27 Bangs.

28
29 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 I'll try to make this as quick as possible. I, too, am
31 against this proposal but in light of the testimony, it's
32 obvious they're not meeting their needs. The part that's
33 surprising to me is the numbers that the Department
34 furnished us here and it shows a dramatic increase in the
35 commercial harvest right off of the Bay of Pillars. I
36 don't think they do port sampling or scale samples to
37 determine the origin of those fish, but, to me, that
38 would signal that something is changing. I've heard on
39 the dock from seiners that there's a lot more pressure by
40 the seine fleet in that area. I don't seine, but I hear
41 there's a lot more what they call money fish. For that
42 reason alone, I think it's not in the Department's best
43 interest to supply information like this and then give a
44 proposal to open it up. Anyway, I just wanted to say
45 that. Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
48 Bangs. Other Council. I think we covered the points.
49 If you want to add anything. Mr. Jordan.
50

1 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I see the
2 situation a little differently and I have really
3 struggled with this. I really appreciate the testimony
4 from Kake and that has weighed heavily on me. To me, the
5 data indicates there's sufficient fish there for a sport
6 fishery and I see the situation differently than Dolly.
7 I notice that we just passed a regulation for all the
8 streams not listed the sockeye limit is 10. This is more
9 liberal than that. I still think it's small. If there
10 had been a proposal here based on the information I see
11 in front of me to raise that limit to 20 for subsistence
12 users, I would have supported it.

13
14 As tempting as it is to support whacking
15 the non-Federal qualified users in this case, based on
16 the data I have in front of me, and in spite of the
17 public testimony, I don't think the sport fishery is the
18 problem here. I think if there are some problems as my
19 fellow Council member alluded to, and even though I'm the
20 commercial representative and I don't know what we do
21 about it, the problem is the dramatic increase over the
22 years in the commercial sockeye harvested in Chatham
23 Straits.

24
25 For those reasons I will be supporting
26 the proposal because I don't see it documented
27 conservation concern, I don't think the sport fishery
28 will have a dramatic negative effect or even a negative
29 effect on subsistence users from the data I see. I think
30 the data and the Staff testimony in the final analysis
31 supports the recommendation to me and I think if we
32 reject it, it will have a negative effect on the sport
33 users. Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just to be clear,
36 we're not whacking anybody. What this proposal would do
37 would open it to them. They've already been on a
38 closure. This was a hotly-debated issue for those who
39 haven't been on the Council that long. So this attempts
40 to open it back up, not close it. Any other Council.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready for
45 the question.

46
47 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
50 before you is FP05-25 as shown on page 106. The language

1 reads as follows: only Federally-qualified subsistence
2 users may harvest sockeye salmon in streams draining into
3 Falls Lake Bay and Gut Bay. In the Falls Lake Bay and
4 Gut Bay drainages, the possession limit is 10 sockeye
5 salmon per household. In the Pillar Bay drainage, the
6 individual possession limit is 15 sockeye salmon with a
7 household possession limit of 25 sockeye salmon. All
8 those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

9

10 MR. JORDAN: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
13 same sign.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion has
18 failed. Our recommendation is do not adopt on 25. We're
19 going to go to 29. We have two people that want to
20 testify from the public. We also have a Staff member
21 here that needs to make a presentation. So we're going
22 to go with Proposal 29.

23

24 DR. GARZA: If you're looking, it's page
25 131.

26

27 MR. REEVES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
28 name is Jeff Reeves. I'm the subsistence fisheries
29 biologist. I represent the Craig, Thorne Bay and
30 Ketchikan ranger districts. As Dr. Garza just said, the
31 executive summary is found on Page 131.

32

33 Upon my arrival and I thumbed through a
34 Council booklet, I noticed that several of the tables and
35 the appendices that I included did not wind up in the
36 analysis, so there is an addendum handout that has tables
37 2, 3 and 4 along with appendices A and B.

38

39 Proposal FP05-29 was submitted by William
40 Welton of Thorne Bay. He's requesting the re-
41 implementation of a 36-inch minimum size limit along with
42 a two fish annual bag limit on the Federal subsistence
43 steelhead fisheries for Prince of Wales and Kosciusko
44 Island.

45

46 In the State regulatory history, all
47 steelhead were either harvested incidentally in
48 subsistence or commercial fisheries or under sportfish
49 regulations. Prior to 1994, the State had a very liberal
50 sportfishing regulation that allowed the take of one

1 steelhead a day any size. In the early '90s, numerous
2 systems were closed by emergency order and in 1994 the
3 Board of Fisheries revised the sportfishing regulation to
4 a one fish daily, two fish annual limit with a 36-inch
5 size restriction. The daily limit could be two fish if
6 one of them was shown to be a hatchery fish as evidenced
7 by a healed adipose scar.

8
9 The commercial fishing regulations were
10 also changed during this cycle, which prohibited the sale
11 of net caught steelhead. These fish, although they were
12 prohibited from being sold, could be retained for
13 personal use. The troll fishery was not restricted and
14 was allowed to sell steelhead.

15
16 In 2003, the Board of Fisheries revised
17 the current region wide sportfishing regulation to only
18 allow the two fish bag limit in Ketchikan Creek and the
19 Klawock River, which at that time were the only two
20 locations where potentially adipose clipped steelhead
21 would still be found.

22
23 In March of 2004, ADF&G issued an
24 emergency order that was only effective from April 1st to
25 the middle of June that basically closed all but eight
26 systems to the retention of steelhead on Prince of Wales
27 and Kosciusko Islands.

28
29 On the Federal side of things, in the
30 FY2001 fisheries regulatory cycle, the first steelhead
31 regulation was put on the books. It virtually mirrored
32 the State sportfishing regulation. During the 2002 cycle,
33 the Board rejected both FP02-40, which was to further
34 liberalize the fishery due to potential conservation
35 concerns.

36
37 In the '03 regulatory cycle, based on
38 some new household harvest survey evidence, the Board
39 went on and liberalized the fishery by modifying 03-25,
40 which put the current regulation in the books.

41
42 In last year's cycle, 2004, the Board
43 dealt with numerous proposals opposing FP01-31, -32, -34,
44 -35, -36 and -37. Those proposals dealt with several
45 issues, monthly or weekly mandatory reporting, there was
46 a fin clipping proposal and I believe there was three
47 that would revert or further restrict the fishery. Due
48 to the low participation that was indicated by permit
49 returns, the Board opposed those. However, based on
50 testimony heard at the Council meeting in Craig, they did

1 support FP04-33, which added Koskiusko Island into the
2 current fishery under Federal permit.

3
4 Steelhead are present in 74 known
5 drainages on POW Island and four on Koskiusko. The
6 majority of steelhead are present on these islands in
7 April and May. Most of them contain spring stocks.
8 There are a small portion that do contain fall run
9 stocks. Spring stocks are dominant and fall steelhead
10 have only been documented in 13 drainages on Prince of
11 Wales. There are no known fall run stocks on Koskiusko.

12
13 Actual population numbers on the POW and
14 Koskiusko drainages are unknown. Tentative escapements
15 for some systems were estimated during the 1980s and no
16 predictive models have been developed to determine
17 harvestable surpluses. The available information for POW
18 steelhead that we have is very limited. Since '94, both
19 the ADF&G and the Forest Service have initiated index
20 snorkel surveys on some of the island drainages.

21
22 Table 1 on page 139 list some of these
23 drainages that are snorkeled and the peak index counts
24 that were seen for those years. How well those counts
25 indicate trends is relatively unknown. There has been
26 very little data collected to relate those counts, the
27 actual escapement. This here on the 12 Mile project that
28 Doug McBride spoke about earlier in his presentation, the
29 index counts that we got while we were snorkeling, when
30 we compared that to the actual number of tagged fish that
31 we knew were up there, the variation ranged from 15 to 86
32 percent of what we were seeing.

33
34 We had a period during the project where
35 about 84 to 97 percent of our total visual escapement
36 counts were seen in like a hundred yard distance above
37 the weir where these fish were stalled due to low flows
38 during their downstream migration. Although we had a
39 high range of 86 percent, because of those fish being
40 stalled at the weir, there's a good chance that that 86
41 percent is well above what it would normally be if those
42 fish were allowed to move through the system.

43
44 Length data for the island is lacking.
45 Table 2, which is in the addendum, shows a sample of
46 1,125 steelhead. The majority of those are from the
47 Karta River. The 85 or so fish that we sampled I believe
48 from 12 Mile were added in there. The fish out of 12
49 Mile seemed to be a lot larger, but when those fish were
50 added in, the length composition only jumped by another

1 tenth of a percent, so the data shows that only seven-
2 tenths of a percent are 36 inches or larger. Again,
3 because those are mainly derived from the Karta River,
4 they still may not fully represent the other island
5 drainages.

6
7 Household subsistence harvest surveys
8 estimated harvest by POW communities at roughly 600
9 steelhead a year mostly taken by rod and reel. During
10 the course of the 2003 subsistence season, which was the
11 first permitted steelhead fishery, 76 permits were issued
12 to POW residents. This fishery resulted in the harvest
13 of only 24 steelhead. The winter 2003 season, which was
14 the first winter fishery that was directed at fall run
15 stocks, resulted in a total of 10 permits issued with a
16 reported harvest of two steelhead. The spring 2004
17 fishery resulted in the issuance of 40 permits to island
18 residents and a reported harvest of only 26 steelhead.

19
20 On Table 3 you can find a breakdown of
21 communities and the harvest by those communities. It
22 shows a breakdown from the community harvest surveys
23 along with the three Federal steelhead fisheries to date.
24 It's unknown why there's discrepancies between what was
25 reported in the household surveys and what's reported on
26 the Federal permits. Factors could include changes in
27 the community populations following that household
28 survey, the availability of access to alternate resources
29 such as the subsistence halibut fishery, and the fact
30 that some households within communities may harvest
31 regardless of a permit requirement.

32
33 Liberal sport regulations up until 1991
34 resulted in large sport harvest of steelhead on POW.
35 Table 4 shows sport harvest for Southeast of steelhead
36 and for POW Island for comparison. You'll notice from
37 that table that sport harvest peaked in the year 1987
38 with an estimated harvest of 1,950 steelhead. Since '94,
39 the estimated sport harvests have ranged from a low of
40 zero to a high of 114.

41
42 The total catch for Prince of Wales in
43 the year 2000 was estimated at 4,104 steelhead and catch
44 includes fish that were both harvested or fish that were
45 caught and then released back into the water.

46
47 Published mortality studies suggest a two
48 to three percent catch and release mortality for
49 steelhead caught with artificial lures or gear.
50 Managers, to be conservative, will commonly assume about

1 a five percent mortality for catch and release. Bait
2 mortality has been found to be three to nine times higher
3 than that of artificial lures.

4
5 The commercial fishing bycatch is also
6 found in Table 4 and ranges from a low of 533 to a high
7 of 11,540 prior to the 1994 regulation changes with a
8 majority of that bycatch occurring in gillnet fisheries.

9
10 Since 1997, fewer than 50 reported
11 landings have occurred yearly and those come from the
12 troll fishery. The recent estimates, there is some
13 uncertainty with them as the net caught steelhead are not
14 documented.

15
16 This proposal will restrict subsistence
17 harvest of steelhead on POW and Kosciusko and reverse the
18 Board's decision establishing the current regulation.
19 Household harvest surveys have indicated a harvest level
20 of seven fish per household and 600 fish total for POW.
21 The Subsistence Board's action in 2002 was designed to
22 accommodate the harvest as documented. An annual
23 household limit of two fish will not meet the subsistence
24 user's documented use of the seven steelhead per
25 household for the households that reported using them and
26 it would be an unnecessary restriction to those users.

27
28 Harvest opportunity for Federally-
29 qualified users would also be greatly reduced and catch
30 and release mortality could increase with an re-
31 implementation of a minimum size restriction. Based on
32 the low reported harvest from the Federal fisheries,
33 little or no effects would result for other user groups
34 by further restricting the fishery.

35
36 Staff's preliminary conclusion is to
37 oppose this proposal. The largest issues facing the
38 steelhead fishery on POW are the large numbers of
39 Federally qualified fishers and the ease of access to the
40 small road accessible systems. This issue was addressed,
41 following consultation with ADF&G, by implementing a two
42 fish annual limit and a 36-inch size restriction along
43 with the prohibition of spears on 24 small roadside
44 drainages during the spring season fishery and two of
45 those are also restricted during the winter fishery. If,
46 in the future, participation and harvest does increase,
47 the Federal manager can require more stringent harvest
48 regulations under his or her existing regulatory
49 authority. Direction was given after two years to report
50 back to the Council and the Federal Subsistence Board so

1 any modifications to permit requirements, seasons, bag
2 limits, harvest caps or other regulations concerning the
3 fishery could be addressed. No modifications are
4 believed to be needed at this time.

5
6 Current harvest opportunities are being
7 managed conservatively to reflect documented sustainable
8 use. The reported harvest during the 2003 spring fishery
9 was 24 steelhead and during the 2004 spring fishery was
10 26. All these steelhead were taken from larger systems
11 on POW, with harvest from each system being well below
12 the ten percent annual exploitation rate. Based on the
13 permit data, there has been no reported harvest from any
14 of the small steelhead drainages regardless of access.

15
16 Concern over the fall run stocks was
17 addressed between State and Federal staff prior to action
18 by the Board in December 2002. To provide harvest
19 opportunity while protecting fall steelhead from
20 excessive harvest, an annual harvest cap of 100 steelhead
21 was placed on the winter season fishery, with the winter
22 harvests included in the cap for both seasons. Reported
23 harvest during the winter 2003 fishery was two steelhead,
24 both harvested from the Klawock River.

25
26 An annual household limit of two fish
27 over 36 inches does not meet subsistence users documented
28 use of seven steelhead per household for households who
29 use them. This would be an unnecessary restriction to
30 subsistence users. Although reported harvests have been
31 low, permit returns have indicated that some households
32 have harvested an annual limit of five steelhead during
33 the spring fishery.

34
35 Again, based on the low reported harvests
36 from the Federal fisheries, there would be little or no
37 effects for other user groups by further restricting the
38 fishery.

39
40 This concludes my presentation. I'm open
41 for any questions you may have.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.
44 Council questions. Mr. Jordan.

45
46 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I want to
47 commend you, and I'm sorry I forgot your name, on an
48 excellent report and I have one question. I was looking
49 at Table 2 and my experience in other Southeast is that
50 the average size of steelhead vary from stream to stream

1 depending on a whole bunch of factors. Do you see the
2 same thing on Prince of Wales?

3

4 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chair, Mr. Jordan. With
5 the limited number of steelheads I've seen out of many of
6 the systems, there is a size variation. I can recall
7 last year the majority of the steelhead that I was
8 visually seeing in Cheheen Creek looked like they were
9 probably no more than 22 inches in length and there was
10 about 15 to 20 of them. Then again this past spring on
11 the 12 Mile project, I believe the average size of
12 steelhead that we passed through the weir was pushing 31
13 inches. So, yes, there is a variation. The Karta River
14 is one of the largest systems on the island and in
15 looking at that data even there it still shows that those
16 really large steelhead are just fairly non-existent.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's Jeff Reeves,
19 by the way. I have one question for you and that is
20 we've received earlier testimony on a different project
21 that some of this data may be bogus. Of course, we
22 always have to remember that data has to be interpreted,
23 there has to be some error in there, we know that. But
24 I'm going to ask you on your best professional judgment.
25 If you feel that there's severe or moderate or what kind
26 of under-reporting. You know, there's obviously
27 something going on here. Maybe one fish, two fish, but
28 not 20. Maybe you could characterize what you think is
29 going on and if there is a conservation concern in this
30 area.

31

32 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. The best
33 answer that I could give you is that depending on the
34 community. If you look at the household harvest survey
35 numbers and the time frame they were done, there was
36 still active logging going on and the population of
37 Coffman Cove was probably twice the size it is today.
38 Perhaps there was a shift in the population. Then you
39 look at Hydaburg where from the household surveys we had
40 an estimated harvest of 172 fish and we've had one permit
41 issued and it looks like two permits issues this past
42 spring.

43

44 I have taken the approach to work with
45 Mr. Christianson of the Hydaburg Cooperative Association
46 to have permits issued down there to see if that makes a
47 difference and what I've been told down there is there's
48 people who are going to proceed with their activities
49 regardless of a piece of paper or not. The
50 discrepancies, there were several possibilities as to

1 what could be the difference in 600 compared to 26 and I
2 believe it will vary between the community that you're
3 looking at.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Staff
6 recommendation is to oppose this. We have lots of data
7 on this. Any other questions for Mr. Reeves. He has to
8 leave tonight, so this is your last opportunity. Dr.
9 Garza.

10
11 DR. GARZA: Not on this proposal, but I
12 want to get a feel for the FIS proposal that's requesting
13 funding for steelhead. What do you think of that
14 proposal?

15
16 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza. After
17 spending a lot of time away from my family this spring, I
18 would love to see some projects going down there. All
19 the work the Forest Service did down there to try to get
20 that on the right track could be taken care of. My
21 feeling is one of the big data lacks and one of the, I
22 think, biggest issues now, are these systems small, are
23 these systems larger, the restrictions on them, are they
24 necessary. I believe based on Turek's findings that
25 perhaps an FIS project to look at more of the stock
26 status to benefit myself as a manager to make
27 recommendations to my district ranger who has the
28 in-season authority is that perhaps if we can look at
29 these systems where we know the use is going to be
30 utilized so we can make a proper choice, rather than
31 having to be ultra conservative if we didn't need to in a
32 protection measure.

33
34 My beliefs, being a resident down there
35 and what I've seen spending time on the island, is that
36 these stocks seem to be supporting what's going on. I
37 wouldn't base a scientific decision on my own belief
38 because it's just my feeling. So any data that could be
39 gathered from where these fish are being harvested would
40 be a big help in my position.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Anybody else.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I want to thank
47 you for your report. Well done and safe travels. We're
48 on Proposal 29, but we have to go to the FIS proposals.
49 Let me bring us back. I have three proposers, Anthony
50 Christianson, Richard Peterson and John Morris on 29. I

1 don't know if I'm going to take these because I need to
2 get Mr. McBride out of town tonight. I will note that
3 these gentlemen apparently appear to oppose the Staff
4 recommendation as opposed. If you're getting out of town
5 tonight and you really feel you need to testify, I'll
6 give you a couple minutes, but I just can't let this go
7 on too much longer because we're going to run out of
8 time. Mr. Christianson, go ahead.

9
10 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.
11 Chairman. I guess we're just here and we oppose the 36-
12 inch limit two annual because it puts more restriction on
13 the subsistence users of the resource without any
14 substantial data. We find it odd with the recognition of
15 the subsistence steelhead fishery on POW, the area
16 fishery biologist or whoever is in charge, closed 24
17 small systems that are probably more utilized by
18 subsistence users due to the reasoning that they are
19 small systems and it is easier to harvest their
20 subsistence needs. Spears and other gear doesn't work in
21 systems as large as the Thorne River or Klawock River as
22 it does in some of the smaller drainages. Our position
23 is to oppose.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. We're
26 not happy with all those closures either. Mr. Peterson,
27 do you want to take a couple minutes.

28
29 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 On behalf of the Organized Village of Kasaan I too oppose
31 this proposal. It severely would limit our people and
32 our need for subsistence steelhead. While I'm here, I'd
33 also like to support funding to gather more data to find
34 out what's really out there. Thank you.

35
36 DR. GARZA: For steelhead.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Mr.
39 Morris.

40
41 MR. MORRIS: Can I turn it over to Mr.
42 Demmert?

43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You're turning it
45 over to Mr. Demmert. Okay. A couple minutes.

46
47 MR. DEMMERT: Thank you. It had to be
48 about three years ago that we wrote a proposal to
49 liberalize the steelhead regulations because they were
50 too stringent on our people that were utilizing the

1 resource, so we oppose this strongly. Thank you guys for
2 opposing as well.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I
5 guess those are all that are leaving. We're going to
6 come back into this tomorrow. Right now what I'd like to
7 do is go back to the FIS proposals. Mr. McBride.

8

9 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Table 4 is on
10 page 170 and Table 5 is on page 172.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it the
13 Council's wish to just take them in that order?

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing no
18 objection, let's do that. Let's put Kook Lake on the
19 floor, please. I would like to get a motion to adopt the
20 Proposal 05-601.

21

22 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I would move
23 that we accept the recommendation of the TRC for
24 accepting Proposals 603, 604 and 601 in that order.

25

26 MR. KITKA: Second.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been
29 moved and seconded that we accept the recommended funding
30 of the TRC in accordance with the priority shown on page
31 171, is that correct?

32

33 DR. GARZA: Yes.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Discussion. Mr.
36 Hernandez first. I don't know if we have to justify
37 these like that, but we do need some justification in the
38 record for why we're going to take this action. Go
39 ahead.

40

41 MR. DOUVILLE: Just to clarify something.
42 I believe that the table on page 171, which lists them
43 603, 604, 601 we would be prioritizing them in that
44 order?

45

46 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, that's
47 correct. The recommendation is actually shown on the
48 table and that's why I referenced that. They're saying
49 yes, yes, yes. Discussion. Mr. Hernandez.

50

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 I support funding these three projects; however, when it
3 comes to the priority, if we're going to rank them in
4 priority status, although I would be expected to be
5 supporting Prince of Wales Island steelhead assessment
6 above Kook Lake sockeye assessment, I would rather
7 support the Kook Lake sockeye assessment higher up on the
8 list. I feel that sockeye stocks are more important than
9 steelhead stocks. In my view, sockeye stocks is what
10 puts food on the table far more than steelhead. Although
11 being a species of great concern, it's not a very large
12 factor in what people actually depend on. As I say I'm
13 for the funding of that project, but as far as the
14 priority I think I would like to recommend Kook Lake be
15 placed above that.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you making
18 that in the form of an amendment that we rank them in the
19 order of sockeye salmon over steelhead?

20
21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I guess I would have
22 to phrase that as an amendment to the motion to list the
23 priorities as Klawock Lake, Kook Lake and Prince of Wales
24 Island steelhead.

25
26 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, we can make
27 this a friendly amendment.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's no such
30 thing, but let's just make sure that the record shows
31 that.

32
33 DR. GARZA: I can be unfriendly if you
34 want me to.

35
36 (Laughter)

37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't want you
39 to be unfriendly at all, but let's just make sure we're
40 clarifying what the Council's intent here is. We're
41 going to put these in that order, so that's how they're
42 being considered now. Mr. Jordan.

43
44 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, I'm supportive of
45 voting for funding for all three of these. The question
46 I have, is there a limit on funds? If I vote to fund all
47 three of these, does that affect whether we can support
48 the TEK proposals on the next page on Table 5 because
49 that might affect my vote if I couldn't support all of
50 them.

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm going to turn
2 this over to Mr. McBride. My take is there's 42,000
3 there, but it's already been allocated. If you could
4 explain that further what this vote would mean if we were
5 to accept.

6
7 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. Yes, funding
8 these three projects would utilize all the available
9 funds for this year. The \$42,000 that Chairman
10 Littlefield referenced is the difference between the
11 total cost of these projects and the target funding
12 amount for Southeast. The way we view those targets is
13 they're approximate targets. That's what we attempt to
14 hit with the recommendation, but in a low money year like
15 this, our ability to hit those on the head is limited.
16 You're limited by the limited dollars and the projects we
17 have available. Mr. Chairman.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Jordan.
20 Follow up.

21
22 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, and this is a
23 question for you. What's happening here? Is the Council
24 ready to support all of these because we're looking at
25 them as a package and we've ranked them in the order that
26 the Council wants and then not support the others? I'm
27 trying to get a sense of where the Council is headed.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

30
31 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. As the maker
32 of the motion, it was my intent to fully accept the
33 recommendation of TRC, that the money go to the first
34 three, the stock assessment guys. We may discuss if we
35 can do something with 42,000 with one of the TEK's, but
36 they would not be fully funded. We may also say let's
37 put that money to a current TEK project and see if they
38 can do a little more with it. So, in the past, we've
39 taken 20,000 and said, okay, Mike Turek, can you add that
40 to your current TEK project and get some steelhead
41 harvest data for us and he did and that was pretty cool.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The answer is, if
44 you vote yes to accept this, there will be no funding
45 left for the TEK projects. The 42,000, even though it's
46 shown there, has been allocated to the Southcentral for
47 projects they were underfunded. It's not just free
48 money, but theoretically it's money that was part of the
49 62 percent that goes to the Tongass. We were allocated
50 413, we're spending 370, but that's not enough to fund

1 either of the other projects. Is that clear?

2

3 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair, I'm really on the
4 fence here. I'd really appreciate comments from other
5 Council members. It would help guide my decision-making
6 here.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council
9 members. Mr. Kookesh.

10

11 MR. KOOKESH: I don't know what you're
12 looking for, Mr. Jordan, but from what I saw in this
13 proposal was the material on page 172. I feel that the
14 makers of the HM/TEK project need to go back and start
15 working on the proposal and I'd like to see more of a
16 partnership and a collaboration effort on the local
17 level. I'd like to see more done and I'd like to see
18 this thing fine tuned before I support it. I'd like to
19 see this one go back and be redrawn. I certainly don't
20 have anything against what they're trying to do. It's
21 just that I think it needs some work yet and that's where
22 I'm coming from.

23

24 I support the other ones because of the
25 fact that the TRC says they need a lot of criteria and I
26 have to go there. Hopefully this will help you fall off
27 the fence there.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'll let the
30 discussion go astray a little bit on this because it
31 addresses partly Mr. Jordan's question. Although the
32 customary trade proposals are not on the floor right now,
33 it effectively would kill the funding for them. So
34 discussion on them is appropriate.

35

36 What I'd like to do is ask a question of
37 Mr. McBride. Earlier, when I had the principal
38 investigator here, I asked him a question, whether he
39 could adapt and what he thought the problems were and
40 stuff like that and he said he could adapt. That was one
41 of the things he said he could do. He also said that his
42 recollection of the problem between the TRC was that that
43 was a problem of methodology. We discussed that and I
44 can't dispute his because obviously he can do some
45 methodology.

46

47 But I would like to have the other side
48 of the story, which is Mr. McBride's side of the story,
49 of why he would say maybe this is or isn't. You
50 characterize what you think the differences are and

1 whether they can be successfully implemented in this
2 calendar year.

3
4 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. The majority
5 of the TRC had some really significant questions about
6 the documentation and methodology in the investigation
7 plan. I would disagree with Dr. Langdon that it wasn't
8 dueling methodologies. It wasn't that the TRC was saying
9 we want you to do it this way instead of the way you have
10 proposed. The methodology that Dr. Langdon explained to
11 you is basically what's in the investigation plan. But
12 there were a lot of questions about the details of that
13 and that's what the investigation plan is supposed to do
14 and that becomes really important when we get to the
15 implementation stage where we have to take this
16 investigation plan and it becomes the backbone of the
17 contract that will be written with these investigators to
18 get this product. That's where myself and particularly
19 Cal Casipit enter into this. So when you have an
20 investigation plan that has that level of questions, it
21 becomes really hard to write a contract that ensures
22 you're going to get a product.

23
24 So, in direct answer to your question,
25 Mr. Chairman, I think they're fixable but I don't think
26 they're very fixable within the time frame that we have
27 left for this round of proposals. Our track record of
28 making those levels of changes in this short a time frame
29 is not good. That is why the majority of the TRC
30 recommended to highlight this subject matter for the next
31 call for proposals and deal with these changes the next
32 round like we did with the steelhead project over the
33 last year. Mr. Chairman.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'd like to ask
36 Dr. Chen to take a seat here too because he is a member
37 of the Technical Review Committee and perhaps he could
38 clarify that. Then we have a question from Dr. Garza.
39 If you'll just both stay there until we get this hashed
40 out.

41
42 DR. GARZA: I thought we were going to
43 hear from you first. I guess I wanted to respond to you,
44 Eric, and the motion I made was very difficult for me
45 because I strongly support 30 percent to TEK absolutely,
46 no doubt. We've underfunded that area and my concerns
47 were several. One, that I thought the amount of funds
48 that actually went to the local community to do their
49 work didn't allow for capacity building and you look at
50 the monitoring projects with Meg Cartright and involving

1 Klawock and involving Angoon and the capacity building
2 there is phenomenal. So that is a strong support for me.

3

4

5 I think that the three resource projects
6 were absolutely needed despite the fact that the Kook had
7 the lower rating there wasn't a problem with me. The
8 data is necessary to me. The steelhead was absolutely
9 necessary because probably when we re-evaluate our goals,
10 steelhead is going to drop out again and this could be
11 our last chance to get some good funding and some good
12 work on steelhead, so that was my rationale for keeping
13 it in.

14

15 And then the final thing for the TEK was
16 -- I mean the tribes just came in, they just went through
17 a workshop on how to write FIS proposals, how to do TEK,
18 how to do harvest monitoring projects and I'm hoping that
19 we get proposals from them next year. Some of those
20 proposals may be trying to do the same thing that Langdon
21 was doing only from the community perspective and that I
22 would strongly support. Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Chen, you can
25 comment on this if you would, please.

26

27 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
28 Would you like me to comment specifically on the harvest
29 monitoring TEK proposal and the TRC discussions on that?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm going to give
32 you the latitude that you desire. You're a member of
33 that TRC and you can say whatever you want. You know
34 what we're struggling with right here, so whatever you
35 want to offer to help us get where we're going would be
36 appreciated.

37

38 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As
39 you indicated, I'm a member of the TRC representing the
40 Bureau of Indian Affairs. I was among some of the folks
41 that were of the minority viewpoint with regards to the
42 HM/TEK study regarding customary trade. A couple of my
43 colleagues are in the social sciences field, Dr. Jim Fall
44 and Mr. Taylor Brelsford and they were advocating
45 strongly for approval of this proposal. Although social
46 sciences is not my field, I was compelled by some of the
47 arguments they presented about the merits of the
48 particular project. So I was convinced about their
49 arguments regarding the technical merit of the project
50 and it should be rated higher than what the rest of the

1 TRC provided.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

4

5 DR. GARZA: Thank you. I much appreciate
6 those comments. In the motion that I made and as I
7 stated earlier I had in no way questioned the
8 capabilities of Professor Langdon. I think he's a great
9 professor. He's done absolutely phenomenal work around
10 Southeast. He has a strong commitment to documenting
11 Southeast uses of fishery resources over time. My
12 concern was although it has great merit, who should be
13 doing it. To me, the more local we go in terms of the
14 tribes and tribal participation, the greater support
15 you're going to get from me. Thanks.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you
18 characterize that as saying you and your contemporaries
19 had the same minority viewpoint were strongly in favor of
20 customary trade projects?

21

22 MR. CHEN: The issue of customary trade
23 is, of course, very important before the Board, so
24 projects that are designed to answer some of the
25 questions and provide information for the Board are also
26 deemed important. This particular one, customary trade,
27 this proposal, the investigator, Dr. Langdon, is a very
28 accomplished researcher in his field. We felt that his
29 methodologies, past experience, his ability to work with
30 local Native organizations was probably unparalleled.
31 Those are strong points for us to consider with regard to
32 recommending his study.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Are
35 there any other questions for the Interagency Staff
36 Committee and also Staff.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thanks for filling
41 in the blanks. We all know where we've got to go.
42 Thanks for helping us out here. Are you ready for the
43 question. Does everybody understand what's going on
44 here?

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
49 before you is to fund Projects 05-603, 05-601, 05-604, in
50 that order, for 2005 and the amount is \$370,500. Is that

1 the recommendation of the Regional Advisory Council. All
2 those in favor of that. Let's put it on page 171 just
3 for the record in the order of steelhead as the last
4 priority, but they're still effectively funding those
5 three projects. All in favor of doing so please signify
6 by saying aye.

7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
11 same sign.

12
13 (No opposing votes)

14
15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Now our
16 recommendation. We're not funding these. Let's make
17 that clear. We're going to make a recommendation that
18 these three projects be funded and that exhausts the
19 available funds, but it doesn't exhaust your ability to
20 say something about the other two projects if you would
21 like to.

22
23 DR. GARZA: I think it pretty much
24 exhausts the Council, John. We're getting tired.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're not
27 exhausted yet because what we're going to do now folks, I
28 said earlier 6:00, we're going to go back to 29 because
29 we're going to try to get some of this done. We've got a
30 ways to go. Let's go back to Proposal 29 and get the
31 State comments. The gentleman in the back, I know you're
32 leaving and I would like to thank you for your input in
33 the meeting as well as attending the other part. We know
34 we're going to see you guys again.

35
36 MR. CHRISTIANSON: You're welcome.

37
38 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, John.

39
40 MS. SEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members
41 of the Council, members of the public. We note that we
42 didn't see the Federal data tables handed out. In fact,
43 I still haven't seen them but we will at some point
44 presumably.

45
46 I have modified the comments just
47 slightly to make sure they're clear. The written version
48 you have presumed we were going to do 28 before 29. I'll
49 just recapture a couple of points that you would have
50 already heard in 28 had we done them in that order.

1 The Federal analysis provided to you
2 offers relevant background about the regulatory history.
3 There was quite a good summary provided to you from
4 Federal Staff. We also note that as we recommend, and
5 you'll hear this tomorrow about Proposal 28, that we
6 think it's really key to obtain specific stock and
7 harvest assessment to help determine steelhead abundance
8 and harvest patterns. Thank you. I have just now
9 received the Federal tables.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: These Federal
12 tables were given to you in previous information, is that
13 correct?

14
15 MS. SEE: I don't know. I haven't seen
16 them yet. I would have to look at them. I don't know.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's my
19 understanding that this information was made available to
20 the State previously and in the packet that went out
21 quite some time ago, but it's new to us. We didn't have
22 it in our Board book. That's my understanding. But the
23 information was made available to the State.

24
25 MS. SEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for that
26 comment. In continuing, the BIA proposal to the FIS
27 program, which you just finished discussing, which is
28 about steelhead populations, we think that is a key way
29 to help obtain information about the species. That
30 really relates to this and any other related proposals
31 about Prince of Wales steelhead. We really think it's
32 key to get that information as part of looking at the
33 range of concerns addressed in this and other proposals.

34
35 We also note that the Federal analysis
36 mentioned the intent of the Federal Subsistence Board
37 that the current Federal regulation be assessed after two
38 years. We think that's an important step. At this time,
39 the harvest monitoring program for the Federal
40 subsistence permits does show a disparity between
41 reported harvests and community harvest information.

42
43 We encourage the Regional Advisory
44 Council to help support improved harvest monitoring for
45 these Federal subsistence fisheries on POW Island. We
46 also have Staff here from the three divisions that work
47 with data regarding this proposal and steelhead and
48 harvest. So, if there are questions of detail, we can
49 certainly bring any of them up to help. Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I'd
2 note that we did recommend for funding the steelhead
3 proposal. Are there any questions for ADF&G on Proposal
4 No. 29. Again, state your position.

5
6 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, our preliminary
7 recommendation on this proposal is that we are neutral.
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any questions.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. We're
15 at tribal governments. Any tribal governments that would
16 like to testify for Proposal 29. I got the other three
17 gentleman, but is there anybody else.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's fine.
22 Let's move to Interagency Staff Committee. Mr. Kessler.

23
24 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman and Council.
25 The Interagency Staff Committee believes that the
26 information in front of you is complete. The committee
27 supports the preliminary conclusion of the proposal
28 analysis to oppose.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any
31 questions for the Interagency Staff Committee.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, sir.
36 Fish and Game Advisory Committees. Any Fish and Game
37 Advisory Committees present.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Summary of written
42 public comments. Dr. Schroeder.

43
44 DR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. We haven't
45 received any written public comments for this proposal.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other public
48 testimony. Any member of the public that would like to
49 testify on Proposal 29. Your last chance.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. This is before the Council. I have this starting on page 131, FP05-29. I would like to have a motion.

DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. To put it on the table, I move we support the FP05-29 as written on page 131.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second.

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the language for FP05-29 as shown on page 131. The language is shown in the proposed regulation in bold and it states: For all streams on Prince of Wales Island, the minimum size limit is 36" with an annual household limit of 2 fish. Discussion. Dr. Garza and then Mr. Jordan.

DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I will be voting against this proposal. In looking at our four criteria, is there a conservation concern. I do not believe there is. The current subsistence harvest level as reported by biologist Jeff Reeves is relatively low compared to the stock on the island. What is the effect on the subsistence user? It would be substantial. Again, referring to Mr. Reeves handouts, less than one percent of the stock is over 36 inches. That obviously does not provide opportunity for subsistence users if that's what they're limited to. Does substantial data support the recommendation? I do not believe it does. What is the effect of this proposal on other users? I'm not sure what the effect would be, but I can't imagine it would be much. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Mr. Jordan.

MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I agree completely with Dr. Garza and thank her for her comments. I want to comment in addition. I originally proposed a steelhead size limit for one river, Sitgo Creek, in the late 1970s that was adopted and then repealed. My experience is that steelhead size limits need to be appropriate to the watershed. If you were going to have a regional size limit, it would be more in the nature of around 32 inches than 36 inches and I'm not certain

1 that's the best way to conserve steelhead. I'm with Dr.
2 Garza.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

5

6 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 I will not support this proposal either because it would
8 put a restriction on subsistence users. Before we can
9 put the restriction on subsistence users, we must
10 eliminate all other uses. Therefore, I will not support
11 it.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We've beat this to
14 death for four years or so. Any other Council comments.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
19 before you is FP05-29 as shown on page 131. Proposed
20 regulation reads adding the bold language to
21 27(i)(13)(iv), for all streams on Prince of Wales Island,
22 the minimum size limit is 36" with an annual household
23 limit of 2 fish. All in favor please signify by saying
24 aye.

25

26 (No aye votes)

27

28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
29 same sign.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The recommendation
34 of the RAC is to oppose FP05-29. I'm going to get a
35 recommendation from Mr. Casipit. We have only a couple
36 proposals left. Would you give me your recommendation on
37 what to do.

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40 Because of the nature of the remaining proposals, I
41 suggest we not attempt 28 and 30. However, we may be
42 able to do 27 if Mr. Larson is prepared to do that right
43 now. It looks like he is.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's try 27.
46 That will be starting on page 116.

47

48 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. Bob Larson
49 from the Wrangell and Petersburg Ranger Districts, Forest
50 Service. Proposal FP05-27 submitted by the Southeast

1 Alaska Regional Advisory Council working group and it
2 addresses the Area's Federal subsistence coho salmon
3 fisheries. If adopted, this proposal would remove the
4 annual harvest limit for coho salmon and delete the
5 prohibition on retaining incidentally-caught trout and
6 sockeye salmon in the Southeast Alaska area.

7
8 The intent of this proposal is to
9 standardize the Federal regulations for subsistence coho
10 fishing in Southeast Alaska. There's no restriction on
11 incidental harvest of other species while targeting coho
12 salmon in Section 3-A, 3-B and 3-C. However, there is in
13 the rest of Southeast. In Sections 3-A, 3-B or 3-C
14 there's been no enforcement or conservation concerns with
15 having no incidental harvest restrictions. Removing the
16 prohibition on incidental harvest of other species in the
17 Federal subsistence coho fishery would align State and
18 Federal regulations. Removing the annual harvest limit
19 from the Federal subsistence fishery would provide for a
20 single Federal subsistence coho fishing regulation but
21 would not align Federal and State regulations completely
22 because State regulations specify a 40 annual coho
23 harvest cap.

24
25 The coho fishery for Sections 3-A, B and
26 C, which occur in the west coast of Prince of Wales were
27 in effect during the 2001 fishing season. The subsequent
28 year, the 2002 fishing season, similar regulations were
29 adopted for the remainder of Southeast Alaska. Neither
30 of the coho salmon subsistence fishing regulations
31 restricted open areas or provided for a closed season but
32 they did severely restrict allowable gear by specifying
33 only spears, gaffs, dipnets and rod and reel. A
34 prohibition on the retention of sockeye and trout was
35 applied to all areas except Sections 3A, B and C due to
36 concerns expressed by the ADF&G concerning the lack of a
37 fishing season and the use of rod and reel.

38
39 The State adopted subsistence coho
40 fishing regulations effective in the 2003 season. These
41 regulations were valid in both freshwater and marine
42 waters and generally allowed the use of gillnets, seines,
43 dipnets, spears and gaffs. The season opening date was
44 August 15, but there was no restriction on the incidental
45 harvest of other trout or salmon.

46
47 Federal subsistence salmon harvest in
48 Southeast Alaska is closely monitored with almost 100
49 percent return of fishing permits. All the coho salmon
50 harvested in Southeast Alaska were taken from POW Island

1 in both 2002 and 2003. There were only seven sockeye
2 taken incidentally to the coho fishery and maybe not even
3 incidentally to the coho fishery in Sections 3-A, B and C
4 in 2002 and no sockeye were taken from those sections in
5 2003.

6
7 I'd like to reference Table 1 on page
8 119. It has 2002 and 2003 information on it. There it's
9 obvious that all the cohos were taken from POW Island,
10 there were no cohos taken from the remainder of Southeast
11 Alaska.

12
13 Our recommendation is that we support
14 this proposal. This change would streamline Federal
15 regulations and provide users with consistent regulations
16 for the harvest of coho salmon in the Southeast Alaska
17 Area. This proposed regulation would not change recent
18 harvest practices nor will it affect conservation of any
19 species. That's my presentation.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any
22 effect of proposals that we've taken action on that are
23 going to change any of this language here, like your hand
24 lines, et cetera?

25
26 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chairman.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I was asking if
29 any of the actions that we'd taken previously, such as
30 the action on hand lines, would affect any of the
31 proposed Federal regulation language or strike-throughs
32 and your answer is no or yes?

33
34 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, you have
35 already amended the coho fishery by including hand lines.
36 There is nothing that has been done previous to this to
37 change the portion of this proposal that involves
38 striking that section that references Section 3-A, B and
39 C.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Our action was
42 like 18 or B or whatever it is after this section that
43 we're amending right here, so it applies? You're saying
44 we can use hand lines here?

45
46 MR. LARSON: You've given the Staff
47 direction to include hand lines in this regulation. The
48 intent of this proposal is to have a consistent proposal
49 for Southeast Alaska concerning the coho fishery.
50 Nothing you've done previous to that would change that

1 intent.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Casipit.

4

5

MR. CASIPIT: Yeah. I mean we have
6 direction from you, subject to the Board approving the
7 use of hand lines. We would make the change to the
8 regulations to include hand lines. For this particular
9 regulation for cohos, we would also, subject to your
10 recommendation and the Board's action, combine these two
11 to have one set of regulations for coho for Southeast.
12 So depending on what you guys do and what the Board does,
13 there will be some changes here. If the Board approves
14 use of hand lines, we'll add hand lines here. If the
15 Board approves collapsing these together for one fishery,
16 we'll do that as well.

17

18

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, sir.

19

Mr. Douville.

20

21

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
22 have a question about should this fail, will this affect
23 the harvest limits in subdistricts A, B and C as there is
24 no annual harvest limit? However, there is a daily
25 household limit of 20.

26

27

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. If your
28 action on the sockeye proposal would not complicate this,
29 but this prohibition on incidental harvest would really
30 go away. So you've already kind of dealt with this with
31 the sockeye fishery. If you did not pass it, it would
32 remain as it was written, but with the addition of hand
33 lines probably.

34

35

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions
36 from Council or the Staff presentation. Mr. Hernandez.

37

38

MR. HERNANDEZ: Could I ask you, are we
39 going to be deliberating on this tomorrow?

40

41

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: No, I think we're
42 going to take her on tonight.

43

44

MR. HERNANDEZ: I guess I was kind of
45 hoping to see the actions we took earlier affecting coho
46 with what we might do here on this one, I was wondering
47 if we could see wording of how a new coho regulation
48 would look if we act in favor of this one and what we did
49 earlier. I don't know if that's too much to ask.

50

1 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. If I could
2 direct you back to page 116. Based on previous actions
3 by the Council, the only difference you would see in the
4 language other than what's before you would be the
5 inclusion of hand lines. That's the only change.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

8
9 MR. KOOKESH: Is the originator of the
10 proposal chairing the proposal and does that tend to
11 create a conflict of some sort? Shouldn't somebody else
12 Chair this portion.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The originator is
15 not the Chair.

16
17 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
18 remind the Council that this is the last of the series of
19 nine proposals that was developed by the working group
20 last spring and addresses a number of issues and having a
21 uniform set of coho fishing regulations is the last issue
22 before the Council from that group.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
25 questions.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Last bite of the
30 apple. Thank you. State of Alaska.

31
32 MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, members of the
33 Council and the public. My name is Marianne See with
34 Department of Fish and Game. Our comments on 27 are
35 fairly short. All coho fisheries in the region have a
36 season and annual limits under State subsistence
37 regulations and stocks are healthy. The State had
38 previously conformed to the Federal rules and those would
39 change if this proposal is adopted. We note that harvest
40 data suggest that most fishers are obtaining fish using
41 rod and reel in marine waters under State sportfishing
42 regulations or by retaining some of their commercial
43 catch and I should note that's most subsistence fishers.

44
45 There is an alternative approach that
46 could be considered. If the current Federal subsistence
47 regulations for coho salmon were also extended to Prince
48 of Wales Island, they would align the annual limits
49 throughout Southeast with State subsistence fishing
50 regulations. The Department would support this approach.

1 Proposal 27, as noted in the Federal
2 analysis, would standardize Federal rules throughout the
3 region. At the same time though, it would diverge from
4 State subsistence regulations regarding the annual
5 harvest limit. In addition, the incidental harvest
6 limits for trout that are included in the current Federal
7 subsistence coho regulations would be eliminated.

8
9 Our preliminary recommendation is that we
10 do not support the proposal as written but would support
11 the modification that I just mentioned. Thank you.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions for
14 ADF&G.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you.
19 Tribal governments. Testimony on Proposal 27.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any tribes.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Interagency Staff
28 Committee comments.

29
30 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair and members of
31 the Council. Steve Kessler with the Forest Service. The
32 Interagency Staff Committee believes the facts are before
33 you on this proposal and the committee supports the
34 preliminary conclusion of the proposal analysis.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any questions.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Fish
41 and Game Advisory Committee comments. Dr. Schroeder.

42
43 DR. SCHROEDER: There are no Fish and
44 Game Advisory Committee comments or written public
45 comments.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any members of the
48 public present that would like to testify on Proposal 27.

49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Proposal 27 is now
2 before the Regional Advisory Council. I have this
3 starting on page 116. FP05-27 as shown on page 116. I
4 need a motion. Mr. Kookesh.

5
6 MR. KOOKESH: This has nothing to do with
7 making a motion, Mr. Chair. I think it's getting kind of
8 late tonight and I was looking at the wrong proposal, so
9 I apologize if I was out of order there. I was looking
10 at number 28 here. You're keeping me past my dinner
11 appointment.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So noted. Mr.
14 Douville.

15
16 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 I move to adopt FP05-27 as written on page 116.

18
19 MR. STOKES: I'll second it.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion before
22 you is to adopt and it's been seconded, FP05-27 as shown
23 on page 116 and I'd like Dr. Schroeder to read this and
24 give me a rest, please, if you would.

25
26 DR. SCHROEDER: The new regulation would
27 read: You may take coho salmon under the terms of a
28 subsistence fishing permit except in the Stikine and Taku
29 Rivers. There is no closed season. The daily harvest
30 limit is 20 coho salmon per household. Only dipnets,
31 spears, gaffs, and (Staff will add hand lines) and rod
32 and reel may be used. Bait may only be used from
33 September 15 through November 15. The other sections are
34 deleted. Mr. Chairman.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's the motion
37 before you. Is there any discussion. Dr. Garza.

38
39 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I intend to
40 speak in favor of this motion. I think it helps. In
41 evaluating our criteria, is there a conservation
42 concerns? It doesn't attempt to create a conservation
43 concern. What is the effect on subsistence users? I
44 think it makes it easier for them to read the
45 regulations. Does substantial data support the
46 recommendation? I don't think this addresses data. What
47 is the effect of this proposal on other users? I don't
48 think there are any. The intent of the motion is try and
49 clean up some of the language and I think this does this.
50 I would commend the efforts of the subcommittee that

1 pulled together these nine proposals. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other
4 Council. Are you ready for the question. Mr. Jordan.

5

6 MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. I believe
7 earlier in our meeting we allowed the use of gaffs,
8 spears, gillnets, beach seines, dipnets, cast nets, hand
9 lines and rod and reel for the harvest of coho, so those
10 would be included in the proposal as legal gear to take
11 coho. And, of course, I'm opposed to the use of hand
12 lines for snagging coho, so I will be voting against this
13 proposal.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question
22 before you is FP05-27. The language as shown on page 116
23 and as previously read by Dr. Schroeder All those in
24 favor of adopting that language please signify by saying
25 aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed
30 same sign.

31

32 MR. JORDAN: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The recommendation
35 on FP05-27 is to adopt. We have two proposals left
36 tomorrow morning, 28 and 29. We still have quite a lot
37 to do. When Dr. Garza chairs in the morning, I know
38 we'll get through 28 and 29 in about an hour, but we
39 still have quite a bit of stuff to do, so I'd like to
40 start at 8:00 o'clock unless there's some giant
41 exception. Okay. We'll go at 8:00 o'clock. We're in
42 recess until 8:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. Thanks for
43 sticking with us. Appreciate it.

44

45 (Off record)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 257 through 422 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the VOLUME III, SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Salena Hile on the 29th day of September 2004, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at Juneau, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 13th day of October 2004.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08 _