KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

Kodiak, Alaska
September 22, 2006
9:10 o'clock a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alfred B. Cratty, Jr.
Jim Hamilton
Patrick Holmes
Richard Koso
Samuel Rohrer
Speridon Simeonoff
Peter Squartsoff
Richard Zacharof

Regional Council Coordinator, Michelle Chivers

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
3522 West 27th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99517
907-243-0668
jpk@gci.net

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Kodiak, Alaska - 9/22/2006)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's 10 after 9:00. We'd like to call this meeting to order. My time says 9:11.

Can we have roll call, please.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff. Here. Patrick Holmes.

MR. HOLMES: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Richard Zacharof.

MR. ZACHAROF: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Samuel Rohrer.

MR. ROHRER: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Alfred Cratty.

MR. CRATTY: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Jim Hamilton.

MR. HAMILTON: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vince Tutiakoff.

(No response)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul Gundersen.

(No response)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Speridon Simeonoff.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Richard Koso.

MR. KOSO: Here.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair, we do have a

quorum. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'd like to welcome everybody to our meeting this morning. If the public starts coming in, I guess we have those orange papers if they want to address the committee. We welcome you and we'll move on. Right now it's the adoption of the agenda.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. Actually we might want to start with introductions and then we've got some staff in the audience as well, so if you want to maybe start with Pat.

MR. HOLMES: I'm Pat Holmes. I'm kind of a latecomer. I didn't get to Kodiak until '63. I did 25 years with Fish and Game and have been to every village except for two between here and Nome and Attu. I love fish. I talk too much about fish. I've been on the RAC. This is my fifth or sixth year and I have 11 years with the Fish and Game Advisory Committee. I really love subsistence and the folks that live here.

MR. KOSO: My name is Rick Koso. I'm now living in Adak. Been there for the past four years. Originally from King Cove. Lived in Cold Bay, fished Aleutians most of my life. Presently I'm in Adak and it's my first meeting on the board, so brand new to this gig, but I'm looking forward to it and hopefully I can contribute.

Thank you.

MR. ZACHAROF: My name is Richard Zacharof from St. Paul Island. I've been on the board for seven years.

MR. CRATTY: Al Cratty from Old Harbor. I think I've been on the board 10 or 11 years.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: And I'm Speridon Simeonoff from the village of Akhiok. This is my second term.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff, Port Lions.

MR. HAMILTON: Jim Hamilton. I'm a hunting and fishing guide from Kodiak, commercially fished a good part of my life, sport user, subsistence

user. Glad to be here.

MR. ROHRER: I'm Sam Rohrer. I was born and raised on Kodiak Island. I've been on the board and this is my third year. Also a hunting and fishing guide, subsistence user, sport user and enjoying being on the board.

MS. CHIVERS: Michelle Chivers, Subsistence Council coordinator.

MR. HILE: I'm Nathan. I'm the court reporter.

MR. FRIED: I'm Steve Fried. I work for Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. SIEKANIEC: Sandra Siekaniec, the refuge manager at the Izembek Refuge.

MS. CRAVER: I'm Amy Craver. I work for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management and I'm an anthropologist.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm Helen Armstrong. I'm also an anthropologist for the OSM at Fish and Wildlife Service. I normally work with the North Slope Council, Seward Pen, but I'm here today to talk about rural.

MS. COHEN: Good morning. This is apparently the anthropologist section of the room. I'm an anthropologist. My name is Janet Cohen and I work with the National Park Service and I used to live and work in Kodiak.

MS. PETRIVELLI: I'm Pat Petrivelli, the BIA subsistence anthropologist.

MR. EDWARDS: Good morning. Mike Edwards, Fish and Wildlife Service out of King Salmon, fisheries biologist.

MR. SAITO: Brandon Saito, subsistence wildlife biologist for the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. VanHATTEN: Kevin VanHatten, fisheries biologist for Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. I'm Liz Williams. I'm the anthropologist for OSM Fish and Wildlife Service. For the new Council members, I used to be a subsistence anthropologist for Fish and Game in this area for four years. It's nice to meet the new people on the Council.

MR. KNAUER: Bill Knauer, policy and regulations specialist for the Office of Subsistence Management.

MR. KESSLER: Hi, I'm Steve Kessler. I work for the Forest Service and I'm on the Inter-Agency Staff Committee. I was here along with others for the hearing the last couple days.

MR. HAYES: Good morning. I'm Warren Hayes, wildlife biologist with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the subsistence section.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. I'd like to welcome Liz. She's our newest team member. When Pat Petrivelli moved to BIA, she was our anthropologist, but now Liz is our new anthropologist for our particular region. I know a lot of you know Liz already since she is very familiar with the Kodiak area, but I just wanted to make sure we welcomed her.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Good morning again. Welcome to all our new board members. At this time we'll move forward with the adoption of the agenda.

Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair. I have two items. I'd like to add ADF&G under 11(1) and also under item 10, agency reports, I'd like to move item 5 up to number 1.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Then 1 becomes 2?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes, ma'am.

MS. COHEN: If it's all right with the Board, I'd like to give you a two or three-minute update

under agency reports of some of the Park Service activities related to the Federal subsistence program and the Park Service subsistence. If we could put that wherever you want under 11 or under 10 under agency reports, at the end of the other agencies, that would be great.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That will be item 6 on agency reports.

MS. COHEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Under new business I'd like to add to the agenda the results of the ad hoc work on Canadian geese and a very brief report on the Subsistence Board hearings on Kodiak rural status and Southeast. I'd also like to just do a little heads up to folks on the state is starting a subsistence review.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That will be number 2 under new business. Anything else. A motion will be in order to accept our agenda with the changes.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: So moved.

MR. CRATTY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no discussion, is there any objections to the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No objections. The motion carries. The minutes of our March 21st and 22nd meeting. Do I hear a motion to accept the minutes of that meeting.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair, I make a motion to accept the minutes of the meeting of March 21st, 22nd at Sand Point.

MR. CRATTY: I second it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Any discussion.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. It appears that the resolution that Kodiak Tribal Councils and the Native entities had sent to the RAC supporting Kodiak for rural and also supporting the Southeast RAC in their endeavors for Sitka and Saxman, that correspondence has gotten lost somewhere, so I'd like to see that put back in as correspondence. We didn't get to talking about that, but that was some of the correspondence that was submitted to the RAC.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no further discussion, is there any objections.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No objections. The motion carries. I guess Michelle will find that resolution.

MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vince Tutiakoff did attend the meeting, but he's not here today. So, if everybody would turn to Page 15 in your book, it has the 805(c) letter, which gives the actions that the Board took at the -- you know what, actually that is the wrong letter. My apologies. It's the wrong letter in the book. It was supposed to be the letter of the actions taken at the May Board meeting. We didn't have any proposals, so Vince was basically there just to hear all the other regions' discussion on some of the things that they had going on in their region. I believe we did have -- I'm trying to remember what the proposal was. Maybe if somebody was at that Board meeting. Were you there, Pat? If I recall correctly, if that was the right one, Vince was just there to hear what happened with the other regions. I apologize for the wrong letter being in here. I just realized that.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Actually weren't there two wildlife proposals, the caribou reduction and then the deer harvest. So there were two proposals that you

made recommendations on. I think the Board followed your recommendations, but I can't remember. Steve would. Oh, there it is.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. Steve is passing out the letter here. Once you have it I'll kind of walk you through it. I'll go ahead and describe what happened there. There was a statewide proposal, which is Proposal No. 1. It was restricting the commercial sales and purchase of handicrafts made from bear byproducts and the Kodiak Council recommendation was to support with modification.

The other proposal was Wildlife Proposal No. 2, which was the handicrafts made from non-edible byproducts and this Council supported with modification to remove the redundant reference.

We also took action on Proposal 19, which was the caribou Unit 9(D) to reduce the harvest and this Council opposed 19. There was a second proposal, Proposal 20, which was to restrict the harvest to bulls only and that was a proposal that this Council supported.

And 21 was to extend the antlerless deer season in Unit 8 and the Council's recommendation was to support and the Board did adopt that proposal as well. I don't believe there was anything else that this Council took action on.

This is a copy for your records.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Item 7, call for proposals and change subsistence wildlife regulations. Any proposals from the public.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. For the audience's information and the Council, there is a form on the back table, which is the call for proposal form, and actually they'll be accepting proposals to change the wildlife regulations and they'll accept proposals until October 20th. So, if anybody has any recommendations for a new proposal to change any wildlife, this would be the form to do it. Then we have agency staff here. If the Council wishes to make a change to a regulation, we have staff here to help write those up if you have a request for that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. Regional Council charter. Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Okay. In regard to the charter, because FACA limits the term of the Advisory Committees to two years, the secretaries must review the Regional Advisory charters every other year, so at the fall meeting would be the time that the Council would review its existing charter. If you turn to page 18 in your book, it has our current charter in there. What they have the Councils do is review the charter in the fall meeting and make any changes if they wish to do so. The changes that Council can make to the charter would be a name change, a boundary change, the size of the Regional Council. We don't have any Subsistence Resource Commissions in our area, so that's an option that all the Councils have if they have them in their area. Also you can change the criteria for removing a member.

The last time we met as a Council we made a change to the charter and the charter change that was made was in terms of membership. This was when we were going through the whole 70/30 thing that they had going. We had made a change that at least four members would reside on Kodiak Island and three members residing on the Alaska Peninsula and that did get approved, so you'll see that in the charter.

If there's anything else that the Council wants to change or if they want to make a change to what's there existing now, now would be the time to do that. I don't know if you guys had a chance to review it or not.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: At our last meeting we recommended that we send a letter to the Secretary of Interior asking that the Chairman of Federal Subsistence Board be given authority to appoint new members.

MS. CHIVERS: Right. They had a letter that came out regarding that. I think we did that separately as a letter, not in this particular thing, because that was something that would have to go through a whole review process. I don't believe the change was made to that. It doesn't show up in the charter.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I think I read it in the transcript. I found it in there. It might have been

a later meeting.

MS. CHIVERS: I don't believe that a change was made to that, but if the Council wants to make a change, we can request that change. We can write up some language and then we can submit it when I get back to the office, submit it to the FACA coordinator. So if we want to get together as a group and write that up, we can do that. Unless you have something already that you want to write down now.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chair. I'd definitely like to make that recommendation, that Board members can be appointed from the Federal Subsistence Board within state, appointed by the chair.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I think that Staff should go back and look at the transcripts from our last meeting on that because we did make a resolution for that. So the verbiage is in there. It should be in the system. It should be going through Pete's gang up there and be going to the Board for them to send it to the new secretary because I think that if it would have gotten through the process to where it should be at this point, I think the other RAC's could also be dealing on it.

And I'd like to make a motion, Mr. Chair, that our resolution from that past meeting on that be sent to the other RAC chairs around the state because in the correspondence that I've had was Southeast and the folks up in the Kenai area, I think everybody statewide would like to see the Alaska four chairmen be able to make those appointments instead of waiting 18 months or more sometimes to see a new person on.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Can you restate your motion.

MR. HOLMES: Okay. I was verbalizing, talking too much. Mr. Chairman, I would like to, as a motion, that our discussions from our last meeting requesting the Federal Board Staff to do whatever review process is necessary to allow for or to submit to the secretary that the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board would be able to appoint new members to the RAC. I believe we did have a resolution at our last meeting and I'd like to see that resolution and a discussion, this motion forwarded to the other RAC chairmen for their input to the Federal Board.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Is there a second.

MR. ZACHAROF: Second.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Is there any discussion. Yes, sir.

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm Bill Knauer, Office of Subsistence Management. To let you know, historically, this has been presented to the Secretary a couple of times and even a request to have Board Chair authority to make, I'll call them, interim appointments when there is a vacancy in between cycles and the secretaries have consistently and historically reserved the right to make the appointments for themselves. I just wanted to let you know so you wouldn't get your hopes up too high.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Any other discussion. Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman, you know, that may be the Staff position and the people that guard the Secretary, but Mr. Kempthorne is a new Secretary. He might have a different vision if it ever reaches him. You know, certainly the Chairman's appointments could be subject to review and obviously they would be from the Chairman. But this is such a ponderous process. I know when I was nominated and interviewed, I was interviewed by a really nice young fellow basically from America and he didn't even know where -- he knew where Kodiak was, but certainly none of the other places that we represent or that I had been. You know, that whole process was a sham.

I think Alaskans know Alaskans much better and at least to modify the process where the Chairman could recommend to the Secretary rather than the Staff to recommend to the Secretary because then on the way there the Staff could put in their two bits worth, but at least so the process could be speeded up.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any further discussion.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair, I agree. I think it needs to move forward. We do have a new Secretary. He may just allow it to be done within state.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no other discussion, is there any objections to the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no objections, then the motion carries. Amy Craver.

MS. CRAVER: Good morning, Council Members and Mr. Chairman. For the record, my name is Amy Craver and I will be presenting to you a draft of the 2007 Fisheries Monitoring Program from the Southwest Region. The materials I'll be covering can be found in your Board books on Pages 21 through 47. This report is organized into three sections. The first section beginning on page 22 provides you with a summary of the Fisheries Monitoring Program statewide.

The history procedures used to evaluate projects and policy and funding guidelines that are also discussed. On Page 25, Table 1 provides a breakdown of the numbers of fisheries proposed. You will note that the projects are summarized by stock status and trends projects that are biological studies, like escapement weirs, towers, tagging studies and harvest monitoring and traditional knowledge studies that deal with how subsistence users interact with fish resources.

The last three columns reflect the recommendations made by the Inter-Agency Technical Review Committee. The total funding for 2007 was $3.9 million. The total cost of funding for all 37 projects submitted was $4 million and the cost of the 35 projects recommended would be $3.8 million. Figure 1 on Page 26 shows the distribution of funds between Alaska Native, State and Federal organizations.

The draft Resource Monitoring Plan for the Southwest Region beginning on Page 27 discusses the issues and information needs that went out in the 2007 call in November of 2005. It should be noted that within

the Southwest Region the Kodiak/Aleutians Council has identified salmon stock assessment and monitoring subsistence uses and practices and concerns for small stocks and mixed salmon fisheries as the most important issues in the region.

Table 1 on Page 28 lists 34 projects that have been funded in the Southwest Region since 2000. Three of these existing projects will continue in 2007. These projects address issues in the region. Eighteen proposals were originally submitted for the Southwest Region in 2007. The Technical Review Committee recommended 10. Of the 10, six of the projects were stock status and trends and four were harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge for the development of investigation plans. However, four of these proposals were withdrawn by the investigators before they reached the investigation plan stage.

Table 2 on Page 30 provides a listing of the proposed funding by project. Table 3 on the same page lists the local hire and matching funding proposed by each project.

The Technical Review Committee listed its priorities for funding of the projects on the top of Page 31. After reviewing the seven investigation plans, the Technical Review Committee prioritized them in the following descending order and I'll go through that. More detailed descriptions of each of the projects and the Technical Review Committee's recommendations are found between Pages 34 and 47. So, for each project there's sort of an executive summary.

These seven projects, the first one is Buskin River sockeye salmon weirs that occur in this region and basically this project would provide three annual estimates of sockeye salmon spawning escapement into the Buskin River system through operation of two weirs and would obtain information on residency and traditional fishing sites of subsistence fishery participants.

The next one is a project on Perryville and Clark River coho sockeye counts that is in the Bristol Bay region. Then the next project that's recommended for funding in this area is the McLees Lake sockeye weir and basically this project would provide three annual estimates of sockeye salmon spawning escapements in the McLees system through operation of a

weir. The third project that's recommended for this particular area is Afognak Lake sockeye assessment and this project would provide three annual estimates of annual sockeye salmon small production from Afognak Lake as well as an annual assessment of juvenile smolt production capacity of Afognak Lake.

The next project that's recommended for funding by the TRC occurs in the Bristol Bay Region and that's a harvest monitoring TEK project, Kvichak watershed subsistence fishery, fishing ethnography and then the final project that's recommended for funding by the TRC also occurs in Bristol Bay and that's the Togiak River rainbow smelt assessment.

The project that was recommended for development of an investigation plan but was not recommended for funding by the Technical Review Committee was on the Adak Island subsistence fishing project. The goal of this study is to characterize the cultural context of contemporary subsistence fishing and analyze whether conservation management strategies are needed to ensure the production of subsistence fishing on Adak.

The Technical Review Committee, the majority voted not to support this project; however, there was a minority that felt this was an important project to fund given that Adak will most likely change its status from nonrural to rural and the minority opinion felt that given the status would be rural, they don't know anything about subsistence fisheries issues in this area, that it would be recommended that maybe additional research should be funded. Like I said, the TRC recommended it not be funded.

So basically, in closing, the Technical Review Committee recommended funding the six highest priorities of the seven projects I just listed for consideration for the Southwest Region. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Amy.

MS. CRAVER: Would the Board like to take action on supporting the Technical Review Committee's recommendations?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Which ones did they recommend?

MS. CRAVER: All the projects I mentioned they recommended funding with the exception of the final project, the Adak Island subsistence fishing project. So there were seven projects that I mentioned and they recommended funding the first six.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. All these are really important projects and Aleutians are really near and dear to me. There's getting to be more folks moving into town from out that way as well as people from St. Paul and Atka and Unalaska moving to Adak. That's a pretty darned important area.

I have a question for you, Amy. Is this funding broken up into actually science versus ethnology or is it all coming out of one pool?

MS. CRAVER: The Adak project is being proposed by a private consulting firm out of San Diego. I don't have the exact breakdown. The majority of what's being proposed for funding goes towards the consulting firm and there is a significant local involvement, local agency match. It is a regional Aleutians corporation that they're working with.

MR. ZACHAROF: No, it's AEC, Aleut Enterprise Corporation.

MS. CRAVER: Exactly. Thank you, Richard. What they're proposing to do is have local people help them do interviews and logistics, so they've got that, a local capacity piece through AEC. Then they're also going to be doing some of their own research through I think it's NMFS, so there's a $25,000 match that they'll also be contributing to this project.

MR. HOLMES: Do you know how much is going to the stateside outfit? I've done a lot of pro bono stuff for the Village of Atka and I was just wondering if this might not be something that if it's not approachable for funding or if like most of this is paying some stateside consulting firm, that, to me, strikes me that maybe that might be something to do, sort of a multiple feeler type of thing. You know, with APICDA, they have some funds that they have at times.

Also maybe with Fish and Game. What's the name of the Federal research group that does McLees Lake. I did a lot of work out there in the '80s. It's a really important thing.

I hate to see all the money go outside when there's expertise in state. I'd like to at least conceptually support exploration on this on trying to find some way to fund it because they're spending 90 grand for basically an interview program and you look at the other things for the region and those are all hard applications basically doing field work. I think it's really darned important, so I'd like to make a motion. I can't say that I support coming up with 90 grand if it means that they close Afognak and Buskin and the McLees Lake and Perryville project to pay for it, but I think it would merit our Council giving moral support to try to find some better funding sources to accomplish this. I suspect even you could get it done contracting ADF&G subsistence cheaper.

So I'd like to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, for moral support on this that there be some more explanation for potential funding, but I wouldn't like to see it at the expense of our already existing priority projects.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Amy.

MS. CRAVER: Just for clarification, Pat, it would not be at the expense of any of the other projects. You could recommend this project and it wouldn't mean that another project -- because the first six projects are solid recommendations and there is actually extra money allocated for the region that could go towards this project, so it wouldn't mean that this project would go and one of the other projects wouldn't. So this would just be an additional project.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, I'd like to have our Council make a recommendation that preliminary research on Adak subsistence is really important for the Aleutians. Would that get it done?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I second support of FIS Project No. 07-455.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chair. I guess on a philosophical note with Liz being here, I wish Liz was here from the State so she could jump up and say the subsistence folks there need the money and could do it cheaper than the Seattle firm, but she's on the Federal side now. Too bad Jim Fall wasn't still in town because I know he's sniffing for grants, trying to find some way to keep his shop open. Anyway, I bet there's just tons of overhead in it, but, philosophically, that's a darned important thing.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Steve.

MR. FRIED: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Steve Fried from OSM. I just want to clarify that. What the Council can do is support the TRC's recommendation with modification and the modification would be to include this as a recommendation for funding, but that's about all you can do. We can't make a change of who's going to do the project. I mean next year you might want to see if somebody else could do a similar project, but at this point I guess would be whether or not you just wanted to include this one as a recommendation for funding or just go with what the TRC recommended, which would be just the six. That's the action I guess the Council would take. There could be modifications to the investigation plan, but I think modifying the investigators is a little bit too much to do at this point.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman, I was just being philosophical. I think perhaps Pete's wording that our Council support this project and whatever way is found to fund it, you know, that's fine. I guess let's change my motion that the Kodiak/Aleutian Regional Advisory Council supports the Project 07-455 and then we go back to Pete's second if that's okay.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: No problem.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We're working on a motion for 07-455. What I heard Steve say Was if we remove this motion we can accept the other six and move to include 07-455. Is that correct?

MR. FRIED: Yeah, that's correct. I thought that maybe what the motion was on the floor is that you would support funding all seven instead of just

the first six, which would include 07-455.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I worded that wrong. I'd like to support the first six solidly and that we add 07-455.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: There you go.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: It has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion.

(No comments)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Question.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: The question is called. All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Those opposed.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Motion carries. Thank you, Amy. Steve, you're next. Council review and comments on the Strategic Plan.

MR. FRIED: Good morning. Steve Fried with Office of Subsistence Management. What I'd like to do is provide some information on the draft Strategic Plan for the Monitoring Program for this region, then see if the Council has any modifications or if they'd like to support the plan the way it's written. Hopefully everybody received a copy of the plan. It's fairly large. It's well over 100 pages. A lot of it though is appendices. So what I did was provide an executive summary today to make things a little bit easier to follow and a little bit more understandable. We also encourage any comments, suggestions from the general public. I've put some copies of the plan on the table.

What we hope to do is be able to finalize the plan in time for the call for proposals this November for 2008 and use that plan to sort of focus the call to the most important information needs for this area. Hopefully by doing this it's going to focus, you know, the money from the plan on information needs that are important to the area and we can use the plan for the next three to five years with maybe some minor

modifications each year as new information becomes available.

This plan was developed in a process that involved regional managers and scientists and three Council members, stakeholder group representatives. There are actually 15 people that participated in two workshops that were held in Anchorage. One was held in November for three days, the 1st through the 3rd in 2005. The second one was held in May in 2006, the 3rd and 4th. On the Council, the three representatives were Mitch Simeonoff, Richard Zacharof and Peter Squartsoff. In the plan there's an appendix that has the other people that attended and participated.

Essentially what was done at the workshop is first they identified what we call subsistence fisheries units and then the important species within the units, so basically what was identified is that there were two subsistence fisheries units, one for salmon and then one for the other species, the non-salmon species. They broke these apart because people felt that these two groups were managed differently from each other, but for salmon the management was fairly similar within that and for the non-salmon species there were a lot of similarities there.

They also identified the important species within each fisheries unit and prioritizing for the salmon and for the non-salmon -- well, they identified two groups. They really didn't identify a priority. For the non-salmon I think it was rainbow steelhead trout and Dolly Varden and Arctic char were the two species groups identified.

For each of these two units we then went ahead and we developed a framework of the goals, the objectives, the information needs for each fishery unit. Those are in the plan book. Then we conducted information inventory. We tried to collect all the information that was available on these topics and having that in hand we then took a look by an information need to see whether or not there was a lot of information, no information, some information. We call this the knowledge gap analysis. Based on that there were some decisions made on whether or not we needed to do studies to collect more knowledge or if we had adequate information and we didn't really need to do studies at this time.

Using the prioritized list of information needs and the knowledge gap analysis we were able to come up with a prioritized list of topics that we should focus on for the 2008 call. In the executive summary I included the two bar graphs and that really encapsulates what was done at the meeting and you can see these are all the information needs. One is for salmon, one for non-salmon. You can read what they are on the left side. If there are any further things to characterize that, there's some writing on the bar graph to indicate that to be more specific. Essentially, the little bars that are black are the ones that don't have enough information. The ones that are clear people felt there was probably adequate information at this point. Basically they're ranked from the most important one on the top to the least important one on the bottom.

You have to also realize that the information needs are those that are relevant to Federal Subsistence Management on the associated public lands. So we had to make sure when we did this that everybody was on the on the same page and that they understood what we were doing. It also had to be consistent with the Board guidelines and if you recall that that had to do with hatchery propagation, restoration, enhancement, supplementation, things like habitat protection, restoration, enhancement, and also contaminant assessment, evaluation and monitoring activities.

The Board feels that these type of activities are more appropriately funded through other programs by other land management agencies, but we could use monitoring program monies to address the effects of these types of activities on subsistence resources and fisheries. So although we wouldn't provide money for somebody to build a hatchery or fertilize a lake, we could potentially fund an investigator to see whether or not these activities were affecting Federal subsistence fishing or user groups.

As I mentioned, there's the two fishery units, there's species within the units. I already mentioned Dolly Varden, Arctic char and rainbow steelhead trout for non-salmon. I don't think I mentioned the ranking for the salmon species. The most important one the participants felt were sockeye and coho. Second in importance were the pink and chinook. Last in importance were chum salmon.

One thing that the work group was very

specific about was that they felt that this Council should continue to identify the specific runs in populations in the systems for which information was needed each year. They just identified the important species, but they wanted the Council to keep providing input on what specific runs, what specific areas this information should be collected for. They reference the existing list that was developed by the Council, which is also in the appendix in the report. So you guys aren't off the hook totally here even if we have a strategic plan. They're still looking for your knowledge of the area and your input.

Essentially there were 22 information needs in the salmon fishery unit. There were 16 for the non-salmon unit. There were like 135 study topics that were relevant for salmon. There were only 28 for non-salmon, so you get an idea of where most of the effort has been in research over the years.

For the salmon fisheries unit the top five information needs for 2008 proposals would be to estimate annual subsistence use harvest and effort for Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Island area. That would be the primary one. Estimate total abundance by species river/lake system for coho and small sockeye runs, obtain reliable estimates of spawning escapement over time for coho and small sockeye runs, identify factors affecting subsistence harvest levels and identify critical factors that affect population dynamics of coho salmon. And you can see those, the top five bars that are black on this would be those. And the same thing was done with the non-salmon and you can see which the top five were on there, too.

So, essentially, if this plan went forward as it is without modification, then in the call they'd actually provide not only a link to the report that had all this information but in the call it would actually probably list the first five or so topics, information needs that we're looking for information on. That doesn't mean we wouldn't find other things necessarily if somebody put another proposal in. It doesn't mean that if some conservation problem or fishery problem came up one year that we wouldn't consider it because it wasn't in the plan. But this just gives us a lot more guidance as to in general what are the most important things in the region.

So I guess what I'd be looking for today

is whether or not you think the work group actually hit it on the head here and this really does seem to go along with what everybody feels are the most important thing, was there anything left out, those sort of comments. I mean if you think the strategic plan looks fine the way it is, I guess you can just support it. We do have, you know, over a month before we really finalize it to use it for the call, which will be sometime in November as far as I know to this point.

I guess that's all I'll say now. If there's questions, we can have questions. Like I say, there were three Council members that were on this work group. They could probably help the other Council members also.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Steve. I think you went through a really good, lengthy process to develop these things. I do see putting on my more provincial hat for the Kodiak Archipelago and, you know, the Buskin and Litnik are the two largest sockeye producing systems for subsistence in the western gulf -- not the largest systems, but they produce subsistence food for more folks than anywhere else in the Gulf of Alaska. So I would hate to see this priority -- we've got priority rankings for Alaska Peninsula and Aleutians. I think that's really important, but as far as, you know, allocation of funds, I think that we do need more work there.

I would hate to see the Buskin information that provides food for, you know, more than 2,000 families in Kodiak and the other villages here on the north end and Litnik, I'd hate to see the Buskin funding go away or Litnik's for that matter in order to look at Korovin Lake on Atka because that's basically self-supporting. The folks there, when they do the little fish trap or fishing in the creek at Korovin, you know, they take two and let two go and they've got a way of keeping it going and it would be nice to have information for that I would like to see as things come up for funding. I'm sure you'll bring it back to this Council for us to provide some input on that.

On species and stocks of interest, the sockeye, coho and chinook, certainly chinook are important. On Kodiak, the Ayakulik and Karluk are the two real Chinook producers and basically the folks on

Karluk are the ones that use the kings. When you go down the peninsula, the only decent run is at Chignik and that's real important to the folks there. Unfortunate on our RAC -- no, Chignik is a different district, isn't it? They're lumped into Bristol Bay. Sorry. Really, beyond Chignik, there are no king runs.

Anyway, I hope you come back to us. I think one thing I'd like to see -- in these plans you've identified different items and biological information needs and socio-economic needs, but I think there needs to be some integration because in terms of McLees Lake this Council has asked them several times about the age information, whether or not they've ever ground truth their weir studies at the creeks at the head of the lake. This year the department had to do some severe closures of that system and we have asked the Service folks doing that research to communicate with the community as to age composition and what's going on.

In chatting with Vince, there's a lot of feelings in Unalaska that the run collapsed because it was over-fished, but myself, as being a fish guy and having worked with that lake many years and talking with Arnie Shaw, who just died, that information never really got back to the local folks. You can go back for when that run built up. My point is that that very obviously was over-escaped. The research folks never communicated to the people there -- I mean obviously it takes a long time to come up with escapement goals, but one can look at different lake systems, little ponds like that all up the peninsula and the chain and one can see that once you've reached the point when they started getting those huge escapements of 80,000 or so that the thing is going to collapse.

So there's a great deal of, I feel, conjecture in the community that they've over-fished it, when, in fact, as far as looking at that system, if you take -- somewhere here Maureen Clark sent me the report and you can look at age composition and you can say, wow, once that system got above maybe 25,000 escapement, you add five, six years to that and, bingo, here you come up this year and they're gone.

I'm sorry, I'm talking too much, but there needs to be more communication from the science people with the folks in the community. That's my point. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Pat.

MR. FRIED: Can I respond to Pat, Pat's first question. I think that was a good one because it's a pretty lengthy report and it's hard to understand it maybe, but if you look at these two bar graphs in the executive summary, basically on the left they're all information needs in importance and they're pretty general and they're not specific to any one run, species, geographic area within Kodiak/Aleutians. And the bars that are dark are really the ones we're looking at for 2008, so I guess I should have been clearer for that. So Buskin is not there and Afognak is not there because those things will be funded, you know, hopefully this cycle. So we don't have to fund them again. We're good for another three years, so that's why people at the workshop said, well, you know, looking ahead for 2008.

So come the next go around 2009 we take a look at what was funded, what is funded and probably change, you know, what we're focusing on for specific information needs. So that's how we go from year to year. That was a good question to clarify that. I'm sure other people had that question.

As far as McLees goes, that project I think was funded through this year at least, so I think we had six years of information on it. I guess the Department of Fish and Game is the agency that would be adopting escapement goals and setting escapement goals. We just advise them during those meetings. Actually, the project is being done by the Fish and Wildlife Service, King Salmon Fish and Wildlife field office. They run the weir and do the age comp. We have someone here and you might want to speak to him about that. I didn't realize that there was any subsistence fishing restrictions there lately or run failures, so that's news to me.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, this year they closed it, put markers on, had a collapse, a big drop in the run. But I need to go down as a RAC person and light the fire under Fish and Game a little bit, too. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Usually I'm sitting next to Pete and he kicks me when I talk too much. But you clarified my big question, whether this will be affecting Kodiak. It's kind of obviously up to me to give a poke to the Kenai folks and the Kodiak folks to get together and communicate with the community. I apologize to the RAC for taking too much time.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair. I think Steve should have explained this so all that we were looking for is new projects and our projects we already have going are continuing, so it makes it look like they're not included, but those are the priority projects. These are looking further down the road.

But I do have one question for Steve on non-salmon species. I know we discussed a lot about the Dolly Varden in Afognak Lake and I didn't see that anywhere in there. Is that what's being added for research or whatever, funding to research the predation of Dolly Varden in Afognak Lake?

MR. FRIED: I guess I'll have to look through the report and see if that got missed, but I'll make a note. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do we have any more questions for Steve.

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mike Edwards with the King Salmon Fish and Wildlife field office. I just wanted to ask if now is the time Pat would like to discuss the McLees thing or he and I would like to talk off the record.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Probably off the record would be fine.

MR. HOLMES: I'm sorry. I was just getting off. I'll stay away from coffee.

MR. EDWARDS: The one thing I would like put in the record is the closure. Prior to the weir going in in '01, the way Fish and Game managed escapement at that lake was based on aerial survey data, which, as Pat can attest to, is very difficult to get in Unalaska. To conservatively manage that subsistence fishery, come the first of June they always enacted a 500-yard closure at the mouth of the stream of the terminus that drains the lake. Since the weir has been in, they've been able, by emergency order, to not put the markers up for the first four years. Last year and this year they went ahead and opted to be conservative. We still had 10,000 fish already in the lake, but they still went ahead and put the markers up. So I've been working with Fish and Game, the folks in Kodiak and the managers in Cold Bay or, excuse me, Dutch Harbor to try and get them to come up with a number. If they want to go -- we all agree

with being conservative, but our question to Fish and Game has been, well, if 10,000 are in, are we going to take the markers back down and that's the debate that's going on now with that system. So I just wanted to make everyone aware that the markers that traditionally always had gone up until the weir had been in there and then with the weir being there they've been able to leave the markers down and allow subsistence fishing.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Isn't this the last year for the project?

MR. EDWARDS: This was the last year but it's up for funding for another three years.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I'm glad that funding is there. Maybe next time we have a meeting in Cold Bay we can go over to Mt. Baldy and commune with Arnie Shaw's ashes and I'll give the guys a call out at Dutch because really they don't know diddly about salmon anyway. (Laughs) And kind of maybe give them my gut feeling that Arnie mentored me on, on some of those tunder pond systems like that. Because it seems like for a system that size most years, and this is no science, but once you've got 10,000 fish in, the way that creek comes in to that ocean beach you could leave it open to the mouth after 10,000 and odds are you'd get -- if you got 15 to 20 in that lake, it probably would be producing forever. But once you get up to 80,000, my God, it's too late and the thing is going to collapse five years later or six. I'm really glad you're -- I'm done.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair. I'd like to make a motion to adopt the Strategic Plan for the Subsistence Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, Kodiak/Aleutians area.

MR. HOLMES: Second.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no discussion, is there any objections to the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If there are no objection, then the motion carries. We'll continue on until about 10:30 and then we'll take a break. Agency reports. Do you want to take a break before we start that? Let's go ahead and take a break right now then and be back at about 10:15.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Let's come back to order. At this time we have agency reports. The first one on the agenda is the Southeast Council's draft petition. Steve Kessler.

MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Mr. Chair and members of the Council. It actually says here it's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service agency reports, but I've been asked to do this even though I'm a Forest Service employee. I've been asked to present this item because I work on a regular basis with the Southeast Council and they're the originators of this. So that's why I've been asked to come here.

The Southeast Regional Advisory Council has developed a draft petition to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture regarding the need for state hunting license requirements. You'll find the materials on Pages 61 through 68 in your book. On Pages 61 and 62 there's a letter to the Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board asking for the distribution of this material to the Councils and then the actual draft petition, which would go to the Secretaries, is on Page 63 through 68.

Since this is a statewide issue, the Southeast Council requests that all the other nine Councils review this draft petition at these meetings, at the fall 2006 meetings, and provide comments and recommendations. The other Councils' comments and recommendations will be included when the Southeast Council's petition is submitted to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture. So, again, these comments would go to the Southeast Council and they would provide that information to the Secretaries along with this petition.

The petition requests that the

Secretaries remove the current requirement that Federally-qualified subsistence users must obtain and carry a state hunting license when hunting on Federal public lands under Federal regulations and that the Secretaries issue a Federal hunting license to Federally-qualified subsistence users. The Secretaries have the authority to change this license requirement.

After the petition is received by the Secretaries they may request Federal staff to analyze the effects of changes and license requirements. The Secretaries may also request the Board to make a recommendation on the change. If these steps are taken, which seems likely, Councils would then have the opportunity to make a recommendation to the Board at a future Council meeting.

You might ask what are the effects of this change. We know some effects but others are not well known. Here is some of what we think at this point. Federally-qualified subsistence users would no longer be required to purchase and possess the State of Alaska hunting license when hunting on Federal lands. Federally-qualified subsistence users would need to obtain and possess a Federal hunting license when hunting on Federal lands. There's also the possibility of a fee for this Federal license. To hunt on non-Federal public lands and all private lands, a State of Alaska hunting license would still continue to be required. In areas with multiple ownerships, hunters would be required to possess both licenses or have to be very careful where they hunt if they didn't purchase a State license.

The State of Alaska would receive less in license fees if the Federally-qualified subsistence users chose not to purchase the State of Alaska hunting license. State of Alaska uses these license fees to support wildlife management activities, including field studies and hunt management. License fees are also used to leverage Federal matching funds, such as Pittman Roberts Program Funds. Existing State of Alaska license fees also support watchable wildlife programs, construction and maintenance of shooting ranges, boat ramps and other facilities, hunter education programs, et cetera. So a decrease in those license fees would decrease the funding available for existing State of Alaska activities. Some of these activities benefit subsistence hunters.

Again, the Southeast Alaska Regional

Advisory Council would now like your comments and recommendations on their proposal and they want those recommendations, if you have them, before they submit this information in the petition to the Secretaries.

If you have any questions, I hopefully can answer them.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: My first question is you said there would be a fee for that Federal license. I don't understand why if they don't have a fee and there's already a fee for the State license. Except if you're over a certain age it's a free license. So why are we duplicating?

MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Squartsoff. What I said was there's a possibility of a Federal license fee. We don't really know if there would be a Federal license fee. I don't know, but there could be. There's nothing in regulation or in ANILCA that says that there shouldn't be or can't be. So we don't know if there would be a fee or not. I think that if you commonly hunt on both Federal and State lands or private lands, then you would need to have the State hunting license, then there's probably very little advantage of this because then you would have to have two licenses. However, if you're primarily hunting on Federal public lands or would maybe change the way you normally hunt so that you would stay just on Federal public lands, then under this you would no longer need a State license. State permitting would go away and you would need a Federal license. Whether that would have a fee or not, I really can't say. I have absolutely no idea. This would have to go through the whole Federal rule-making process until we would know.

MR. HOLMES: I just want to say I see potential problems. I was reading in here where if you make under $8,400 you can get a license for $5, a State license. I think that's what it says. I feel the true subsistence user, if he's making under $8,400, a $5 license isn't very much. Me, myself, I don't have a problem with buying a license to hunt on Federal land. I see all kinds of different problems with the State, you know, when you're crossing boundaries or whatever. How are they going to enforce it. It's going to become a big problem, I think. I don't know. I just wanted to voice.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chairman. I think these are the kind of comments that you might want to make in response to the Southeast Council. I think they're asking for your comments and any recommendations. I think any of these types of comments would be helpful to them.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I can see why folks down there would probably feel that way. A lot just hunt in Federal lands. I'm just thinking the last time I got invited by some friends in Larsen Bay to go hunting over at Amuk and on the other side and up in the bay and, you know, the tidelands on Kodiak are basically State and then you hit the uplands and they're either somebody's private inholdings or Native lands, which you need the State license for to go through those to get to Federal lands.

Myself, I've got the State geezer license now and that's real nice. It's for life. Back when I was fishing I ended up losing money more than enough and got a low income license one time. I think for Kodiak those funds support the local game management and I know for solving the needs in the villages here. Larry VanDaele probably spent more than his whole budget of 3,000 as far as the time he's donated to our community in trying to help us solve problems and I'd hate to see him lose the little bit of funding he does get that comes out of the State licenses. So I think it could end up hurting folks here on our island somewhat. Like Al was saying, the folks that are low income can get that $5 license without any hassle. Frankly, I'd hate to have to have another license or more paper when I go hunting.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Pat. Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I personally have no problem supporting Southeast, but for our area I would have a problem supporting it. Maybe we could separate areas.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Sam.

MR. ROHRER: In my life I'm all about simplifying things. The Council, in the past several meetings, has made decisions to try to line up Federal and State subsistence regulations a little bit closer, trying to make things simpler, easier to understand. I hate the idea of having to get another license, another piece of paper to carry around with me. I just don't see any need for it. Again, a $5 license for a low income family, anyone can afford that. Even the idea of dividing up Southeast and us over here, that just makes a lot of extra regulations for people to remember if you're going somewhere else to go hunting. I just don't see a need for it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple additional comments. Part of the rationale the Southeast Council is requesting this petition is that currently there's no fee for fishing subsistence, so you do not have to have a sport fishing license in order to go out subsistence fishing. So part of the logic was, well, if you don't need to have the license for fishing, why should you have to have a State license for hunting.

Another situation, and I know you've talked about Southeast specifically, is that perhaps Southeast has a higher proportion of Federal lands. In a lot of areas there's a bigger mixture of Native corporation lands, State lands and other private lands, whereas in Southeast Alaska there are numbers of places where it is not mixed ownership. It is all Federal lands. So that may be a little bit different in that region than perhaps in your region.

Another thing I just wanted to inform you of, the North Slope Council also considered this request from the Southeast Council and they essentially came up with no recommendation. They made a number of similar comments that you've been making here, the concern of having to carry two licenses around because they hunt on both Federal and non-Federal lands.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: The reason I did say separate because I was sort of thinking about what he said about their region being all Federal lands and our island is split, so that's why I said that about separating it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: I think reflecting on Sam's comments and also on Steve and just thinking about family relationships and stuff, you know, I guess we have to defer to their Council for their neck of the woods, but if I end up going down to Juneau and visit my in-laws or go hunting with my daughter-in-law down there, then that's more paper. But it's their turf and I'd kind of let them do what they want, but for us here I wouldn't be keen on the idea.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Al.

MR. CRATTY: I'm really concerned that the money that the State's gotten, you know, with the State and the Feds trying to work together, that's why I support their idea, but I don't support it for here. The State budget is getting cut so bad, I mean we barely get enough funds to manage our fisheries anymore. I think this would lead to more problems in the hunting and getting the biologists and stuff to keep working for us.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: What's the wish of the Board? How do we want to move forward with this? Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Steve, would we have to -- the way we're leaning, it's a statewide proposal, do we have to support it or reject it based on what we're saying?

MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair and Mr. Squartsoff. I don't think you have to do either one. I think you can remain neutral on it. You could do this in the form of a motion, which I think, if I understand what I've been hearing correctly, most of you would support Southeast in their endeavors for Southeast, but you don't think it would be applicable to your region. You could do that or you could just ask the Council coordinator to summarize the comments that you've all made and provide those directly to the Southeast Council. Whatever you please there.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chair. I'd like to

suggest that if our coordinator could summarize our comments and forward it to the Southeast RAC with our respect.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: From this board we remain neutral on Southeast's request. Thank you, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: You're going to discuss comments for proposed rural status.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Helen Armstrong. I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management. Does everybody have a rural report that looks like this? I think everybody does. This is what I'm going to be talking from. Was everybody at the public meeting or there were some people who weren't at the public hearing. I wasn't sure, Mr. Chair, if you wanted me to do the presentation that we gave at the public hearing because I wasn't sure how many people were there.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: You can probably just summarize for the Board.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I'll try to be brief. It's a little bit complicated. I think all of you are aware that the Federal Subsistence Board is seeking public comments through October 27th of this year on the proposed rule that would change the rural or nonrural status of several Alaskan communities and the communities we're concerned with here are the Kodiak area and then Adak.

ANILCA requires that rural Alaskans be given the priority for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands and only residents of rural communities and areas are eligible for this subsistence priority. Therefore, the Board has to determine which communities are rural and our regulations require that we do this every 10 years. This was last done in 1990. It's been more than 10 years, but that's because we were waiting for census data to come out and it doesn't come out right at 2000 and some of the data we didn't get for another five years.

The regulations require that communities or areas that are economically, socially, and communally integrated be grouped for evaluation purposes. The first

thing we do is look at the grouping of communities and then we evaluate whether or not the community is rural or nonrural.

When we consider whether an area should be grouped we look at three indicators; the proximity of the area to the community, whether it's connected by road, whether it has a shared high school attendance area, and if there are more than 30 percent of the community who commute for work to the community of interest.

The regulations establish guidelines for rural and nonrural and those communities with a population below 2,500 are considered rural unless it possesses significant characteristics of a nonrural nature or is considered to be socially and economically part of a nonrural area. A community with a population of more than 7,000 is considered nonrural unless it possesses significant characteristics of a rural nature. A community with a population above 2,500, but not more than 7,000, is to be evaluated to determine rural/nonrural status.

So when we looked at rural/nonrural first, we categorized the community or the grouping by population size and then we evaluate community characteristics as warranted. We looked at diversity and development of the local economy, use of fish and wildlife, community infrastructure, transportation and educational institutions.

In this region there were two changes proposed. The status of the community of Adak would change from nonrural to rural. Adak has undergone substantial change that warrants a change in status. The population of Adak decreased by 94 percent from 1990 to 2000, bringing it well below the presumptive rural population threshold of 2,500. It is an extremely remote island community accessible only by boat or plane.

I think, Mr. Chair, what I would suggest is that there are two parts to this that affect this region. There's Adak and then the Kodiak area. I would suggest that the Council take a vote on each one of those separately. That would be my suggestion.

I don't know if the Council would also like to hear about other changes in the state. We didn't talk about them in the public hearing at all. I'll just

briefly summarize maybe. We are proposing that Prudhoe Bay be made nonrural. It's been classified as rural and that's a case where the population is below 2,500. There are today no people living there. In 1990 they said there were 15 people living there. I'm guessing that they were not really living there. They just had their P.O. box listed as being there so they could get the Permanent Fund Dividend. But there are no people living in Prudhoe Bay. It's an industrial enclave and the North Slope Council is the one that proposed it become nonrural and they supported it being non-rural.

We've looked at the Delta Junction area. There's some changes in the groupings in Wasilla area. There's some changes in the groupings on the Kenai Peninsula. The Ketchikan area has been proposed to remain nonrural. And Saxman in the proposed rule has been proposed to remain grouped with Saxman. We're holding public hearings in Saxman and Ketchikan next week. And then Sitka, which was not evaluated, but we are holding public hearings there in October.

So I'll move then to the Kodiak area. That starts in your book on Page 41 if you wanted to just read along with that. Michelle, did they get the Q&A sheet? Do we have it here?

MS. CHIVERS: No. That was going to be brought from the public hearing here. Whatever was left from that meeting was going to be brought to this meeting.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Amy is going to look for them in the car. I don't know if we have them or not. I think Maureen Clark has them and she went home last night. I can still talk through this. The Q&A sheet actually has a map of what the proposed rule says in terms of the area that they are proposing be nonrural.

The area we looked at, to make sure it's very clear, was only the road system outside Kodiak area, not the communities on the island. It doesn't affect anywhere else except the road system. We looked at then census designated places in that area, that's how we evaluate them in terms of population, and that area is divided up into the Kodiak city census designated place. If you look on the map on Page 42 you can see that area. Then the Coast Guard Station, the CDP, census designated place, of the Kodiak Station and then there's Women's

Bay, Bells Flats. Those are the three census designated places in that area and then Chiniak has its own census designated place.

The census documents people living outside of communities and most of those people live on the road system somewhere outside of those CDP's. There are about 4,000 people, but some of them also live on the island somewhere, not in a village, and those people are called the remainder. But only about 350 of the 4,000 live outside of the road system according to the Kodiak Borough's estimations. Essentially, the people that are in that remainder are on the road system living anywhere from Anton Larsen to Pasagshak, anywhere along that road system. This only applies to Federal public lands and I think this Council is fairly well acquainted with what that means, but on Page 43 there is a map that applies to Federal land, public lands and waters. The waters around Afognak Island are included as well as the waters in Chiniak, Women's Bay, Chiniak Bay, the Buskin River, headwaters of the Buskin River. If you want more discussion, Pat Holmes did a really nice job of explaining what that all means. So it's not the whole island, it's just the Kodiak Refuge and just those waters. It does not affect halibut, clams, sea mammals, birds. It's just the land mammals and salmon.

So what we did first is we looked at the different CDP's and whether or not they should be grouped with the Kodiak city and the first one we looked at was the Coast Guard Station, so there were three criteria we're looking at on the Coast Guard Station. Is it connected by road? Yes, it is. Does it have a shared high school attendance area? Yes, it does. Where it became a little more complicated is that of the 1,975 people who live on the Kodiak Coast Guard Station about 894 of those are workers and of those the estimate is about 11 percent work off of this Coast Guard Station. That does not fulfill the third criteria of 30 percent.

So, in the analysis there were actually two options. The Federal Subsistence Board chose to group the Kodiak Coast Guard Station with the city of Kodiak even though they didn't fulfill the three criteria. What we had done is whenever there wasn't a solid, absolutely fulfilling the three criteria, then we gave two options in the report. There were other places in the state we did that as well.

Then the next one we looked at was

Women's Bay. Women's Bay is essentially a subdivision with no services and schools. They're in proximity and road accessible to Kodiak city. They share a common high school attendance area and they had 44 percent of their workers working in Kodiak city, so they clearly did need to be grouped with the city of Kodiak.

The third one was those people living in the remainder area that I talked about and this is also fairly clear, but it had some grayer parts to it. They definitely are road accessible and in proximity but the distances are pretty far. Anton Larsen is a good ways away and sometimes the road is difficult. Pasagshak is a long way away. So the Board had to deal with that issue. Yes, it's road accessible, but the regulations don't say how far away can it be, so there was some concern about that part.

They do share a high school attendance area, but we do know that some people probably are home-schooled and don't go into Kodiak for school, but we didn't have good data on that. We did know that 59 percent of the people work in the city, but what we didn't know is how many people that live in Pasagshak actually work out there, so there could be some other information but that's not collected by the census. So, without getting further information we couldn't really tell in Anton Larsen or Pasagshak what percentage of people living in those smaller, sort of sub areas, actually commute to go into Kodiak. So the Board decided that they would group the remainder area with Kodiak but exclude Anton Larsen and Pasagshak. So they grouped it, but not all of it.

Then we looked at Chiniak. Chiniak was also a little bit less clear. It's a very small community. They do have a school that goes to 10th grade. There's a roadhouse and a bakery, a library, but there are no stores, no gas station, so it is certainly a community that depends somewhat on the city of Kodiak. It is road accessible, but it's about 45 miles and the last 14 miles are unpaved, so it's a little more difficult to get to.

It does have kids attending high school in the city of Kodiak, they're in their high school attendance area, but you can go to school through 10th grade. So then we said it's half of high school, it's not all of high school, and there are students who choose to do correspondence school at Chiniak School and not

travel into Kodiak. There are two students in Chiniak or at least last year there were two who go to school in Kodiak. So, again, it's a little bit gray.

In terms of workers commuting into the city of Kodiak, there were 31.9 percent of the workers commute. It's close to 30 percent, it's a very small community and if you just had one or two people who changed jobs, quit, retired, that would flip the other way, so that also was not quite -- it's close but not quite that close. So the Board elected to not group Chiniak with the city of Kodiak.

So what they have grouped is Women's Bay and the edge of Women's Bay is on Middle Bay and then all of the city of Kodiak, Women's Bay, Coast Guard Station and the boundary on the road to Anton Larsen was at the pass there. Is that correct, Pat, to describe it that way as a pass?

MR. HOLMES: Sure.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So that was what they grouped as the Kodiak area and then they looked at is it rural or nonrural. We looked at it. The Board looked at it, too. There's a table on Page 50 in the book that goes through the population of the Kodiak area. This is, I think, pretty interesting because the population really hasn't grown significantly at all since 1988, 1990. I mean it's grown but not much. 1988 that's the year we used, the census we used for the original 1990 determinations that were done. The population of Kodiak city was 6,651. It's decreased by 2005 to 6,088. The Kodiak Station has increased from 1,700 in 1988, 1990 it was 2,025, and today it's 1,975. Women's Bay didn't have a CDP at that time. By 1990 they did. It was 620 people. There's 703 there in 2005. The remainder area, it looks like it's decreased but actually the Women's Bay was included in that number. It's gone from 4,159 in 1988, 1990 3,220 to 3,900 in '98. So the growth has been in the Kodiak Station and in Women's Bay most likely where we've seen some growth. So it's grown from 1988 from 12,654 to 12,816 in 2005. If you look at 1990 figures, it's 12,229. It's not been a significant growth that we've seen in other parts of the state.

Looking at demographics, it is above 7,000 but there has not been significant change since 1990 and it has -- if you don't include the Coast Guard Station 1,975 people, that drops the number down a bit

too.

I'm not going to go through all of it, but there is information in here on the history, transportation, the fact that it's an island community that often difficult to get in and out. That was brought up over and over in the public hearings. The economy was also discussed a lot in the public hearings but the fishing and the problems with the down-turn in the fishing industry. Unemployment rates, it's really hard sometimes to get a handle on unemployment in Kodiak because you've got fishing and it goes up and down, so it kind of depends on what time of year you're taking it and what's been happening. In 2000 it was 4.3 percent, but the average rate in 2004 was 9.7 percent. So it's not really far off from -- it's sort of in the middle of a lot of other communities.

There is an appendix at the end on Page 82. It's kind of interesting to look at. We've looked at some nonrural places in the state and then we have rural places and we've compared them in terms of unemployment, wage employment, population per capita income, diversity of services. We've also included whether there were large national retailers, like Wal-Mart, cost of food index. In all of those, Kodiak varies how different it is from some of the other nonrural communities and some of the rural communities.

The second part you see the places that are under consideration. Then on the next page there's a comparison, transportation, educational institutions. We looked at did the community have -- was it K-12 or did it have some college, perhaps a community college or a full university.

The other part that we really looked at because it's so important is use of subsistence. On Page 57 there's a table that shows the per capita pounds of subsistence resources harvested. The only data we had was from the early '90s, 1993 and 1991. This was done by ADF&G Subsistence Division. They did divide the study into sections where they had the Kodiak city, the road system and the Coast Guard Station, which is good because it was useful for us. Kodiak city had 151 pounds per capita harvested and the road system was 168 pounds per capita harvested and the Coast Guard Station was 115 pounds. The weighted average of the three of them was 155.

When you look at the comparison to the other places that we researched, this isn't everywhere in the state, this compares to Valdez, which is nonrural, 103 pounds per capita. Seward was 97, Homer 94, Kenai 84. So it's well above what you find in other nonrural communities. It's also similar to some rural communities like Cordova 179, Ninilchik 164, Wrangell 155, and it's well above Hope, which was 111, Cooper Landing 92 and Whittier 80, which are also rural places.

Then there's another indicator the Subsistence Division uses, which is the variety of species used and the Kodiak area used 11.8. Valdez was 6.5, Kenai area 7.1, Seward area 7.5, Homer area 8.8, Ketchikan 8.8, and it was more similar to rural places such as Dillingham, which had 11.8, Cordova 14.4, Kotzebue 15. So in terms of variety of species used it was similar to some rural places.

I don't want it to appear those are the only things we looked at in terms of subsistence use and demographics because we did look at other factors, but I'm not going to go through all of them here. They are in the report.

So the Board's proposed rule, and this is just the proposed rule, is that the Kodiak area be nonrural. They're soliciting public comment, as you know. We've spent the past two days having public hearings and we've had a very, very good turnout in Kodiak. I think Pat wants to talk a little bit about that later and we are welcoming the Council's recommendation. If you'd like to submit written comments, you can do that by October 27th. If there are any public here who want to testify, I think this would be the time to do it after we've done this presentation. So that also is something that we were looking for is public comment here at this meeting as well. I think it was advertised that we would take public comment.

Any questions? I kind of whipped through that quickly and I hope it wasn't too long. I know it was a lot of material to cover. Kodiak is a complicated area.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat, do you have a question.

MR. HOLMES: One small clarification. The unemployment stats do not include fishermen. That's

just something that's not gathered because it's considered like agricultural work. Our unemployment for the Kodiak area compared to other areas where they don't commercial fish is extremely larger and a much higher degree of fluctuations. We're probably more similar to Sitka in that response looking at their unemployment. Basically they face the same problems we have in Kodiak. But I think when it gets to summarizing this, I'd like to defer a lot of comment to Elder Iver Malutin from Shun'aq Tribal group as far as how the meeting went, but thanks a lot. It was a lot of ground covered.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Do you want to give a recommendation on what you want to do with the Kodiak rural determination? I don't know if you guys want to stay with what you originally went with or if you guys want to make a change.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I guess the last two meetings this Board has unanimously supported the continue of rural determination for Kodiak and having the main Board here yesterday and the day before and then having an Advisory Board meeting after.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Pete, that was at the request of Vince Tutiakoff when I talked to him. He wanted the Council to have an opportunity to discuss the things that they heard in public testimony if they so wished and then if there was additional comment from the public. That's why it happened in that manner.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I was thinking it might be a time perhaps to take a look at Mr. Malutin's observations of the hearings that we had if that would be okay.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: So noted. Iver.

MR. MALUTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank all of you for having a time to speak. My name is Iver Malutin and I didn't really plan on speaking. In fact, I didn't even fill out a little form. But since there was a presentation made on what I consider to be a very, very important part of Kodiak's future. I think it's really pertinent that we all get involved. I am co-chair of the round-table and the round-table is a

group of people that got together to lead all the people in Kodiak in the direction they want to go and they steered us in this direction to keep Kodiak rural.

With that, my first observations when I went to the meeting I was really, really upset. Number one, the Chairman of the Board wasn't here. Mike Fleagle, whoever he is, I don't know, had other commitments and I was so upset I told them at the meeting I didn't think it was right for the Secretary of Interior to appoint a person that couldn't make the meetings. That's how upset I was.

Another thing I was really upset about at the meeting is to see how prepared and unprepared the Board was that makes all the decisions after you give them the information. They were in a lot of cases totally unprepared with the information that they needed in Kodiak to even begin to have a meeting because they didn't familiarize themselves with the issues that were on the table. If they had first had some kind of knowledge with pieces of paper on what they were coming to Kodiak for, they would know where the regulations, State, Federal boundaries are. I'm not saying that they all didn't know, but it was very evident that some didn't know. These are the people that are making our decisions after you've given them the information.

So something has to change. I'm not sure what. Anybody trying to change some community's lifestyle has to change. It shouldn't be based on numbers and maybe it won't.

It was a full day and a half of testimony and there were a lot of people and we had it from all walks of life. Some of the highlights, I'm not going to go into detail, but there was a young Coast Guard couple there and they were talking about how they live in Kodiak, they like Kodiak, they're going to move back to Kodiak. On the other hand, he was talking about how he is working with Coast Guard people that live in Kodiak, that are stationed at the base that hate Kodiak. They're from Los Angeles, New York, whatever, but they don't want no part of Kodiak. All the numbers in the Coast Guard are put into one big pot and they're being used as one total on the bottom regardless what their stand may be.

It's just like getting a bunch of democrats and republicans in one pot and they're not all going to vote -- they're going to vote their own way.

But that's what's happening here. They're doing it, they're using it, it's wrong. So that criteria has to be defined and it has to be broken down into a little better fashion than they are dealing with because I think it's so important. I told them my family came to Kodiak with Baranof when he came to Kodiak in 1794. The Malutins came to Kodiak and that's how long our family has been here and we've been subsiding for all those years. Nowadays, up there without the information and they're going to make a decision that's going to change the future of my life.

I told them I'll be the first to go to jail. By that the Kodiak mayor says I'm radical and they're right. I am radical. I'm a radical Native that will never change my ways. But that's the only reason I'm radical.

Every single person was in support of what we were trying to do except one person at the beginning of the meeting clapped when they talked about urban. But when it came time to testify there was one little application which would have enabled them to speak was withdrawn. I think it was that person because he was the only person. Nobody spoke in opposition.

Let me see. The information for this meeting that they had according to the Chairman of the Board will be available in two weeks he said. He thought the transcript would be ready and some of the information would be ready so we could get a better idea. I'm really worried about this. I told him I think there could be too many people -- well, they work on their own jobs and that really steers their direction.

Pete Probasco got up and he gave his own observation, an opinion, on point of clarification on State and Federal lines. Not saying anything else about anything other than that's what he said. What he failed to say was the impact this is going to have on Kodiak's future because he doesn't know anything about it. He's Fish and Game.

But, anyway, the impact it's going to have on Kodiak's future is right now there's a lot of kids going to school and they're all qualified under Migrant I and that means that that kid is going to get breakfast and lunches free based on their subsistence or whatever, not based on income. That's just the beginning. If we want urban, probably a lot of that will

be gone. Not only that, some of the other programs that are Federal funded, WIC, a lot of the other programs could be drastically affected.

I told them if they put us in the same category as Los Angeles, Seattle, Anchorage and Kodiak, all nonrural, we're going to look just like them. When I could go one minute down to the beach and catch fish, I could go five minutes and catch fish, I could go another five. I can catch fish all over the place. Can you do that in Los Angeles, Seattle and Anchorage? But that's what I told them.

I just wanted to let you know it was a really good meeting but it's not over and I'm really worried about it right now and we do need your help. The only thing I would like to say, and this has nothing to do with that, but I was listening to your comments on Southeast, I think we should communicate with Southeast, we should be friendly with Southeast, work with them as much as we can, do the best we can with them, because we're going to need their help someday, too. So, from that perspective, I'm not saying Southeast is right or wrong, but I think we've got to do this thing all together because I think we need their support in keeping Kodiak rural.

That's it in a nutshell. Any questions? Pat could probably talk a long time on this.

MR. ZACHAROF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yes.

MR. ZACHAROF: I was at the testimonies yesterday and heard a lot of good testimony from a lot of folks. As Mr. Squartsoff mentioned, we did support rural status at our two previous meetings and I think most of the Board members still feel the same way. I'd like to make a motion to continue rural status for Kodiak. That would be my motion on the table.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a second.

MR. CRATTY: I second. I didn't get to any testifying, but I know we all feel deeply about this. I feel the same way as Iver does about our new Board Chair. I think something this important he should have been there. There should have been no excuse. I don't know how they appointed somebody who isn't going to

support his job.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: It is moved and seconded. Discussion. Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Without too much discussion I would like to offer a friendly amendment in Kodiak retaining its rural status that the Coast Guard Base be excluded. The Federal government has done a customary and traditional on salmon and basically if you live on the base you're not supposed to take salmon or king crab. I think if they were to remain on there we'd probably want to recommend a C&T review on deer and do the same thing. But I would like to make a friendly amendment to exclude the Coast Guard CDP from the population considerations on Kodiak as an amendment to Richard's motion.

MR. ZACHAROF: Yes, I agree with you on that, Pat. There was a lot of testimony with regard to that and I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a second on that amendment.

MR. CRATTY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We'll vote on the amendment and we'll vote on the main motion. Any discussion on the amendment.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If there's no discussion on the friendly amendment, is there any objections.

MR. ROHRER: Mr. Chair. A question on the amendment. Pat, you said do not include the Coast Guard Base numbers in the population numbers, but I assume, going along with that, that would exclude them -- part of that amendment would be you're proposing to exclude them from remaining rural if we remain rural. Is that correct?

MR. HOLMES: Basically it would just be that they -- I was offering that as another strategy. Right now, the way Federal law is, if you live on base you don't take salmon or crab. That was just part of the discussion. I would just simply in that motion that

those numbers not be considered part of the Kodiak CDP. Basically, most of the folks that live on base really don't do the subsistence harvest anyway. So just clean and simple, exclude the base CDP from the Kodiak area count and the main motion of Kodiak area should remain rural.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Further discussion. Jim.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chair. For the sake of clarification, Pat, you're talking about active Coast Guard personnel living on the base, not Coast Guard personnel living in town, not retired, only active on base, is that correct?

MR. HOLMES: That's correct. Because there are some folks that have chosen to make Kodiak their home, retired people, people that live off base. Under State and Federal law that's peachy. In fact, we did, as Iver mentioned, had some folks that live off base that will retire here. They're in the Guard now. It sounded like they didn't make a lot of money and they'd like to stay. Folks that respect each other and do all the caring and sharing, I just don't want to get into that. The base itself, those numbers I don't think, from listening to 110 people testify, almost everyone made that contention, so I'd like to support them.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any further discussion. Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair. I also listened to a lot of the testimony up there at the school and a big percent of the people were concerned about the Coast Guard Base. As some of you recall, I started mentioning it about four years ago that the Coast Guard Base was going to affect subsistence on Kodiak. I don't know how it's going to work to try to exclude just the Coast Guard Base. I really don't know.

MR. HOLMES: If I can footnote that. After Pete mentioned that we had coffee and talked about it and I did go down and some of the people talked to Fish and Game and they can't deny -- because if you fish subsistence, State or Federal regs, you've got to have the State permit, but under Federal law there is no Federal enforcement but they really aren't supposed to, if you live on the base, participate. I did have a fish with comm. fish folks and the lady that does issue the

permits, they can get a permit but they have to fish in State waters only, which is not Buskin, not Afognak. So they can't deny them a permit. But since she's been talking to them and she uses kind of the school teacher eyebrow and mentions that the numbers of people getting permits that are on base has dropped from way over 200 to 43 in 2005. So it has been reduced for those on base. Beyond that, you know, it's a social judgment. I, philosophically, really agree with you.

One observation I can make is a lot of newcomers that are trying to gill net don't know how to do it anyway, but I think this is the first step using existing laws without ruffling feathers and I think it would just help the total Kodiak argument if those numbers aren't included.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any further discussion on the amendment?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If there's no further discussion, is there any objection to the amendment to the main motion?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no objection, then the amendment passes. We'll move on to the main motion. Is there any further discussion on the main motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No discussion. Is there any objections.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no objections, then the motion carries.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. I don't know if the Council would want to do this, but the other issue is what the boundaries of that Kodiak area should be. The Board came up with this idea of subdividing -- excluding Anton Larsen and Pasagshak and Chiniak and I would like to get some input from the Council if you don't want to do a motion maybe just some discussion of

what people think about that idea because I've heard different things. I've head people say the whole road system should be the same, we shouldn't be dividing people, and on the off chance -- I mean it is a chance that the Board will make Kodiak area nonrural. They've already put in their proposed rule. If they do do that in the final rule, I would want that area to be something that people agreed with. I'm just throwing this out. You can think about it over lunch. I don't know how people feel.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair. I don't even want to discuss that because we're going with the rural status. Why draw lines if we're supporting staying rural.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I wanted to make sure there was at least an opportunity for some thought about it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. Going along with the sentiment of our group, I bet I've used up half the memory on my computer sending messages down to Sitka, Ketchikan and the RAC folks there. I would like to present a motion that the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Committee support the Southeast Regional Advisory Council in their judgment as to what should be rural and nonrural in Southeast. I think all the support that folks in Sitka and Saxman can get, particularly coming from us, I think that goes in the tradition of the Advisory Councils when they agree on a concept of trying to support each other. Particularly Sitka, you know, there's a lot of Tlingit folks married into Kodiak and Kodiak folks married in down there. Their fishing has gone to heck, established within 10 years of Kodiak. As far as a sister community, that's a regional hub, I think they deserve our support.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Would you restate your motion, please.

MR. HOLMES: My motion would be that the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council support whatever decisions that he Southeast Regional Advisory Council judges is appropriate for rural determination in Southeast and particularly support Sitka remaining rural

and Saxman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Is there a second.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll second it just for discussion.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any discussion. Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Wasn't Sitka already determined to stay rural?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It was on the proposed list for analysis. When the Board met in December of 2005, they took it off the list because, quite frankly, the Sitka people came forward with lots of data and facts and good testimonies and it persuaded the Board to take Sitka off the list. The State of Alaska has not been very happy with that and are pushing hard. I think that's a fair assessment, but there is some discussion, let's say, that Sitka should be made nonrural. That's why we're having a public hearing there, but we did not actually do an analysis of it. So I'm not sure what the Board will decide to do. It's difficult to predict.

MR. HOLMES: The folks in Sitka are worried because all it really takes is for the Board to say, hey, we want to take this on the table, so they are doing the same thing we've done in Kodiak, preparing their whole efforts and the Sitka folks asked us, tribal folks, they prepared a joint -- Pete helped on it, a joint resolution for AFN. Anyway, they just asked for our support because they're worried that they'll be taken back up on the table. So this resolution is supporting their communities in doing what they want to do. If they should decide that they want to become part of Bellingham, good for them. I think supporting them in their efforts to maintain their rural status is really important.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any further discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no further discussion, is there any objections to the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no objections then the motion carries. Do we also have Adak on there? Did we?

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Could I make a nomination for that or maybe Pete should. I think my colleague, Mr. Koso, might support him in whatever motion he wants to make on Adak.

MR. KOSO: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion that we designate Adak as a rural area.

MR. HOLMES: I'll second that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing no discussion, is there any objections to the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no objections, then the motion carries. Is there any further business on this item?

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make one other motion and this would end up being a long-term thing. It's a concept that I discussed with Niles Cesar, the chair for the BIA and some of the other Board folks. Part of this rural determination all spins off the Federal Subsistence Management regs that were put together based on Ketchikan and the magic number of 7,000 within the city of Ketchikan when they first drafted those regulations. That was only for the city. So similar, number-wise, Sitka, Kodiak and Ketchikan because the cities were all around 6-7,000. Kodiak won out, so did Sitka, but the surrounding areas around both communities when that was written were all pushing 10-11,000 and I would like to suggest to the Board through our RAC that they look in the future towards something that will be accommodating this change in Alaska because Kodiak is a rural subsistence hub. So is Sitka.

I was talking to a friend that lives up in Bethel and if you hop on a snowmachine it doesn't take too far out of town and you're 7,000 people for Bethel.

All over Alaska folks move in from the villages. Here in Kodiak I bet we had 5-600 boomers move back to Ballard and it's been the Aggas and Carlsons and Refts and whatnot that have moved into town in Kodiak and that's what's kept their numbers relatively stable, is folks moving in. I think it might give the Board some more flexibility in the future for looking at rural communities such as Kodiak or Sitka if they were to cogitate or look in their Federal regs a category called rural subsistence hub communities and that would just be a recommendation to them to explore that.

So I guess my motion would be the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council would recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board that they explore modifying, that means submitting to the Secretary, looking at another category for rural subsistence that would be rural subsistence hub communities and I think that's going to be something in the next five years we're going to see play out all over the state where traditional Native subsistence communities are going to be going over that threshold. So it's just a comment and I'd like to toss it out for discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: A motion has been made. Is there a second?

MR. KOSO: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Is there any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's the first time I heard that, Pat, so I'm not going to support that motion. I think there's a lot more to be discussed about that, what it's going to affect. I can't support that motion.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any further discussion.

MR. HOLMES: Well, it was to start the process because they would never do that. They'd have to write regulation proposals, they'd have to discuss it,

they'd have to go out all over the state. It's just to kind of air the concept and get folks discussing it, thinking about it.

In Kodiak's case, if we were called a rural hub, there wouldn't be any problem because we've got characteristics of a rural community. Because there are some folks, particularly in the State, more of the Alaska Outdoor Council people that are holding the Feds to the table at 7,000 as an absolute threshold. I was just asking the Board to look in the future as to some ways that would give them a little more flexibility and add some protection for places like Dillingham, Bethel, Nome and Kodiak and Sitka that have always been that type of community. So they'd have to define what it would be, what threshold it would be.

It's just more of a suggestion to them rather than a request or demand that they add something new. It's just something to look at to give folks a little more flexibility and that kind of counters the pressure that's coming from corporate guide type parts of the state down in America.

I'd urge you all to look at the Alaska Outdoor Council's web page and look at what their objectives are in terms of ANILCA and rural preference. It's totally negative and this just kind of helps give us another potential way of keeping subsistence for rural folks. Thank you. I'll discuss it another time and I appreciate your point of view, Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I think about that a lot because the numbers do make a difference. I mean how high are we going to go with the numbers? We have to protect the resource. The resource can only handle -- the resources are only so much numbers. We also have to protect the resource. If the numbers get too big in some communities and it's open for everybody, then the people in the outlying areas will have to be shut down.

MR. HOLMES: My point was Kodiak now, the Delegated Hunters Program is really swell because folks that move in can use that to hunt for their relatives back in the villages. What you're going to see is -- you know, frankly, I don't see Kodiak getting much bigger other than people coming in from the villages. I see more people leaving. But in a whole statewide approach, it's a big change everywhere. But I'm talking too much again and I appreciate your comments. So I, with

permission of the second, withdraw it.

But I think it's something that could help folks that move into town part of the year and go back to the villages in the summer, it would let them help their villages and that's the only thing because I don't see that -- it's like Julie Knagin said. She shouldn't be penalized for living in town now that Dennis needs to have his medical things. She shouldn't be excluded in the future. So I was just trying to give a cushion to towns like us where folks -- I mean there's more Native folks in town than I think there were when I came here in '63, but they want to go back to their home. Anyway, I'll just withdraw the motion with the permission of the second if that's okay.

MR. KOSO: Yeah, on that deal I think maybe just a recommendation or something. I don't think it's necessary to have a motion. It's more of a discussion than anything else. So I withdraw my second.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I could just add a comment. There's a saying, you know, great minds think alike. We have actually, Pat, had this discussion in our office that once we get done with the rural process and we get it behind us that rather than waiting until the next time we do it because most of us will be gone since we're an aging population, we'll hopefully be just retired, and then people won't have that institutional memory of what we did last time. We've actually discussed sitting down and evaluating some of the things that Pat has talked about in trying to make sure we're doing rural evaluations in the best way. So that is something that we're thinking about as a staff and we planned on having more dialogue about, so I think the comments from all of you are really good.

I also wanted to assure you, Pete, because we have the Section 804 in ANILCA that when there is a shortage then you start looking at who is in closest proximity and who has the longest dependence on a resource, so there are those protections built into ANILCA to help exactly what you're talking about. We've actually implemented 804 quite a bit in the Seward Peninsula area because of the problems you're worrying about with Nome hunters. So, by doing those 804 analyses they've been able to cut out the Nome hunters and make sure it's all there for the villages.

Thank you.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I'll be quiet after this for a long time. I got a message from a flaming bush. This paper just flew out of the air. It was a thought that relates around my choice of words in the motion about the Coast Guard Station to exclude and perhaps that's a little bit too active a verb that carries.....

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I'm sorry, Pat. We're in the middle of a new motion here. Do you have something?

MR. KNAUER: I just wanted to correct something that was said relative to where individuals could fish using a State permit. As far as salmon goes, those individuals using a state subsistence permit for salmon can fish in Federal waters. They're not prohibited in fishing in Federal waters except there's some specific closed areas that are closed to everybody. That's what the regulations specifically -- unless an area is specifically closed to non-Federally qualified users, individuals can harvest in those waters.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on the motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: If there's no further discussion, all those in favor say aye.

MR. HOLMES: I withdrew the motion.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Oh, you did? I stand corrected then. Pat, you had something to add.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I did receive a divine inspiration from the sky in my choice of verbs in my motion for the Coast Guard CDP and perhaps the choice of exclude is too passionate a verb. With the concurrence of my seconds on that motion I would like to bring up -- or maybe I should just talk first and then we could consider whether to bring it back. I would like to suggest if we brought that back on the table this motion that appeared spiritually or wording, perhaps use the phrase that the Board does not aggregate the Coast Guard CDP in with the rest of the Kodiak road system. If anybody feels that would have merit, I would like to bring the motion back on the table to give it perhaps a more politically acceptable phraseology.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any comments.

MR. KOSO: I'd like to bring it back and look at re-wording it. I think that's a good idea. I think we have to be clear about not being divisive and really show an appreciation for a group of people that do a lot for us. I think it's well taken. I'd like to discuss re-wording it.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I would like to move that we bring the recommendation to the Board on the Kodiak back on the table at this time. I'd like to make that motion and then we'll go from there.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: A motion has been made.

MR. ZACHAROF: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No discussion. Is there any objection.

MR. HOLMES: Mr. Chairman. I would like to take our motion on Kodiak remaining rural and eliminate the word exclude and to show proper respect for the folks on the base but going in the spirit of the existing Federal C&E on the salmon, I think it would help our efforts on rural to replace exclude with do not aggregate in the motion. Is that precise enough? That's my motion.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do I hear a second.

MR. ZACHAROF: I second it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Moved and seconded. Discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no discussions, is there any objections to this motion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Seeing none, the motion carries. Do we have any further business on this item?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing none, then we'll move on. It's 10 to 12:00. We'll break for lunch and come back. What do you need, an hour, hour and a half? An hour. Come back at 1:00.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We're back to order. The next two items on our agenda are for information purposes, items 3 and 4. I guess right now we could take care of Iver.

MR. MALUTIN: Thank you. I didn't expect to be on. I thought I'd be at the end of the meeting, but that's okay. I'm glad I'm on earlier. I got a little concerned and I'm not even sure that one of them is even part of what you can but it might be. I'm on the Halibut Working Group for RuralCap and one of the things we provide is subsistence halibut now to National Marine Fisheries -- no, no, North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Excuse me. Anyway, we got that through and one of the unique things about the subsistence halibut that we could do with that, even though they are Federal, it's something that you can't do at migratory birds. With halibut, we can take them from an included area, such as Kodiak, and we can ship them to a non-included area such as Anchorage. So what that does is enables everybody that's here that gets halibut to provide for the people in Anchorage that are in their family.

The reason I bring this up is I would like to see this happen on migratory birds. There's so many people that are moving to Anchorage and you heard Pat and you heard everybody talking about -- and even to go back a little further, our little Alaska Native corporations are doing a really good thing. They're giving scholarships to all their kids. They're getting them college educations. So what does that do? It gives them a degree and are they going to go back to Akhiok and Karluk and Larsen Bay and get a job? I don't think so. So in a sense we're paying their way out of the villages and we're paying them to probably not to Kodiak but more

likely to Anchorage or Seattle where they need these foods.

So that's why I'm bringing this up. I don't know what you could do with migratory birds as far as making some kind of -- if you talk to the right people. I don't even know who to go to yet, but I'm going to find out. I know Herman would probably be a good one. To get something for getting ducks or migratory birds from an included to an unincluded area. I don't think you could legally do that today. That was one of the main things.

The other main thing that I've got to bring up -- looks like Pete has something to say. I'll just stop there because I was going to go into another topic. Go ahead, Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Iver, I hunted a lot of geese out at Cold Bay and I was told by the Federal people out there I could give them to anybody anywhere and ship them out and then if I gave them to somebody in Anchorage or Kodiak or Ouzinkie or whatever it didn't matter. You could give migratory birds to whoever you want.

MR. MALUTIN: You could do it but you could not do it legally. It all has to be documented.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: No, it's legal. All you have to do is put your license on there, how many birds there are and send them off.

MR. MALUTIN: No, they told me I couldn't do that, so I don't know who you're talking to, but you're probably right.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Fish and Wildlife at Cold Bay.

MR. MALUTIN: I'll just say you're probably right.

Anyway, number two. Was appointed by Governor Murkowski on the Commission of Aging. So I look in this room and I look at all of you and I decided why I would take that job, is because you're all getting older and I've got to take care of you. One of the ways in taking care of you doesn't necessarily fit into this picture but it does and it's long-term elders health

care. What does that mean? That means if we could get all the traditional foods to the people that need it, it's going to enhance their lifestyle for the last years of their life.

I was just going to ask this Advisory Board is if they could enhance any way to get special permits -- we do have some already in place, but we don't have all of them. Just something to think about in the future, to think about some way that we could get food to the elders through special permits, through special hunts. We do have proxy hunts, we have proxy permits, but not on all species, only on some. We're lacking in some of them and that's the only reason I wanted to talk to you about that, is just to get started because I'm going to come back to you time and time again and one of these times we're going to get it through.

That's all I really have to say. It's not that much, but I really thank you for your time. I know you're busy and I'm just glad that I got to talk. Thank you.

Oh, one more question. I know you're going to be having applications for new Board members or old Board members resubmitting. When does that time come and who are they? Is there any way would could get on a mailing list so we could keep that in mind when we think about other people we could get on the Board.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: It's right there.

MR. MALUTIN: See that, very simple answer. But when your hair gets the same color as mine, just like Peter said, my little brain is getting just like the river Litnik. The Dolly Varden are taking everything out of the river and it's just like my gray hair, it's making my brain get smaller. Every time I get more gray hair, my brain gets smaller. Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Iver. I see Helen Armstrong is back.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: This is the item on the Kenai Council. There has been a proposal to form an 11th Regional Council, the Kenai Peninsula Council. The Board had had a final rule that they'd written but that's been withdrawn and they're going through their regular process, so they're opening up for public comment through November the 9th and letters or any comments here can be

submitted.

What's essentially happening is the Southcentral Council is being divided and right now the Southcentral Council includes the area all the way up by -- it's the Kenai Peninsula and Seldovia is included in that and Port Graham and then it goes all the way up to the Unit 13, the Copper River area. It's a very, very vast area and they're dividing that and cutting it in two basically.

The reason they're doing that is that there's some really intense issues on the Kenai Council, so they're proposing separating it out so that people who actually live in the Kenai Peninsula can be the people who are making the recommendations for proposals that come to the Board. That's it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I should add that the Southcentral Council does not support the formation of the new council.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do we need an action on this? No action. Okay. Moving forward, Izembek.

MS. SIEKANIEC: Mr. Chairman. Council Members. I'll go over my briefing that's on Page 69. The new subsistence limit for 9(D) will be two bulls for the Federal registration permit. That was changed the last time. As of yet we do not have any new data on the herd itself. We're expecting some in October, November and probably February. By the time the Board meets again we will have some information for you. There are still concerns about the caribou, so we're going to try to keep a close eye on that. Anybody have any questions about the caribou?

(No comments)

As far as the Brant goes, there was a change in the co-management council as far as the season for Brant last subsistence season. It was closed a half a month early because of numbers. However, last fall and this winter we had a fairly high number of juvenile Brants in the population, which indicates that the population is growing. This is really encouraging. We also had a record number of birds wintering at the Izembek area, over 20,000. So, because of that increase

in three-year average, the regular hunting season for this fall, instead of the one month that it was last year it was changed to the normal three months again, so it has opened up a little bit more again.

One of the things we think is improving this population is they are doing fox trapping on the nesting grounds and as well they closed off the breeding areas, five of them, to all subsistence egging and hunting and we really think it's having a positive impact on the population.

As far as Avian Influenza, I do have some handouts here that has some pretty good information. The refuge did test swans in the Pavlof area. We tested 64 swans. We do not have the test results back from those yet. And we've also tested over 200 Eiders. We're also in the process of testing Brants from hunter kills as well as Pintails.

As of now none of the H5N1 virus has been found in the state of Alaska, so that's very good news. There has been some found in Pennsylvania and Maryland, however it's the low version that doesn't affect humans, so they're not as concerned with that. It's on Page 3 of the 7. It's a low pathogenic H5N1. As of yet, none of the high pathogenic has been found in the United States, so that's also good news.

I'm still keeping the information in there for you as far as if you do find dead birds please let us know so they can be tested and we can determine what the cause of death is.

We are still working on our Comprehensive Conservation Plan. We're working on refuge objectives and it has been stalled a little bit because of other plans the planning staff is working on.

We've also been supporting the Mortensens Lagoon fishing project and this is their last year. That will be discussed later on today. Does anybody have any questions for me?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes, I do, Sandra. Has any surveys been done on the Emperors?

MS. SIEKANIEC: Yes, they do a spring survey on Emperors every year. As far as I know, the numbers have not increased sufficiently to have an open

season yet, but we have been noticing large populations in Cold Bay and Nelson Lagoon, so that could change in the next year or two. We'll have to see.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I have one question. Was there any findings on the die-off of all the sheer waters down at Dutch Harbor or False Pass area?

MS. SIEKANIEC: Yes. The findings were that they were starving. Apparently their food source was not available to them at the time when they needed it, so they died of starvation.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have another question, Sandra. Can you give us an update on the King Cove Cold Bay Road.

MS. SIEKANIEC: In the last six months I have given four tours for VIP's. The last one was Dale Hall. He is the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and he came out the first part of September. There are discussions with both the Aleutians East Borough and the State of Alaska concerning potential exchanges for a road. Like I said, this is only in the discussion phase. Anything that's discussed will have to go through Congress and be signed by the President, so it's kind of premature to assume anything at this point.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Thank you. I see that as a plus.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: I think that's swell. I've been at Cold Bay and couldn't get out and people were bleeding pretty bad. Anyway, I hope that there is some resolution there. I'd like to just express my appreciation for you coming to our RAC meetings all the time and going to Sand Point when the weather was so foul. I think both you and Steve Fried deserve little gold stars on your blazers or whatever. I think it shows a great respect for our Council and we really respect you as a refuge manager for taking time from your busy schedule and keeping us informed.

Thank you much.

MS. SIEKANIEC: Thank you, Pat. I do consider it part of my job. It is one of our goals or purposes of the refuge that we do need to respond to

subsistence users, so that's why I'm here. Anything else?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other questions for Sandra.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Next. Kodiak.

MR. SAITO: Hello, Mr. Chair. I'm Brandon Saito, subsistence wildlife biologist for the Kodiak Refuge. I'm here to report the activity report.

A brief fisheries overview. The Kodiak Refuge and the Bureau of Indian Affairs collaborated this spring to facilitate and bring in funding of two fishery projects, but the lack of support caused them not to go this year. One project that was completed for our fisheries program was the Ayakulik River steelhead population estimate project. This was conducted for its second year and it had aid from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Sport Division.

Ms. Pattinson has spent three quarters of the year detailed in the Anchorage migratory bird office assisting with the Avian Influenza study.

News of the sea otter. In 2005, the Fish and Wildlife Service listed northern sea otters in Southwest Alaska as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. The Service has formed a recovery team which will provide recommendations and a plan for the recovery of this threatened population. The next meeting of the recovery team will be 24th and 25th of October this year in Anchorage.

On August 15, 2006, there was an Endangered Species Act special rule which published that Native articles of handicrafts and clothing that were derived from sea otters legally taken for subsistence purposes by Alaska Natives is allowed for the limited non-commercial import and export.

The Kodiak population trends. The Service's Marine Mammals Office completed data analyses on sea otter population trends for the Kodiak Archipelago. It appears that the Kodiak Archipelago is on the eastern edge of the overall sea otter population decline in southwest Alaska. The

abundance estimates of sea otters have decreased from 13,526 in 1989 to 11,005 in 2004.

Under mortality studies there was an unusual mortality event occurring in Kachemak Bay. Although it's considered the southcentral Alaska stock, it's located immediately adjacent to the southwest. The unusual mortality event was about 100 sea otters that were found dead and been autopsied and they were found to have acute valvular endocarditis and sepsis, which is a bacterial infection. The mortality age class was mostly prime age adults males. It was also observed a few cases of the disease was within the listed population at Kodiak, the Alaska Peninsula, and the Aleutian Archipelago. It's uncertain whether there is any impact on the overall population.

Any questions so far?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: The predominant cause of death has been -- can you say that next part in English, please.

MR. SAITO: Acute valvular endocarditis and sepsis.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: What is that?

MR. SAITO: Somebody could probably explain it better than me. It sounds like Pat can.

MR. HOLMES: Bacterial infection of the heart valve. The sepsis is basically a breakdown of the body tissue from bacteria, sort of like a precursor to gangrene in subtissues, so it's basically the muscle rotting away.

MR. SAITO: Thanks, Pat. For the Sitka black-tailed deer mortality surveys were conducted on the Kodiak Refuge in April. The purpose of the survey, which has annually operated since 1992, is to index the trend in over-winter deer survival, measured by the number of deer carcasses per unit area in different regions of Kodiak.

Three sites were surveyed, including Chief Cove, north Sitkalidak Strait, and west Olga Bay. Survey results revealed a low/moderate mortality rate over winter, totaling 58

carcasses.

Under brown bear, in April, William Leacock, wildlife biologist, joined the Refuge staff. Mr. Leacock will assume responsibility for coordinating the Refuge s bear program. Every year the Refuge and ADF&G collaboratively assess trends in bear density in one of several regions of Kodiak Island. Survey results are used in conjunction with harvest data to regulate subsistence and sport hunts.

In May, we surveyed bears in the Terror Lake vicinity. It indicates that bear density within the Terror Lake area has not changed since the last census in 1997.

Our Comprehensive Conservation Plan Revision. The final plan has now been written and should be available to the public in mid-September.

Other cooperation. Invasive Weed Cooperative Outreach. The Refuge is continuing its invasive weed survey and control efforts in collaboration with the Kodiak Soil and Water Conservation District. Thus far in 2006 the Refuge collectively completed three survey and two weed control missions at Camp Island, Karluk Lake, and Garden Island, Uganik Bay. Weeds targeted in survey and control efforts included orange hawkweed and Canada thistle.

The Refuge is supporting two Fish and Wildlife Tribal Wildlife Grants. One of them is the Natives of Larsen Bay, who intends to use its grant funds to build its resource management capacity through acquisition of GIS equipment, GIS training, and high-resolution digital orthophotos of the Karluk River watershed and Larsen Bay vicinity. The second one is the Natives of Port Lions, who are using grant funds to construct a bear-proof fence around the Port Lions landfill. In support of the grant implementation, ADF&G and the Refuge have offered and provided technical assistance to the Tribes.

Migratory bird harvest surveys. Subsistence bird use under Federal regulations is periodically monitored to evaluate composition and harvest trends. Results are applied to protect both subsistence use opportunities and the bird resource. The ADF&G, Division of Subsistence, and the Refuge are jointly coordinating the survey effort. A training

session for local harvest surveyors took place in January. Surveyors, all of whom are affiliated with tribes, will be responsible for collecting data and forwarding it to the Refuge. Tonya Lee, Resource Information Technician with the Refuge, will coordinate with surveyors, monitor project progress, and issue data to the Subsistence Division for analysis.

The last thing on the list is Salmon Camp. The Kodiak Summer Science & Salmon Camp successfully completed its 11th year in cooperation with Kodiak Island communities and the Alaska Natural History Association. Eight sessions were held from pre-school through middle school. Additional sessions were held in Akhiok, Larsen Bay, Old Harbor, Ouzinkie, and Port Lions.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Sam.

MR. ROHRER: Comprehensive Conservation Plan was supposed to be available mid-September. It's past mid-September. Are we going to be getting that any time soon?

MR. SAITO: I don't know the details on it right now. I could get that information and give it to you.

MR. ROHRER: I'd appreciate that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: I'd like to salute the refuge there for the Salmon Camp. I've participated in that and been a supporter of it since the get-go. I think particularly this last year reaching out into the villages with that program is really swell. I would say as a former editor your comments on the sea otter declined with your confidence interval through the statistical part of the estimate, a plus or minus 2,400 on the first one and 2,100 on the second one. You can't really say they've decreased because that variability in the estimate overlaps on both of them, so all you could do is say that they might have, but an absolute statement that they're decreasing is not valid with the data that was presented in the report. So just a small point.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have one, Mr. Chair. On your escapement goals for your salmon for Kodiak, it would be a little bit helpful if you had the current escapement up until this is printed so it gives us an idea where we're at on those goals. I know I heard that Afognak Lake did meet the lower end of the goal this year.

MR. SAITO: I'll tell our fisheries biologist that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other questions. Al.

MR. CRATTY: How are the elk doing on our subsistence land? Do you guys see them up there?

MR. SAITO: I personally haven't seen them and I haven't heard anybody talking about seeing them there lately. We haven't had any subsistence users take any elk recently.

MR. HOLMES: Wasn't the first one taken last year? Somebody did get one last year, I think.

MR. SAITO: Okay.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: There was one taken last year under subsistence.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Anything else?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Brandon.

MR. SAITO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: King Salmon.

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Council Members. For the record, Mike Edwards, fisheries biologist with the King Salmon Fish and Wildlife field office. I'm going to give a real quick overview of a couple of the projects that our office completed this summer in your area. My briefing is on Page 76 of your booklet.

Like Sandra mentioned we just wrapped up our Mortensens Creek weir project. We've been in

conjunction with the King Cove Corporation and the Izembek Refuge operating a weir on Mortensen since 2001. The data is there at the bottom of Page 76. The '05 sockeye escapement was a little over 21,000 and the coho were just over 4,000 and the crew, in the process of pulling the weir today and yesterday, sockeye for this year was 14,000, almost 15,000 and 5,000 coho had been counted through the weir. So it seems like everything in Mortensens is pretty healthy and pretty stable. We're pretty happy with what we've seen after being in there for six years. Any questions on the Mortensens project?

MR. KOSO: Can you say the '06 numbers again.

MR. EDWARDS: The '06, the sockeye was 14,688 and the coho were 5,003. Just a note, Richard, on the coho, that's early. Usually we would keep that weir in through most of October but due to budgetary and fiscal year we pulled it. We weren't going to be there for most of the run, so we didn't see any point in staying any later than we were this year. That's definitely an underestimate of what's probably in the system.

The other project, in cooperation with the Qawalangin Tribe and Alaska Department of Fish and Game, we've been operating the weir at McLees. Well, our office has been doing it for the last three years, but prior to that the Kenai office was operating it, so we've had a weir in at McLees for the last six years. If you've seen the numbers, needless to say the sockeye escapement has been all over the board in McLees. We've been as high as 100,000 back in '02 to 12,000 the last two years.

So, in six years we don't have a real good handle on what, quote/unquote, the average escapement into that system is, but we have gathered some really good biological data that was lacking on the population. So we have a good handle on the run timing, the sex composition and the age structure of the population. So, with the next three more years that will give us a total of nine and hopefully at that point, in conjunction with Fish and Game, we can come up with some kind of escapement goals. So if we are below that number when the first of June or July comes around, if we do have to put the markers up and restrict the area for subsistence users, we can have a number to where we can take those markers back down.

The McLees project, I'm proud to say, that's a very good example of inter-agency cooperation. Everyone plays well together and it's an enjoyable project to be involved with and we get a lot of support from Fish and Game. We couldn't do the project without them. It's also in-kind contribution. They're not really getting any money or anything. So I just wanted to make the Council aware of that.

A couple of the other things we're considering for some fisheries issues in Unalaska is we'd like to potentially get in again and look at Unalaska Lake. That's kind of the reason everyone is fishing in McLees now, because Unalaska Lake population has pretty much plummeted down to a couple hundred fish each year. So we're going to try to maybe run that one through OSM and get it funded again. We've tried unsuccessfully in the past.

We're also going to consider and talk with some local folks and see if everyone is happy with what's going into Summers Bay as far as coho and sockeye. Then some local knowledge I garnered working down there is the Dolly Varden harvest down there was substantial, being utilized by a lot more people than we really realized. It just kind of brought to our eyes the lack of data that we have on the populations down there. So that's kind of something we're looking at, too, is maybe doing some Dolly Varden assessment in Unalaska.

Then the last thing is just a general lack of escapement on everything in the Aleutians, was illustrated with the oil spill. People were asking for numbers of fish in areas and no one knows. So we've revisited that. We're contemplating putting in some proposals to do some aerial surveys up and down the Aleutians out there to get some baseline data since it looks like oil spills and wrecked freighters the frequency is pretty high out in that area. It would be good to have that baseline data before we have another oil spill.

With that I'd be glad to answer any questions.

MR. KOSO: I've got one question, Mr. Chairman. On Adak, do you guys have a weir out there at Quail Bay or anything? Do you monitor any of those lakes out there?

MR. EDWARDS: No. Two years ago we submitted some proposals to go into Kagalaska and Quail Bay and we wanted to do some ground surveys on Adak itself. Basically revisit some work that Doug Palmer did in the '90s from the Kenai office. They never made it past the TRC.

MR. KOSO: I guess another concern would be Lake Andrews. There used to be a creek that kind of ran between the ocean and the lake itself and it seems like it's all plugged up and there wasn't any way the fish could get up there and I seen a pile of silvers trying to get in there and they couldn't. It's an area that we're not able to get to, but I think it needs to be looked at so we could possible get maybe the reds and the silvers back into that lake.

MR. EDWARDS: That's good information. That was Lake Andrews?

MR. KOSO: Lake Andrews, right.

MR. EDWARDS: On Adak itself?

MR. KOSO: Right. Northern end of Adak. It's a huge lake.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: I'll talk with Mike afterwards. I think the work you're doing out there is really great. The comments on Andrews, Quail Bay, Kagalaska, that's probably the biggest sockeye producer in the central part of the Aleutians there, a later run. I think Unalaska Lake has a great deal of merit and please call me and we'll talk a bunch about that. But I'm so tickled that something is getting done for salmon out there. Basically the last time I raised the questions about that with my former employer I ended up without any budgets and sampling codfish. I'm really glad somebody can do it and is trying to do it. It's sorely needed.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other questions for Mike.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Mike.

MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Buskin River. Donn Tracy is not here. His report is in the book. We'll go off record for 10 minutes and give you time to set up.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. BAER: Take just a little bit of your time and show you the results of this last year of the Afognak Lake stock assessment. This is the third year of funding for this project, third and final. I'll just quickly summarize the data that we collected in 2006 and the last three years.

As you're aware, the Afognak Lake system is an important subsistence fishery for villages of Ouzinkie, Port Lions and also residents of Kodiak, which has made it an important system to assess for OSM and local folks.

This graph here shows recent trends that have occurred at Afognak Lake since '78. The most recent years there are -- well, sorry. I'm a little nervous. This graph is historical escapements and harvests, both commercial and subsistence. Since 2001 there's been a pretty sharp decline, hence this study. 2005 the State of Alaska Board of Fish reduced the escapement goal from 40-60,000 to 20-50,000 and that's represented there with those dashed red lines. This graph here shows just subsistence harvests over the last several years and, again, there's that decline in subsistence harvest since 2001.

So, with this project in mind, there's five basic goals that we tried to achieve. Estimate the smolt production, evaluate the water quality and zooplankton potential, measure usable spawning habitat, estimate the rearing and spawning capacity, and compile this data and historical data into a final report.

So the objective one, estimate the smolt production. This year at Afognak Lake the outlet there we trapped approximately 43,000 smolt from May 16th to the 29th of June. In order to determine how many total fish are coming out of the system we do what's called a

mark recapture. We release fish upstream, catch a portion of those fish, determine a total trap efficiency on those smolt and we use that percentage or trap efficiency to determine how many fish are actually coming out of the lake. This graph here shows just that, how many fish by day in a time series total estimation coming out of the lake for this 2006 season. Just over 200,000 fish migrated out.

This graph here shows the last four years of data that has been collected on the smolt. I guess that green line isn't showing up very well, but it's much smaller and lower there and also later. This was a colder spring and fish migrated out later. Not only at Afognak but several other systems within Kodiak. This lower out-migration number was not a big surprise. The parent brood year was 2003 and 2004 for this fish, which was a low escapement year. So seeing this low number was not a large surprise to us.

This is just a basic age composition table showing where things have fallen out the last four years. Again, 2006 total out-migration is a bit smaller than the other years but not a big surprise.

The total condition factor here, this is encouraging. Age one's are holding pretty steady there with that higher condition factor. Objective two for the goals there to evaluate the lake chemistry, nutrients, phytoplankton production. Samples are collected throughout May through September. This is still preliminary. Well, we did finalize some of these. Just last week was the last survey on Afognak Lake and the rest of the data is still being compiled. As you can see, 2006 is holding fairly steady and consistent with previous years with the pH alkalinity, chlorophyll are pretty stable.

This is showing the zooplankton biomass in the system. Since 2001 there is a general trend of an increase there and 2006 was looking pretty good. We still have yet to compile all of it. This last weeks of surveys is not included in here, but it's still encouraging to see that last increase in the zooplankton biomass.

The objective three there was to measure the spawning habitat and we did that last year within the creek systems. Basically 15,000 fish spawning habitat is available in the creek systems. The lake system is a bit

more difficult to assess simply because each year is different.

The fourth objective, measure the production potential and in 2005 Fish and Game, as part of the policy for the statewide salmon enhancement goal readjusted the escapement from 40-60 to 20-50,000 into a biological escapement goal. We are continuing to compile historical data, which is similar to the previous graph you saw. That will be summarized in a final report for this year, for 2003 and 2006.

The most encouraging, there is favorable review from OSM to continue monitoring this lake system and with your support and the Federal Subsistence Board's approval this will continue and we're real hopeful it will for an additional three years with more data, more smolt out-migration studies we can more thoroughly assess the entire system.

Thank you for your support and thank you for your time. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Rob, I'm really tickled that you guys got to do your work. I was wondering if you might touch a little bit on dropping the escapement goal and what that might achieve because I think that probably was some of the most important spin-off from your early work there when you started on the smolt. Can you comment on the dropping escapement goal and what might happen.

My second question is the out-migrations for this year were down quite a bit. What's the age composition of those fish? Are they two or three ocean and what would you see happening in the run in 2008, 2009, the return?

MR. BAER: I'll address your second question first. The age composition of this year was about 71 percent age one's, 29 percent age two's and that was from the brood year 2003 and 2004, which was a low escapement year. So it was not a surprise to see that small out-migration when comparing those two different types of out-migration estimates, both the trap method that we do and looking at a theoretical out-migration based on spawners, based on survival of eggs, based on smolt survival. We count with real close numbers, so

that was not a real big surprise. Escapements that have occurred in the last couple years have been a little better than 2003 and 2004, so we would expect to see a slight increase. Did that address your question, Pat?

MR. HOLMES: What were the ocean age of the parent stock? Were they two ocean or three?

MR. BAER: They were two's and three's and I do not have that off the top of my head. I can get back to you on that though.

MR. HOLMES: So we might see a bit of a dip in the returning adults in 2008 and 2009, but if you get some good out-migrants next year that might buffer it a little bit depending on the mix of two ocean or three ocean return? I guess what I'm fishing for is something you can't really say for sure, but beings that's Pete's turf, you know, kind of letting him know that 2008 might not be as good a year for Litnik. I just wonder if you can conjecture a little bit from parent age to what might happen later when they come.

MR. BAER: Yeah, and that's all part of the forecasting for sure, and I think we will come up with a more formal forecast later this winter for 2007 and a real ballpark projection for 2008, but just preliminary thoughts and looking at these numbers, I think they will be better than they were this year.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, when you get your forecast out, if you could forward that to the RAC through Michelle, and we'll get it tucked in one of our packets, and, you know, it just kind of helps people think ahead for what they'll be doing, you know, in any particular season. So I sure do appreciate your work on that.

Thank you.

MR. BAER: Not a problem. And to address your other question concerning the lowering of the escapement goal, that was based on a ricker spawner recruit curve and recent trends in escapement in addition to forage base in the lake system. And this is -- the lake can only handle so much, and lowering the goal is something that was reviewed by several folks, and I think it's going to in the long term make the system healthier and stronger.

MR. HOLMES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess my last comment to Steve and his gang and his decisions to recommend continued funding for Afognak, I sure really do appreciate you funding the work that's taken us this far, and in the future there I think it will be a big help particularly for folks in Port Lions and Ouzinkie that really depend on that run, so -- and also some of the folks come up from Kodiak. So I wanted to thank the bureaucrat side of the shop that makes recommendations on money.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other questions or comments. Iver.

MR. MALUTIN: Yeah, this is Iver again. And I just want to back to history a little bit. When I used to go to Afognak when I was very young, the whole town of Afognak depended on -- well, not the whole town, most of the town depended on Litnik gill netting. And it seemed to me that like the numbers -- I heard you say that this lake can only support or the spawning areas can only support this many fish, whatever that number is, but it seems to me like when I was a kid growing up there, everybody made a lot of money gill netting at Afognak. And it seems to me like the numbers were way higher than they are today, and I don't think the subsistence in the past has taken anything like the commercial fishermen, the seiners and the gill netters usually take years ago. And I'm thinking only from the top of my head from what I remember, but there used to be a lot of fish there, and the people that live in Port Lions could tell you where they had gill net. They could probably tell you there were 10 gill nets in each -- in the bay. And it seems to me like the numbers were really up high, and I'm just wondering why we can't -- it doesn't -- maybe we are then, but it just doesn't seem to like the numbers are up where they used to be.

MR. BAER: And as you can -- you saw from that graph, that's absolutely true. They have not been where they were, but there were several other things occurring in Afognak system then, or -- I can only speak to some of the data we have. I don't know how far back you're recall, but from.....

MR. MALUTIN: In the 40s, 50s.

MR. BAER: Yeah, I cannot comment on that right now. I don't have that data in front of me, but more recent -- up until 1990 to 2000 that lake was

fertilized and in -- with nutrient fertilization, which, of course, would increase phytoplankton, zooplankton production. In addition to that, the lake was backstocked with additional fish. That lake is no longer supported in that fashion, and there is no intention to continue to do that. So under complete natural conditions, that's how this escapement goal was redone.

MR. MALUTIN: One more thing, a comment then. I'm not criticizing the ADF&G at all, not at all, because I really have the most faith in you guys of what you're doing today. I think you guys are doing an excellent job, and I say it all the time.

And another thing that kind of get me is Karluk. As I grew up as a kid, I used to stay in Karluk in the summertime. I'd spend one summer in Karluk, I'd spend one summer in Afognak. And Afognak at the time was the largest red salmon stream in the world by numbers of fish coming to Karluk and by numbers of fish taken at Karluk. And I'm wondering why we can't get the numbers back there again. It seems like listening to this year's report on pink salmon, it looks like we're getting there, but as far as the red salmon, it seems to me like we're a long, long ways off. Is there any explanation for that?

MR. BAER: Yeah, I'm sorry, I can't comment on Karluk, I'm not that familiar with that system. I've done a little bit of smolt work there, but it's been pretty limited.

MR. MALUTIN: Okay.

MR. BAER: Certainly.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can answer you later.

MR. MALUTIN: And I didn't say that to do anything, but just -- I'm just trying to get information for myself, you know.

MR. BAER: Sure.

MR. MALUTIN: And maybe let them hear that (indiscernible, away from microphone). Thank you.

MR. BAER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Other questions or

comments?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you very much.

MR. BAER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That gets into the new business. Pat, we had you listed in new business.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, Pat, you're in new business, old business, every business.

MR. HOLMES: Oh, new business, every business. Let's see, I would like to give a quick goose report on the ad hoc.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible, away from microphone)

MR. HOLMES: I can't hear for diddly. If you want to poke fun at me, that's good, because I would never know.

I'd like to give a quick report. For years members of the RAC have participated as -- not as RAC members, but as members of the community with people on the advisory committee from Kodiak and Leisnoi village leaders on different sorts of problems and figured out who can solve them the best. And a couple of years ago Al Cratty brought up the idea, and it was seconded by Pete about trying to get the Canadian Goose reopened, and that was part of a project from the local Ducks Unlimited for bringing in migrant non-migrating geese from down in Southeast. And the critters took and for a long time we couldn't get them to reopen the season, so we got together the last couple years, did a lot of talking, and I did give you folks a news release that opens the Canadian goose season, the State, in the Archipelago. It was closed for 20 years, and so it will be opening this fall, October 8th through January 22nd. Daily bag limit of one Canadian goose, two in possession. And anyway.

And then that thing that shows the bear hunting areas, that's the area for geese. I couldn't find a chart, so I just scribbled out bear and put in geese.

The did do a closure of basically the

road system, and that was a misunderstanding with the State biologists, and by the time it was caught, it was too late. Originally we were just going to kind of close off Woman's Bay and Spruce Cape to protect some of the tame geese in town. So I guess one step at a time it's getting opened. And I think maybe through the advisory committee they'll probably give them a little poke and try to make that a lot smaller area, but I think it will provide food on the table and make Ralphy really happy down in Old Harbor, do you think Al?

MR. CRATTY: Uh-huh. It will make Peter happy, too.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, make Pete happy, because he likes to visit everybody. There's a couple things.

One thing that's coming up that we should know in this group is the State of Alaska is having a review of subsistence statewide, and they've already announced for this -- for proposals. They're also going to be looking at nonrural areas. And so that kind of -- even though every bureaucrat will deny anything they do has anything to do with another agency or government, that's another domino, and so if our Kodiak rural status stays the same, hopefully that will help us. There was quite a big argument from what I understand from rumors in the joint boards whether to do it or not, but that's coming down the line.

Kodiak rural. We had 110 different people testify. I don't need to go into that much more. It was probably the best turn out we had at the round table, of which Iver and I and Rebecca Skinner are co-chairs, worked with all the tribal entities in town. Natives of Afognak, Shun'aq, the whole shebang, plus advisory committee, and we were able to keep people aware of what was happening. And I think we probably got one of the best turn outs for this thing ever with the Federal Board.

We still have other steps to go. In December it will come up. We did receive comments even from some people I think that will vote against us. I don't know what Iver thinks, but I think we came from only having one solid vote to maybe having two or three. So it will still be squeaky.

I would like to include -- at the end I

would like to request the RAC's permission. At different times the Chair delegates people to go to the Federal Board meeting, and I would like to ask your indulgence to potent -- if you would consider me a worthy candidate to represent our RAC at the Federal meeting in December 12th and 13th I believe, because whoever you send will actually be at the table and able to speak during the debates. I"m going to fly up from visiting my wife's folks at Christmas back to Anchorage to go myself, but it would be really swell if I could be there with your blessings.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I have one question for Pat since the State ain't here to give us a run-down. What's going on with the goats?

MR. HOLMES: Goats. I think there was a little tiny -- I don't think we changed anything this year, did we, Pete? Mitch? If there was, it was very slight.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: It was slight. I think just the registration dates are earlier.

MR. HOLMES: Oh, yeah. Made the -- changed the registration dates so people going to AFN can do the registration and not get buggered out of our access to that village registration 10 days prior to hunt. I think we still have a time span in there to make it a little stickier for folks from outside. A lot stickier. But, yeah, we did change the time, made it a little bit earlier to let AFN folks be able to register.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: How about the time on the (indiscernible, away from microphone)?

MR. HOLMES: I can't even remember my kids' names. I could get it for you. Larry was going to be here, but he had whole bunch of other stuff going on. The State game guy. I can find out for you or give him a buzz. I just don't remember.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Well, I remember, Pat, that we had that -- we had a teleconference and you had got us all together last spring and we had talked about extending the registration goat hunt on through to February. I was just wondering what happened there? Remember, we all had.....

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, we did ask about it. What time is it? Do you want me to call Larry and have him run out here or.....

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Well, it's just we talked about it.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: And it seemed like it was going to happen. It's just, you know I was wondering if -- so if wanted to subsist, they wouldn't have to go up the mountain. They come down later.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Yeah, because we did talk about having the season go later. We made that recommendation. That may be something Larry can do just administratively.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah.

MR. HOLMES: And I do apologize, too, I've been kind of preoccupied with the rural thing. And I should have brought you some more precise stuff on the goats.

But for our colleagues that didn't participate, this is one project we've been working on for a long time and fine-tuning it, and coming out with a better way for folks in the village and more of the villages to have access to goats. And basically the solution was having a registration hunt for -- in the villages prior to the season, at least 10 days in advance, and we moved that up. And what that does is it increases the goat harvest overall, because we will utilize the permit hunts, or the registration -- the drawings. People -- you don't always -- they never get the amount of goats that they want in the drawing hunts. And so we were able to work out with the State this program where you can register in the village 10 days before the hunt or maybe a little longer, and then that lets people out in the village have access, you know, really as good a chance of getting a goat as you possibly can. And do you want to add anything to that, Al? Pete? Well, it ended up being a good compromise, because it let the sport hunt go on, and then native folks and other folks in town that generally support subsistence and that do do guiding and outfitting can still do that, too. So it ended up being a win for all sides.

And I'm sorry I don't have the specific thing that you need to have, Al. I'll call you up when I find out.

MR. CRATTY: Uh-huh. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any other questions for Pat? How do you guys want to -- how does the board want to deal with his request to attend the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in December? We'll wait and talk with Vincent, see how he feels since he's our representative that attends that meeting?

MR. CRATTY: I'd like to say last time, you know, got mixed up and you were supposed to be there and nobody showed. I think we should have two people going just to make sure that somebody shows up. I remember last December you had called me, and Mitch was going to go, I was going to go in his place. And in turn nobody ever did make it there. So I think it's a good idea that we do have two people going since this is a big issue. I just wanted to say that.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair, Al.....

MR. CRATTY: I think the problem with Mitch was the weather. That's why he couldn't get out.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair, normally we invite the Chair or an alternate. So what we can do is we can have the Chair attend, but if the Chair is unable to attend, then that alternate would attend in their place. So if you guys want to select an alternate. But they won't have us send two people to the meeting. It would just be one. So if you want, you can select who the person would be, you know, have the chair go or an alternate. And if you want Pat to be the alternate, that would be fine.

MR. CRATTY: Well, Michelle, if you come to the meeting and you're up there on your own, they ain't going to kick you out, are then? Okay. Because Pat will probably do that. Like he said, he's going to be up there anyway. He'll probably show up on his own good will.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, but as just a person from the audience I get my three-minute shot and that's

it. And so as you know, sometimes there's a lot of give and take and discussion. And when Della sent me up as alternate when we did the goat thing, I think it really helped Kodiak's cause, not -- you know, I'm trying to be humble and all that, but -- so I guess if I could get your vote of confidence and then ask Mitch if that's okay with him, that would be swell.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: And this board can by a motion appoint him as an alternate to Vince.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair, I was just going to recommend that Michelle talk to the Chair and see what he says, and if it's no problem, we can have Pat or whoever go in his place.

MR. ZACHAROF: If I can recommend, I'd recommend Pat to be the alternate. I make a motion that Pat Holmes be the alternate.

MR. ROHRER: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: It's moved and seconded. Any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no discussion, is there any objection.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing no objection, then the motion carries. You're an alternate, Pat.

We're down to item 12, call for items for our 2006 annual report. Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. ANILCA established the annual reports as a way to bring regional subsistence uses and needs to the Secretaries' attention. The Secretaries delegated this responsibility to the Federal Subsistence Board. Section 805(c) deference includes matters brought forward in the annual report.

The annual report provides the Councils an opportunity to address the Federal Subsistence Board, the directors of each of the four Department of the

Interior agencies and the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, in their capacity as members of the Federal Subsistence Board. The Board is required to discuss and reply to each issue in every annual report and take action when the issue is within the Board's authority. As agency directors, the Board members have authority to implement most of the actions which would affect the changes recommended by the Councils, even though it's not covered under Section 805(c).

The Councils are strongly urged to take advantage of this opportunity. And so at this time, we are checking to see if you guys have any action items you would like to be -- any issues you would like to be brought forward to the Board in a letter, in the form of a letter.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Anyone have any? We're good? Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, Michelle, I guess I need a little more time to think about it. I haven't really been, you know -- I didn't know what that really was.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. Pete. This is an item that has been brought forward to the Council every year. And the way Della has always handled it is she would talk with you guys individually, and then if you guys had issues, then she would call me with those issues. And so I guess Vince -- or, Mitch, if you don't mind if they call you with an issue, or they can call me directly and then I will call you. But if you guys come up with any issues, you can certainly handle it that way as well. Does that work?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah. Well, of course, one issue we have always had about meeting locations.

MS. CHIVERS: And that was one item that was addressed in a letter from Mr. Holmes and has been responded to. And that's -- I believe that's always going to be an issue, but you can certainly bring it forward again if you like.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'd like to bring it forward again, because we do have new people.

MS. CHIVERS: Will do.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you.

MR. HOLMES: And I would agree with Peter. You know, we've got new management and I think our Sand Point experience this year, we had some really -- good for you, Michelle, and the recorder and Steve for coming out, but that really does show how few support staff is really needed. And maybe every couple years or something we could go to some places that are remote so that we get a feeling for the area and so they know what we're about. And, you know, teleconferencing works really good. We can call and get input from folks in Anchorage, and it's just sort of -- I don't mind folks coming out and getting a chance to go goose hunting, but when we get 25 camp followers going to Cold Bay and only have one when we go to Sand Point when the weather's nasty, some money can be saved on trips, and let the Council get a little more experience with the people we're supposed to serve.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah, Pete.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I just have one more comment on that also. When we do go to villages in remote areas, we get people from the public. Here it's all employees. Iver's the only local person here from the public. Cold Bay, we don't get any local people from the public. It's just -- but in the villages we definitely get people from the public.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. Pete. Pat. Normally when we travel to a smaller community, it's when we have an issue that is being taken up, a regulatory issue, whether it be wildlife or fish. And that way we get that op -- give that area an opportunity to come to the meeting. Otherwise, if we don't really have a major issue in an area, that's when they try to ask us to continue to meet in the hubs. So if we have an issue that's coming up, whether it be a wildlife issue or a fisheries issue, then at that point then we could propose togo to that location.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Well, just to be argumentative and an old geezer, we've got Adak coming up here on rural determination, and folks out there asking for input and wanting to have some subsistence research done on salmon streams and survey requests and things like that. That was a $90,000 of which there's no money. And I think it would do us well to go out and check the place out, because I think other than Rick and I, nobody's been there. And, you know, that's going to be -- to me that's a really important issue, and it's an important group of people that we need to serve and visit, and might not have to get there for another 10 years. But certainly when you go to some place like that and you're invited to dinner or potluck, you really do get an understanding for the community and what's going on. So, anyway, we'll argue this for the next 10 years, but it's worth a try.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Iver, did you have something?

MR. MALUTIN: Yes. Iver again. And one of the things I would like to relate to you is what happened at the meetings we had the last two nights. The Chairman of the Board didn't show up. And we understand that he's going to get the transcripts, he's going to get all the information, but he wasn't there to see the sentiment, he wasn't there to see the people. He didn't get the feeling of the people that were testifying, and he didn't get the feeling of the community, and he's not going to get the feeling, he's not going to get the sentiment. There's no way he's going to get what the other members that were here, and there's no way that all these members are going to be able to relate to him what they got out of this. And it is important to reach out, no matter what. It is important. And I just feel sorry for Mike for not being here, and for Edwards for leaving so early, because a lot of people had different expressions and they expressed their views in different ways.

And I think it's really, really important to reach out, and I really think it -- even if it's one person, that you go to wherever you're going to go to talk to. And you could get something out of that one person. And I think it's really important that -- I'm just so sad that our Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board wasn't here to get the full picture.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thanks, Iver. Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair. At the public hearing they did express Mike's apologies for not being able to attend. He was newly appointed to the Federal Subsistence -- as Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board. But prior to that, he had some commitments that he couldn't get out of, and that was the reason why he did not attend. But he has mentioned that he will make the rest of the meetings. He will be attending Sitka or -- yeah, next week. Or Ketchikan. Wherever they're meeting next meet. But he did have a prior commitment and was unable to make it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Understood. Any other items for '06 annual report.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That moves us down to time and place for our next meeting.

MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you would turn to Page 93 in your book, it has the winter 2007 meeting window, and the Council at the last meeting had selected March 12th and 13th in King Cove, and we would like to see if you want to confirm those meeting dates and location, or if you would like to make a change at this time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We're still scheduled to go to King Cove, right? I guess. For the March 12th. We need to establish the location for our '07 fall meeting.

MS. CHIVERS: Do you want to confirm that one?

MR. HOLMES: Spring meeting. Do you want to keep that there?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Do you want to keep the March 11th and 12th in King Cove? Or 11th, 12th, and 13th. I'm sorry.

MR. HOLMES: So we travel on the 11th.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That would make 11th the travel day, yeah. I take it that was a confirmation vote for King Cove.

MS. CHIVERS: Okay. And then if you would turn to Page 94. Oh.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No, go ahead. Go ahead.

MS. CHIVERS: Okay. If you would turn to Page 94, this is the fall 2007 meeting window for next year. And as you can see on August 28th and 29 the North Slope Council is meeting in Barrow. But we've made a wider meeting window for meeting location and dates. And so if the Council wants to select a date and a location for the fall meeting, this is the opening time -- the open time that you would have to select from.

MR. HOLMES: I would like to move that we meet in Adak, because Kodiak's issues will be pretty well flogged out by December, and might even, just as a point of discussion, consider St. Paul. I know folks out there would like to establish a salmon subsistence harvest, and the native corporation there has graciously offered us free room and board if we got there. So we might want to consider thinking about going to St. Paul at some time. And certainly that's all part of the Maritimes, isn't it? And, you know, I think it behooves us to show respect for the communities that different people represent, and try to get a good breadth of experience for travel. So even though we've been turned down before, I think the offer of free room and board is something pretty good. And I don't know if there might be some housing at Adak if we went there in the fall. Adak's not bad in the fall. It would be good for us to travel and go see some folks, and all the OSM folks, Pete, can say no. But then again, maybe Pete wants to go to Adak and fish some silvers in Finger Bay. Who knows. Let's try it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible, away from microphone) seal. (Indiscernible, away from microphone)

MR. HOLMES: I like seal. I like seal.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, I do, too.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Adak has been suggested. You were going to make as the form of a

motion, you say?

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I'd like to move that we (a) go to Adak and as an alternate go to St. Paul Island.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Well, we'll see what the boss man says there.

MR. HOLMES: And that we would teleconference with anybody that's not absolutely needed on site.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair, may I make a suggestion, and also -- that you also select a hub location in case neither one of these two get approved.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Of course Cold Bay.

MS. CHIVERS: Is that what you're selecting? Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOLMES: Well, I think if we're going to Cold Bay, then nobody should go from the Federal Staff unless they're actually going to make a presentation and do something, because a two-minute talk when they're going out to go hunt geese or go fishing is to me unprofessional.

MR. KOSO: If you're going to go to Adak, I think you've got to look at the -- the flights there is only two flights a week. It's on Sundays and Thursdays.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go in on Sunday and come out on Thursday.

MR. KOSO: That will be good.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Oh, wow. We've got free housing there, too.

MR. KOSO: Got lots of houses out there. We ain't short of housing.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't believe the motion was seconded.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Pete's right. All the discussion. The motion dies for lack of a second.

MR. KOSO: Well, you didn't ask for a second.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah.

MR. KOSO: I don't think there was a second asked, but I will second the motion.

MR. HOLMES: Now we can have discussion.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Continue our discussion.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: I just want us -- under discussion, I support that motion, but I don't know, maybe Michelle can give us -- in the last how many years we've picked locations and it's been changed every time for maybe three four years now.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: What's his name, the boss there.

MR. HOLMES: The last time I checked the web, the cost of a Reeves flight out of Anchorage to St. Paul, I don't know what it is to Adak, I haven't been there near as, but at least going to St. Paul, it's no more expensive than going to Cold Bay, and if you've got free housing that's a cheaper trip. If we go to Adak, they're going to provide housing, and, you know, then you take that cost off the per diem per day from the extra cost to get there, I'll bet the flight isn't going to -- no different, certainly no different than going to Cold Bay and paying for the trip for 30 people or more, Staff plus us. Trim the Staff.

Anyway, I won't say any more, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Any further discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Hearing none, any objection to the.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are the dates?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Oh, Jim.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chair. I have nothing against going to Adak. I've been out there before and I know -- I think you've got to be realistic about the flight situations out there, and the what ifs are getting stuck out there a week at a time, up to a week, which has happened to me in the past, so, I mean, I think that's just got to -- that's just a reality you've got to face in the winter, September or February, almost any time of year out there. I mean, I can deal with it, but we've got to look at that I think pretty squarely. And I don't know if Anchorage would be an alternate site or I -- I mean, I don't know. I just know what it's like to go out there. I've been out there two or three times on hunts, and I have been stuck out there for a week. And I had fun during that week, but it's not always fun for everybody.

Thanks.

MR. ZACHAROF: Mr. Chairman. I have to say, Jim, that anywhere you travel, whether it's Cold Bay, King Cove, anywhere, you get stuck, so whether it's, you know.....

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I would also like to comment that we all live in rural areas and we know what getting stuck is.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's the dates?

MR. HAMILTON: I'll bring my rifle.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: What's the date?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now he's going to come. There's the boss.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: And another, Mr. Chair, I don't know if there was any -- I didn't hear any dates.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Now, wait, wait. Now the boss man's going to be talking.

MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman. In this time of declining budgets -- in fact, that's where Pete and Gary are today, they were in a budget session. They're looking at an across the board 10 percent cut right off the bat. I think the likelihood of either of those two

places being approved is somewhere between zero and nil. I would suggest that if you're looking at those two, that you do suggest a third alternative site just in case.

Thank you.

MR. HOLMES: Picking up on Pete, let's have the third alternative be Anchorage, because we'll all be there if the flight gets canceled to wherever we're trying to go anyway.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Adak, Cold Bay and Anchorage?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, it will be Anchorage then.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah, probably. All right.

MR. HOLMES: Dates. Date.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We're on discussion on location. We didn't vote on it yet.

Is there any further discussion on the motion. Michelle?

MR. HOLMES: I still think we need to pick some dates, and is Rick going to be back on by then? Because of his schedule, I was wondering. Okay.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Let's end this motion and then we'll pick dates, okay?

MR. HOLMES: On dates I'd like to suggest at least choosing either some time the week of the 10th or the week of the 24th, because usually between the 15th and the 21st in the Western Gulf we always get the big monsoon. So either go in early September, late September or maybe even October, the first week of October, but avoid the week of the -- that time between the 15th and the 21st. That third week of September is always bad.

(Whispered conversation)

MR. HOLMES: Okay. So end of September would be better for Richard? Okay. I'd like to add onto that motion as long as we're doing this all friendly, to consider some time in the week of September 24th through

the 28th, a two-day period in there, however we could get a flight.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Dan. Sam.

MR. ROHRER: Any time in September is pretty rough for me, especially if we're going to be traveling off island. If it's something close by, if it's something on Kodiak, in town or in one of the villages, that's easy for me to make it, but September's really busy for me, especially for flying to Anchorage or down the Peninsula. I'll do the best I can. October works a lot better for me, but that doesn't work for Jim, so I'll just have to do the best I can.

(Whispered conversation)

MR. ROHRER: When's the last time we've had a meeting in one of the villages? Was last fall's meeting in one of the villages? Or.....

MR. SQUARTSOFF: They went to Sand Point last year.

MR. ROHRER: That was last spring. But where was last falls?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Here?

MR. ROHRER: Here?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Here. We're -- this meeting was supposed to have been in Old Harbor, but they changed it.

MR. ROHRER: That's right. What about doing this meeting in September somewhere on Kodiak in one of the villages since we're going to be down the Peninsula for the spring meeting anyway. And then that would make it for me, personally that would make any time in September I could do that.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Sam, before you got on, we've always had our fall meetings out in the Peninsula and the spring in Kodiak, and it got switched because of this rural/thing in Kodiak. So we're just trying to switch it back the way it was.

MR. ROHRER: I see. I like the new way, but that's okay.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: How's the end of September for you, Sam?

MR. ROHRER: It -- I'll just have to do the best I can. I can -- as long as we can find someone to cover for me, I'll do the best I can.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, I just want to make a comment, too, because Michelle does notify everybody, and she tries to work it out the best for everybody, so I think regardless of where we pick in the dates, there's going to be some conflict with somebody.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. We can pick a date and as it gets closer to next year, we an probably.....

MR. ZACHAROF: Yeah, it's a whole year away.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. So we can say that tentatively it will be September 24th to 28th, somewhere in there?

MR. HOLMES: Question.

(Whispered conversation)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: You want it earlier?

MR. KOSO: If you're going to try to go to Adak, you better make it 27th through the -- go Thursday through Sunday for the (indiscernible, away from microphone). So if you make it in there, you might as well make it from September to -- you know, September 27th.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: 27th through the 1st.

MR. KOSO: You have to leave four days.....

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Through October 3rd.

(Off record comments)

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: It ain't going to happen.

MR. HOLMES: It's just a dream. I had a dream.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Let's go to Nelson Lagoon.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: What's the -- let's make a decision.

MS. CHIVERS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Michelle.

MS. CHIVERS: If you guys have really pretty much narrowed it down to a particular week, do we just want to leave it open as to a day or two and then figure out where the meeting's going to be sometime that week, would that work? I mean, I don't know if you guys can just pinpoint a date.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Sometime within that.....

MS. CHIVERS: At this time you guys keep going back and forth. I mean, in terms of going to Adak, I mean, there's only two flights a week, and you fly in Sunday, fly out Thursday. There's no way that would be approved.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No, I don't think.....

MS. CHIVERS: Not for a one day meeting. I'm sorry.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I think we better quit dreaming and just go with Cold Bay and Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay.

MS. CHIVERS: And then you -- do you want to just pick two days out of that week, like say the 25th and 26th, did you say?

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: That would have to come as an amendment to his motion, because we're still in discussion.

MR. HOLMES: Well, it's in the motion for Cold Bay and Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah. So you'd amend it to strike Adak.

MR. HOLMES: I will (indiscernible, away from microphone).

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Yeah.

MR. ROHRER: I'm worried about being fired after this meeting anyway.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: No, you just put your re-ap.

MR. ROHRER: Yeah, but that don't happen until 2008.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, we're talking about a whole year. We've go another meeting to discuss it.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Well, do they want the dates now or.....

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, let's put anything in there, it doesn't matter.

MS. CHIVERS: You could just leave it open as to that week.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: 24th through the 28. Okay?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah. We're done. Do you want a motion to adjourn?

MR. ROHRER: Move to adjourn?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: So move.

MR. ROHRER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: We're adjourned, 3:06.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This gentleman wants to testify real quick.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Oh, we just adjourned. So we re-open?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, he was just asking me if it was too late.

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: So we re-opened the meeting for a public comment.

MR. DEEVERS: Well, thanks for re-opening the meeting. I was at the -- well, my name is Mike Deevers. I've lived in Kodiak, some of you know me, for quite a few years.

And I was at the meeting last night, and I choose not to make a comment there just because everybody else has said pretty much what I was going to say. But I thought about it a little bit more last night and today, and I came out here.

It never occurred to me how important sharing my subsistence catch was until I listened to the testimony last night. And that's just a real important part of not only going out and getting what I need, but when I have a little extra, I can share with whoever, and that's really important. It's not an economic necessity for me to subsistence fish, but it certainly helps with the budget.

And the other thing that came to my mind after the meeting last night was I grew up on a small farm in Ohio at a time when small farms were being forced out by bigger farms. So we had a large garden, we raised livestock for our own use. And I never realized it until yesterday that I grew up in a subsistence lifestyle, because we didn't go catch it, we raised it or whatever. And when I moved to Kodiak, I found that it's a lot easier to just go out and catch what was here than try to grow what you needed.

That's all I've got to say. Thanks. Any questions or.....

CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Thank you, Mike.

MR. HOLMES: Did you have something written you wanted to submit?

MR. DEEVERS: Not really.

MR. HOLMES: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate you coming out here.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Re-move to adjourn.
2
3 MR. ROHRER: Second.
4
5 CHAIRMAN SIMEONOFF: Okay. We're
6 adjourned.
7
8 (Off record)
9
10 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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 of Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 96 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 22nd day of September 2006, beginning at the hour of 9:10 o'clock a.m. at Kodiak, 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 3rd day of October 2006.

_____
Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 3/12/08