

BRISTOL BAY SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

March 18, 1996

FAA - COMSERFAC

King Salmon, Alaska

VOLUME I

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Daniel J. O'Hara, Chairman

H. Robin Samuelson, Vice Chairman

Sam. G. Stepanoff, Secretary

Peter M. Abraham, Member

Robert Heyano, Member

Timothy J. LaPorte, Member

Helga Eakon, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, we'd like to call the meeting to order, if we could have you come and sit down. And we're going to -- after we finish our roll call and a couple of items on the agenda here, we want to have an introduction. Okay. We'll have our manager do the roll call for us. Sam Stepanoff is our secretary. He's going to bless whatever she says, so, Helga, would you make sure we have entered into the books the roll call tonight, please?

MS. EAKON: Yes, I can do that, Mr. Chair. Sam Stepanoff?

MR. STEPANOFF: Here.

MS. EAKON: Tim LaPorte?

MR. LaPORTE: Here.

MS. EAKON: Robert Heyano?

MR. HEYANO: Here.

MS. EAKON: Peter Abraham?

MR. ABRAHAM: Here.

MS. EAKON: Daniel O'Hara?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Here.

MS. EAKON: Robert Christensen? Robin Samuelson?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Here.

MS. EAKON: Quorum is established. And I do want -- at this point, I would like to say that Robert Christensen asked to -- did fax a letter, asking to be excused, because he has to do fire and EMT training for the next five weeks, and he didn't want to be kicked out of this Council, so he's asking to be excused.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Under -- if the board doesn't -- advisory board doesn't mind, under the agenda items we'll make a motion to excuse him, just in case for some reason he doesn't make it next time, he will still have a grace period there. Thank you.

We'd like to welcome you tonight to the Federal Subsistence Advisory Board, or Regional Advisory Council, and we would -- I realize there's probably a lot of you who have been here already for -- in past Federal Advisory Boards that we've had in Dillingham and the Naknek area, up in Lake Illiamna. And I know that our court recorder tonight would like us to speak

clearly into the microphone. You must give your name so that she can get a record of what you have, and you will have no birthday if you don't speak clearly and give us your name, she said, so you've got to be really nice.

And we're delighted to have you here with us today, and I think it would be good now if we just for the sake of every one here today, maybe we can just go around the room and introduce ourselves, and make sure that this is -- yeah, we'll introduce ourselves tonight so that we'll know who you are. I'll the recorder, if they would stand up and give their name, they probably can figure out who they are without coming to the mike? Okay. So why don't we start up here, and we'll come around the advisory board and continue on out, starting with Peter.

MR. ABRAHAM: Peter Abraham, Togiak.

MR. HEYANO: Robert Heyano, Dillingham.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Robin Samuelson, Dillingham.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Dan O'Hara, Naknek.

MR. STEPANOFF: Sam Stepanoff, Chignik Lake.

MR. LaPORTE: Tim LaPorte from Illiamna.

MS. DOWNING: Meredith Downing, R & R Court Reporters, Anchorage.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Fish & Game Department, Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Feel free if you want to just do a little more than introduction of your name to, you know, say what department you are and what you do also would be fine.

MR. COFFING: Mike Coffing, Fish and Wildlife, Subsistence.

MR. BORBRIDGE: John Borbridge, subsistence specialist with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and member of the Federal Subsistence Staff Committee.

MR. KRIEG: Ted Krieg, Bristol Bay Native Association. I work in the Natural Resources Department.

MR. HUMMEL: I'm Jim Hummel, Chief Ranger for Katmai and Aniakchak National Park.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: A fairly new guy in the neighborhood.

MR. HUMMEL: Very new.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Good.

MR. FINK: Lee Fink, Lake Clark National Park.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. BOYD: I'm Tom Boyd, I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. BOYD: Prior to the mid part of November, Mr. Chair, I was with the Bureau of Land Management as their subsistence coordinator, so this is a recent move for me. I'm now, I use this word, loosely overseeing the Office of Subsistence Management, and Helga oversees me.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Helga oversees all of us.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: If you were still with the BLM, you probably wouldn't be here tonight, because we don't have too much timber in Bristol Bay, in case you haven't noticed.

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Sandy?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service, and Staff Committee to the Federal Board.

MR. BILL: Don Bill, Fisheries and Water Quality Biologist, Katmai National Park.

MR. SANDERS: Gary Sanders, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Juneau.

MS. FOX: Peggy Fox, BLM, Subsistence Coordinator and Staff Committee member.

MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, Anchorage District, BLM, Subsistence Specialist.

MR. SELLERS: Dick Sellers, Alaska Fish & Game, King Salmon.

MR. FISHER: Dave Fisher, Fish & Wildlife Service, Anchorage.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Aaron Archibeque, I'm the refuge manager for Togiak National Wildlife Refuge.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. ADERMAN: Andy Aderman, wildlife biologist with Togiak National Wildlife Refuge in Dillingham.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good.

MR. HINKES: Mike Hinkes, wildlife biologist/pilot for Togiak Refuge, Dillingham.

MR. SALMON: I guess I'm the only non-bureaucrat here. Dan Salmon, Igiugig Native Corporation, Village Council, and resident.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOOD: Ronald Hood, refuge manager for the Alaska Peninsula/Becharof National Wildlife Refuges.

MS. MOORE: Heather Moore, wildlife biologist, for the Alaska Peninsula/Becharof Wildlife Refuges.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. WOOD: Jack Wood, hunting and fishing guide, King Salmon.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good.

MS. RUHL: Gretchen Ruhl, volunteer at the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service complex.

MR. BOS: Greg Bos, Fish & Wildlife Service, Subsistence Management Office in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you. Did we get everyone? Everyone had an opportunity to be introduced tonight? Helga, maybe you can give us your title?

MS. EAKON: Helga Eakon, I'm Regional Advisory Council Coordinator.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. You also handle South-

MS. EAKON: And also coordinator for Southcentral Alaska Subsistence.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Good. We appreciate the fine work that she does for us.

Getting down here to review and adoption of the agenda. Committee members, would

MR. SAMUELSEN: So move, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. There's a motion to accept

the agenda.

MR. HEYANO: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any discussion? Question? All those in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Could we also have a motion to excuse Robert Bobby Christensen at this time? Yes?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that we excuse Robert Christensen from the meeting. The justification is the letter that he shipped to Helga.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Second?

MR. STEPANOFF: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All those in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We have before us on the agenda tonight, one of the items that we need to take of as the Advisory Council is the minutes of the meeting for the days of October 10 and 11, this fall. Have you had a chance, panel members, to look at it and review it? What are the wishes of the panel?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Make a motion that we adopt the minutes of October 10th and 11th.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Is there a second?

MR. ABRAHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Peter, did you second that?

MR. ABRAHAM: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any further discussion? Question?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Thank you. A very important part of our Advisory Council is to be able to let the public have a comment period, and we have a note on our agenda here that says that you have this opportunity. We'd prefer you to fill out a blue card, such as I have here. Anyone who'd like to make comments, certainly feel free to fill that out. However, while we're going through the proposals, we're not so formal that the Council will certainly, you know, be able to have comment from you as we go along. We have many departments here today, and so certainly feel free if there's not an opportunity tonight, that as we get into some of these proposals and the business of our agenda that you will certainly have an opportunity to go ahead and make comment.

We're glad tonight though we do have one member of the public who would like to address us, and we'd like to call Dan Salmon from Igiugig to come up, and he's introduced himself earlier, and he has a few comments for us, and maybe some questions afterwards by the Advisory Council. Thanks for coming tonight, Dan.

MR. SALMON: Thank you for the opportunity. Yeah, basically I didn't come here to testify on any specific proposal, but just some general over-all policies of -- that affect Igiugig, myself, the Village Council and Native Corporation members.

Looking at some of the various pamphlets, directives of the National Park Service affect some of the areas that the corporation has extensive land in-holdings, including the Katmai National Preserve, and of our particular concern here is reading the management plan on the Alagnak River management, and the efforts of the Park Service to work on trespass issues, we have repeatedly contacted the Park Service over a period of probably six or plus years on some of the trespass issues at the outlet of Kukaklek Lake, which the corporation has extensive land holdings.

At one time a pamphlet was prepared by the Park Service that identified a one-mile wide corridor down the full width of the river as public access. Faced with that, the corporation had to do an extensive media campaign to get out the information that that is not quite the case, and educate the Park Service that this particular pamphlet needed to be revised, which they did. That year they passed out an attachment to it that cleaned up the verbiage a little bit, but

When I look at this pamphlet here that's just been put out, and I see the Alagnak River management, I see the Park plans to work with Levelock Corporation, and with BBNA on trespass issues, and plans to use the National Park Service easement marking program to mark some problem boundaries. Well, this is exactly what we've been calling and asking for repeatedly. I believe I've been through approximately three or four superintendents down here. The turn-over rate's been pretty high. I've contacted Susan many times about issues concerning the corporation in-holdings at Kukaklek, so I'd like the Park Service to be aware that we do want to become part of this process of management and information gathering, especially on the Branch River, and anything involved with the Katmai Preserve.

Secondly, I'd like to testify about my belief that, and our village's, including I believe some of the others around the region that aren't represented here tonight, about the customary and traditional use of four-wheelers and three-wheelers in the Preserve. We've been using them for -- ever since they came out. People have been in that region to trap, hunt, et cetera, using that technology. The mission statement here, regional subsistence policy statement I believe gives the directive that they recognize that subsistence ways of life are continuing to evolve. I think that's a key statement on allowing the use of three and four-wheelers in the Preserve.

And where appropriate, Park management practices may reflect regional diversity. Well, look at the conditions of this winter. Access was awful tough by snow machine to access the properties up there, and the resource, which residents of Igiugig do trap in the Preserve. Oftentimes four-wheelers is the only mode of transportation that can be effectively used to harvest these resources, so I would hope that the Federal Park Service, or whatever agency has to initiate such changes to recognize that that is evolving technology and lifestyles, that they pass whatever it takes to allow the use of that technology in the Park.

Some of the residents in Igiugig have commented that you see all different types of access technology to -- allowed by the Park to access previously hard to access regions for sport fishing, including float tubes, et cetera. Those types of technology can be used to access those resources. That's all we're asking for, a little parity in the use of three and four-wheelers.

And I guess other than that the feds maintain the position that we view the aircraft also as a customary and traditional use. It's been used in this region for quite some time, and to continue to access subsistence resources, we'd like to continue the use of that technology, especially with the declining -- or the harder access of caribou of recent years.

And about the only other one that we didn't get in time

to get a proposal in here, and I guess I need to work better with BBNA to help evolve some of these, we feel that the cow season in Unit 9(B) in December to be a primary traditional use of that -- our particular village, and hope to in the following year get a proposal in that reflects that use.

That's about all I have.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. Any questions from the panel members tonight? Yeah, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dan, good to see you again.

MR. SALMON: Robin.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Maybe we could find a steam over here and cook each other tonight after the meeting.

Yeah, the Branch River's got me real concerned. I've talked to Dan and a number of people from his community about the trespass problems they're experiencing both in Igiugig and Levelock. And it seems that, Mr. Chairman, that we need to get a handle on that. You know, I think at the last Council meeting, or it was a Board of Fish meeting that there was a guide going in there that was trying to open up in that little corridor area, no-man's land, that he was going to put in a strip big enough to accommodate a jet in there, and I don't know what the status is on that, or if staff knows, but when staff gets up here and comments on it, I'd like to see -- I'd like to hear some staff comments addressing Dan's concerns on trespass.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Also, Dan, I think we'll go ahead and address the three-wheeler/four-wheeler issue in the Preserve, and I don't know what federal agency out here, or who the individual will be that will be dealing with that, but we certainly will bring it up this meeting.

And on the Alagnak up there, the Branch, we have a problem there. The State of Alaska has navigational responsibility and we deal with the land, and there just -- it's

becoming unrealistic, the pressure that's going on on that river, you know, so we're just going to have to do something to be able to bring it under control. It's not going to be an easy issue, but we're just going to have to face it and we sure appreciate your bringing it up tonight. It reinforces what we have to do.

Any other comments from the panel members? Well, thank you, Daniel. You may be in and out of the meetings the next couple days?

MR. SALMON: Yeah, I will. I sure appreciate

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. SALMON: the opportunity to address the floor here.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You bet. Come back and see us.

MR. SALMON: Okay. Thanks a lot.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other members of the public that would like to enter public comments tonight, like to address the panel? There will be other opportunities as we go along in the next day or so.

And at this time, if we don't have any other members of the public that would like to address the panel here, we will discontinue public comment period and go into our reports for the rest of the evening.

I don't know where these tee shirts came from, but rumor has it that the panel is going to be playing the federal boys in a basketball game after the meeting tonight, is that right? Got to be 60 years and older or we're not going to play you.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. We have a little change of agenda here. Tom Boyd is going to be talking to us first, and

he's going to be U.S. Fish & Wildlife and subsistence management. Thank you, Tom.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Mr. O'Hara. I was talking with the Board Chairman, Mitch Demientieff, this afternoon, and he sends his greetings to you. I told him I would be out here this afternoon, and he sends his greetings, and I know that he considers the Council deliberations during this period to be a critical part of the regulatory process for the federal program.

What I wanted to do today at this -- in this report was to kind of go back in time, maybe two or three months, and sort of provide an explanation of what transpired following the federal shut-down that occurred in December, and how it impacted the program. And I'll just preface everything by saying it didn't impact things too dramatically, but there were some changes, and some of you were made aware. I know you, Mr. O'Hara, were contacted about changes in schedules and things of that sort, but I wanted to kind of share this a little more -- in a little more detail so that you have some idea of what we went through during that period.

We lost a few days in November to a federal shut-down, and then about three weeks in December. And that created significant delays in the regulatory process. The major effect of that loss of time was primarily for the preparation by our technical staff of the biologists and the anthropologists primarily of the staff reports that you have in front of you now, and the various proposals that you're going to be dealing with in this meeting. And as a result of that, we had to quickly evaluate where we stood on the schedule, and how much time it was going to take us to recover, and also make contacts with primarily the Council chairmen to find out when it would be appropriate to reschedule the meetings, and we -- I think we ended up rescheduling three or four of the ten meetings, which we were pretty fortunate not to have to slip too many of them. Of course, yours was one of those meetings, and that was one of the -- if you want to think in these terms, the casualties of the shut down.

A second change in the schedule was that the Federal

Subsistence Board meeting had to slide from early April, and it's now scheduled from the 29th of April to the 3rd of May in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: 29th of April to

MR. BOYD: To the 3rd of May.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. BOYD: Also, the regulations that were to go into effect normally on 1 July will now -- that's for the next season, the 96/97 season, will go into effect on 1 August, so we had to slide that one month. We had some concerns because there were some new proposals that within the -- and I'm not sure if this is one of the councils that have some of these proposals, but some of the proposals that we were dealing with had proposed seasons beginning in early August, so we wanted to make sure we had regulations in effect before those seasons, you know, assuming the Board might approved those proposals, those seasons -- before those seasons would go into effect. And then to cover the period of 1 to 31 July of this year, we have extended the current regulations to cover that period until the new regulations go into effect on 1 August.

And another casualty of the shut-down was the postponement of a joint Board/Council Chair meeting that was scheduled to take place on the 18th and 19th of January of this year. That meeting was set up to foster a free exchange of ideas and issues and problems between the Board and the Council Chairs. And I think the idea was to enhance communication and possibly to get a better understanding of the regulatory process, the issues that you face, and some of the problems that you're dealing with, as well as on the other side with the Board. We are trying to reschedule that meeting for sometime early in the fall. We don't have dates yet, but be aware that it's coming.

And also to try to capture some of the spirit that was generated when we were trying to get this thing going back in January, we would like to spend the first half day of April

29th, at the Board meeting, to have kind of a constructive dialogue between the Council Chairs and the Board.

That concludes my report to you at this time.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. If we could -- if you could stay a minute, Tom, in case we have any questions from the panel?

MR. BOYD: Sure.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I have a question. Of course, I think they extended the budget for another week, is that what

MR. BOYD: Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Congress did? I guess it's just a guess of what might happen. It is an election year, so there is hope I suppose.

MR. BOYD: Yeah, I was talking about it in a staff meeting this week, it was yesterday, and I referred to it as stop gap to the stop gap, so we've got one more week of breathing room, and then we'll find out what's going to happen

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. BOYD: for the remainder of the year.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any more questions? Thank you, Tom, we appreciate that.

Okay. We come to the Aniakchak Subsistence part of the agenda tonight, and we have Don Bill I believe and Mr. Jim Hummel. Maybe you could both come up to the table, if you would, please, and we appreciate you coming and giving us a report tonight on the status of this part of the agenda.

MR. BILL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, again my name is Don Bill, I'm the fisheries biologist, water quality

biologist for Katmai National Park. This is Jim Hummel, our chief ranger. Susan Savage, who's normally our subsistence

COURT REPORTER: Speak more into the mike, please.

MR. BILL: coordinator, is also right now our acting chief of resources, and as such is in Anchorage at a meeting of the park resource chiefs for budget reasons and others, so she couldn't make it. So I guess you're stuck with me.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's happened before.

MR. BILL: Yeah, I know it. I know it.

Aniakchak, because of the furlough and Susan's temporary reassignment as chief, wasn't able to really devote the staff time necessary to get a meeting going, so she does plan on rescheduling or trying to schedule a meeting for this fall for the Aniakchak Resource Commission.

As far as Katmai, as you know, the Federal Government is reorganizing and down-sizing, and as such we've lost a few of our people to clustering with other parks. Bill Pierce who's our superintendent now is the acting superintendent of Lake Clark also, and is now stationed in Anchorage. Debbie and Cary Brown, Debbie was our administrative officer, Cary Brown is the management assistant, are both now in Anchorage. Bill and Cary will be focusing a lot of attention on the commercial activities of the park.

Jim has filled the position that was vacated by Steve Herd, who was our chief ranger until August I believe he left Jim is from Wrangell-St. Elias where he was stationed there for seven years.

Cliff Lungren will be coming aboard in May as our criminal investigator and pilot.

As I said, Susan is our acting chief of resource

management right now. Rick Potts left in August also, so he took a different position.

Our cultural resource specialist, who was Pat McClanahan for several years, and she's been gone over a year now, we have Jean Schaff is also in a clustering effect, and she is the Katmai National Park, Lake Clark National Park, and Kenai Fjords National Park, so she's working in all three of those areas.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And, Don, where is she located? In this office?

MR. BILL: She's located in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Anchorage, okay.

MR. BILL: She's in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MR. BILL: We have our coastal biologist -- or a coastal -- what do they call it? Coastal management area person is stationed in Kodiak, and that's Buddy Goatcher. He used to be in this office, and he went over there last July.

Robin Leatherman is chief of maintenance, and it looks like he's be covering Katmai and Lake Clark.

So as you can see, we're kind of getting stretched out here a little bit.

I'll just kind of cover a few of the issues that are going on. On the red fish issue, Bristol Bay Native Corporation in coordination with the Congressional delegation, we have House Bill -- or House, I guess it's a House Bill, 1786 which would allow red fish fishing within Katmai National Park for Katmai descendants. I believe Trefon Angasan was in Washington, D.C., or just going to go, to testify. Deborah Williams, who's a special assistant for Alaska for the Secretary of Interior, will testify for the Park Service.

The National Park Service supports the bill with a few minor changes. We'd like to define the descendants to include any people who lived in the Naknek drainage and harvested red fish, and not just those who lived inside the park boundaries, so

We also suggest striking specific locations named in the bill so that we can work with the State Department of Fish & Game biologists and the descendants so that the descendants needs are met and the park resources are protected.

The Department of Interior staff also asked if a definition of red fish be added to the bill, and it defines red fish as red or sockeye salmon that have spawned. So that's where the status of that is at the present time.

Subsistence research. The subsistence ethnography study continues with the oral history project. It's a joint project with several villages: Igiugig, Kakhonak, Levelock, South Naknek, and the Park Service and Bill Schneider of the University of Alaska in Fairbanks. It's a collection of oral history from elders, and formats -- it stores it in the computer-base format. It's called Jukebox in other areas of the State, so if you hear that name, that's what it means.

Information was collected from Igiugig and demonstrated to the community. I haven't heard how that came out. I don't know, maybe Dan can speak to that if anybody's interested. But they do plan on connect- -- on collecting more data yet this spring.

The Alagnak River Management, Alaska Central Office will be funding the Alaska project again this year. We hope to work with the Department of Fish & Game to investigate some fishing patterns and resident fish populations. We also plan to have a law enforcement ranger on the river this summer, and to step up our visitor education program regarding camping etiquette, trash and human waste disposal is a couple of the things.

We also plan to push the bear-resistant food storage requirement. We do have those available at our visitor center,

and the guides and -- commercial guides need to get theirs in line there.

We plan to work with the Levelock Corporation, Bristol Bay Native Association and Igiugig on the trespass issues and plan to use the National Park easement -- service easement marking program to maybe mark some of the boundary -- the problem areas.

As far as biological information collected, Susan flew moose surveys I guess in Angeltakioto Creek area, and in the park boundary area from Contact Creek to Granite Peak. She attempted in the Branch River Trend area, however, it was not completed because of the weather, and because of the furlough time. A lake of snow in the Aniakchak area prevented any surveys there.

At Brooks Camp we're presently working with the Council of Katmai Descendants, DEC and several other federal and state organizations to develop a plan for remediation of several diesel oil spills that took place up there. I just had a meeting on the 14th in Anchorage. We've basically narrowed it down to some preferred alternatives, and we will have an EA available hopefully in about a month for comment.

We also have been working on -- we had a field septic system out at Brooks Camp, so we've been working on how to reduce water use. We're also looking at maybe using a sand filter somewhere near the fish cleaning building as another way of prefiltering that.

The record of decision regarding the Brooks River development concept plan is on the Secretary's -- is at the Secretarial level right now waiting for approval. We proposed to extend the current concessionaire's contract at -- in Katmai for two to three years until the development concept plan is implemented. This will announced in the Federal Register. And once the development concept plan is implemented, there will be a new concession prospectus out.

That's basically my report on Aniakchak and Katmai. So

if there's any questions, Jim and I will try to

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, before we get into questions, maybe Jim could tell us a little bit what his involvement is. You took Steve Herd's place?

MR. HUMMEL: I'll be happy to. I -- can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: State your name and -- so that she can have it on the record there, if you would, Jim.

MR. HUMMEL: My name is Jim Hummel again. I stepped in as of November of '95 into the chief ranger role for both Katmai and Aniakchak, and also as a pilot. I've been working at the Wrangell/St. Elias National Park and Preserve for the past seven and a half years as a district ranger and pilot there, and pretty intricately involved with the subsistence-related activities that occur there, in addition to the commercial operations and visitor use activities that occur in that area. I'm still learning about Alaska, but I do have some background behind me that I felt has been very helpful as I step into my role here in King Salmon as the chief ranger at Katmai, and the role that I have here as chief ranger is to help manage visitor use activities, the commercial operations that occur, and ensure that compliance occurs with those activities so that there's minimal impact to our resources, and at the same time ensure that there's subsistence opportunities that occur within the areas where it's permitted.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you, Jim. Any questions this evening for Don or Jim on their report? Yeah, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Don, on the Alagnak, is there any chance that we could possibly get funding from like Dingle Johnson or Walter Brough funds, matching dollars with National Park Service to conduct and train people from the villages of Levelock and Igiugig to do patrols and -- you know, that is developing into a real controversial river over there, and I equate back to the Nushagak River where we have a major king salmon fishery going on, but the village

council over there, Chugian, decided, well, we're going to get into leases, and we're going to control the -- you know, there's going to be growth. And they charge the sports fish guides X amount of dollars to pay for staff to patrol up and down the river. I think, you know, -- I don't know if these funds are available, but have you guys ever gone after them funds?

MR. BILL: Well, D-J funds and that, if I'm not mistaken, are the State. The State gets the D-J funds. We're -- I'm not sure what Susan's budget is on the Alagnak. It's something like 75,000 I believe, so the whole program that we have, which includes, like I said, a law enforcement ranger, we're probably going to have some SCAs, which are student conservation type people, and possibly one or two other seasonals on the river. Basically that's our project. And I don't think that the State has any funds that I know of for any kind of enforcement or patrolling. They may do some biological work on the river, I don't know what they've got planned for this summer yet.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Gary's here, I'll ask Gary after while maybe and see if Sport Fish Division does any of that stuff.

One thing I'd like to see is some training into those young residents of the communities, because a lot of them are going to be inheriting allotments along that river system. They know it like the back of their hand, and I'd like to see them young guys get involved in protecting their own resource out there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions tonight for Aniakchak/Katmai National Park?

MR. BILL: And we'll be around all three days.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I have several, Don, here, that I'd like to -- you talked about the red fish issue up here at Katmai National Park, and it says that you are including more than the descendants of the park area. Could you just maybe -- I think I might have spoken with Jim on the phone a little bit about that, too. What are you talking about there, because like Lee is

going to be talking to us here shortly, and only certain villages can go into the Lake Clark area and do subsistence, you know. I'm from Lake Illiamna, but I can't go back up there and go to the Park and hunt, because I live in Naknek. And I'm not necessarily, I don't think, entitled to do the red fish thing, because I'm not a descendent of the Katmai National Park. Could you explain that a little bit more, what that might be in the bill?

MR. BILL: Well, my understanding of it is that this would include people -- you don't necessarily have to have lived within the Park boundaries,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, previously. Yeah.

MR. BILL: as long as you used that -- those park -- the resources in the Park,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. BILL: you didn't necessarily live in the Park.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, okay.

MR. BILL: That's what

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That clarifies it then.

MR. BILL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, it's not necessarily restricted to the early descendants of the park.

MR. BILL: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. That's fine. Okay. In the Aniakchak area, you're talking about you did -- you were not able to get a moose count. I haven't heard of very many people down there other than maybe the guides who actually do any moose hunting in the area. Is there a subsistence hunt on moose in

that area, or is there any record of it?

MR. BILL: I really can't answer that myself. I

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Well, Susan's not here, I realize.

MR. BILL: Yes, Susan's not here. I think along the coast there might be some. I'm just not sure. I don't know, have you

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, you know, I know we have a guide here tonight who works the area. He might be able to fill us in as time goes on, too.

MR. BILL: And Dick Sellers may know it, too. He may have an idea.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Dick, yeah. Maybe Dick could help us out. I don't know. This is Aniakchak I'm talking about, so

MR. BILL: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I figured it would be your guys' deal. Okay.

Another issue, Don, that I'd like to mention is on the red fish issue, when you're dealing with gill nets, if that bill does pass, and most likely it might this time, what kind of monitoring is this going to take so that you don't pick up, you know, for instance, a big amount of rainbow or lake trout or dolly varden or something like that? Is there going to be a mesh size attached to that so you catch -- target mostly the red fish that are spawned out, or have you given that much thought?

MR. BILL: I haven't really looked into it, but I -- when and if in fact it does happen, I'm -- whatever regulations we'll come up with, we'll try to definitely target red, and I'm sure that we're going to have to monitor it, so

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MR. BILL: we will be there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Yeah. In other words, you don't want to kill out a whole section of rainbow trout just because we have the privilege of doing a red

MR. BILL: No. No, I mean, that

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: the spawned-out type fish.

MR. BILL: Yeah, we'd be real careful.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: So that will be the burden of proof of this organization here then to handle that when -- should that bill pass?

MR. BILL: I would assume so, yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, because that's not going to be part of the legislation, telling you the size of the mesh and all that type of stuff I don't imagine.

MR. BILL: I don't imagine that will be there,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: The bill I saw

MR. BILL: that will be up to us.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: did not address that.

MR. BILL: We would probably have to come up with a permitting type system so that we can keep track of who's where and

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Gateway to the Park, you talked about the Brooks issue. Of course, here you have a big percentage of shareholders of BBNC, and we're looking at dollars and cents sitting right there at the entrance to the Katmai National Park, and that's where you want it, of course, and so

that decision is still to be looked at by the Secretary of Interior?

MR. BILL: Right. The DCP and alternatives and -- is at the Secretary, I guess, of the Interior's desk now.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. BILL: That's where it's stuck at.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. If we don't have any further questions, thank you, gentlemen, for -- oh, excuse me. Peter?

MR. ABRAHAM: Does the -- I mean, do they use nets on those red fish?

MR. BILL: They -- traditionally I guess they did, yes.

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah. You know, in Togiak Lake over there, the best piece of equipment is a king salmon net, and the size of 7-1/2 to eight inches. This way you cannot catch any smaller fish. All you can catch is the male fish. And all the females

MR. BILL: Uh-huh.

MR. ABRAHAM: go through that net there. Because, you know, any lake trout smaller than these spawned-out male king salmons, it's the only ones that you can catch. Once in a while you get the female in the mouth, and lake trout in the mouth. Once in a while. But the rest of the fish goes through that big mesh of net.

MR. BILL: Uh-huh.

MR. ABRAHAM: That's how we fish in Togiak Lake.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Okay. Any other questions? thank you, gentlemen.

MR. BILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Appreciate it. The -- I guess those who have come in have been able to register back there, and sign up, if you like. We've finished with the Aniakchak Subsistence Resource Commission, and report, the Katmai National Park. At this time we'd like to take the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission, and we have Lee Fink here to -- nice to have you with us again tonight, Lee. You're getting to be kind of a regular.

MR. FINK: Yeah. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Council members. My name is Lee Fink. I'm the subsistence coordinator for Lake Clark National Park.

And, well, Don and Jim filled you in a little bit on some of the changes that the parks in general have been going over, so I won't go into much of that, but we've been working more closely with Katmai lately, so

Our subsistence resource commission for Lake Clark National Park met on January 24th, just past, in Newhalen, and a few items on the agenda. We re-elected our chairman, Mr. Glen Olsworth in his absence was re-elected as the chairman. And we met specifically or primarily to discuss Proposals 30 and 31, to get some input on those proposals which we'll be discussing later in this meeting, and the Council did -- or our commission did pass a motion putting forth their views on how they thought that these proposals should be handled at a local level, so I won't get into that right now, because we have a whole block of time slated for that later on.

Also, Mike Coffing from Fish & Wildlife in Bethel was present at that meeting, and he discussed some of the c&t issues that, you know, this Council will also be looking at, getting some local input from the north end of the district for the Bristol Bay Council.

Presently we are -- all our seats are full. We have nine commission members. Just a quick overview for those that might not be familiar, on the subsistence resource commission

for the park, there are nine members: three that are appointed by the Secretary of Interior, three that are appointed by the Governor of Alaska, and then three that are appointed by this commission. And presently Mike Delkittie, Dave Wilder and Tim LaPorte serve as commission members at the appointment of the Bristol Bay Regional Council. And those seats are up this year, and we'll probably be looking at the nominations later this spring to refill those seats. I think they expire on November of 1996.

So unless there's any specific questions, I guess that's about all I have for the

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, Lee, you're going to be up here a lot when we go through the proposals that's going to come from your area anyway. I have a question, but I'd like to ask the panel members if they have any questions for you tonight? No questions?

Dan Salmon brought up the issue of three-wheelers and four-wheelers in his area. Does this fall under your guys' jurisdiction, or is this from somewhere else?

MR. FINK: Well, I believe probably what Dan was referring to would mostly be in Katmai Preserve.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: So you do handle Katmai Preserve?

MR. FINK: No, no, I don't.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, you don't. Okay.

MR. FINK: I don't handle Katmai. That would be Susan or Jim or Don.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Jim and Don handling that?

MR. FINK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We're probably going to look at that a little more in detail as the meeting goes on, and should

time permit tomorrow or the next day. And then, of course, we are going to be addressing the -- you know, the Branch River thing pretty

MR. FINK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thanks, Lee. We appreciate you being here.

We'll take the Alaska Peninsula/Becharof National Wildlife Refuge, and we have Ron Hood, the manager. If you would like to come and talk to us tonight, Ron? Nice to have you come before us again, Ron.

MR. HOOD: Mr. Chairman, well, thank you for this opportunity. I'm Ronald Hood, refuge manager for the Alaska Peninsula/Becharof National Wildlife Refuges.

I'd like to call your attention to a report that you have a copy of on your desk. This report covers the subsistence management activities of the refuges, but it also -- I expanded it to include all activities of the refuge that I thought you might be interested in. I won't report on the nonessential parts of the report, but it's there for your -- for your information.

Subsistence management issues, the -- under moose, the refuge complex works with ADF&G to do moose trend areas, primarily in the Kejulik River Valley area, and a couple of other locations. This year due to the weather, the flying conditions and the infamous furlough, we did not get any informa- -- gather any information. We did report the information that Susan Savage gathered in the park boundary area, because it's so critical to the Becharof Unit 9(C) moose seasons.

This year we had -- the Subsistence Board authorized a new moose season for Unit 9(C), the Big Creek area portion of Becharof refuge. That ran from August 20th through the 31st. The refuge issued seven permits for that hunt. No moose were harvested by any of the permittees.

The second subsistence hunt that we have in Unit 9 -- well, for both Unit 9(C) and 9(A) run for the month of December. In Unit 9(C) the Big Creek portions of Becharof Refuge, we have an antlerless season. This year we issued 11 antlerless permits. We had three cows were reported harvested to our office. To date we have had incomplete returns of all of those to subsistence office, so we are unaware of any others. There was also one bull moose killed in that with antlers -- one moose with antlers killed during that same time period. This is the third year for that December season, and it was probably the most successful season that we've had since we implemented the cow moose hunt.

In caribou, this year in the cooperative effort with ADF&G, the complex paid for 20 radio collars to be refurbished. They -- we then agreed with Dick or had Dick agree to put five of these collars on animals in the Pacific drainages. However, once again the weather prevailed and we were unable to get that. Dick was able to get several of these collars placed on the Bristol Bay side of the Alushik (ph) range, but none of them were on the Pacific side. Again, we assisted ADF&G with the late June survey of caribou. For this year our time frame was expanded due to weather, so there is a large potential for some error, for some double-counting or missing of animals, but if you look at the report, it gives you a quick summary of what we found. Dick Sellers will be reported later on the population movement and preliminary harvest ticket data from the herd.

I would like to go ahead at this time and make some comments on the Unit 9(E) caribou closure which we're scheduled to discuss a little bit later, but we'll go ahead and discuss it now, because basically we don't have any information. It's much too early to make any evaluation. And then that coupled with the fact that the State lands, the Bristol Bay lowlands were open, they -- that means that the impact of that closure on federal lands is likely to be minimal anyway, but I have some comments in here, a little bit of background on what the conditions were when that regulation was implemented. And then at the last meeting, the Becharof Lake/Allen Arm closure, or implementing of the limiting of air taxis was discussed, and I won't discuss

that again at this meeting, but I did include that report just in case somebody wanted to refresh their memory.

And with that, I will shut up.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Hood, Ron, tonight? Ron, an issue that we've been -- that I have been thinking about and we're going to be looking at possibly for an idea on a proposal this coming October or whenever we have our meeting, which will probably be the next meeting, at which time we'll take proposals in the fall?

MS. EAKON: That will be when the Regional Council responds to the call for proposals, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Okay. Thank you. I've been kicking around a little bit of an idea. I mean to talk to Mr. Sellers. I think without a doubt you're the biggest player of lands on the Alaska Peninsula, you know, taking in a lot of federal, both Becharof and the Peninsula Refuge. It covers massive areas, and a lot of animals. We've had a decline down to, if I'm not mistaken, 11,000 animals, of caribou on the Alaska Peninsula perhaps. Is that a good number?

MR. HOOD: Ball park.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Ball park figure, okay. Down from 17 to that. That may be a good number. It may be a good number. And I was talking with some of the biologists in the area about the possibility of looking at a closure on bull caribou in the month of October. And -- just as an idea. I asked the Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee what their thoughts were on it, and they didn't have any comment, because it was, you know, just brand new to them, and they're not taking proposals right now. But that's something that we might be coming to the table with here next October. We're not going to do it unless we get a pretty good feel from the Federal people, Dick Sellers, the user groups, such as Joe Klutsch and different ones. There may not be a need for it. I think we should look at it. We'd like to begin looking at it, and so we just brought -- I would bring it up to you as the Chair of the Council tonight as something we

might be -- you know, I might consider looking at here in the falltime, but -- and we're not asking for comment on it. We just kind of wanted to forewarn you it could possibly happen.

Any other questions for Mr. Hood tonight?

MR. STEPANOFF: Yeah, I have one.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. STEPANOFF: I'm from Chignik, Pacific side. Ron, you know, like this winter I finally broke down and bought myself a snow machine, a new one, and then I went out with the boys, went up riding around. We spent a couple days, and it was -- there was practically no caribou that we seen. Maybe 20 some in a herd, and that was about it. It's pretty well wiped out. I don't know what happened.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We -- yeah.

MR. STEPANOFF: Yeah, I see that maybe this one partner for some guides got nine in this -- they have nine caribou?

MR. HOOD: Well, that was in some old records of how many were taken in the whole Chignik unit in '93 and '94. In '95 zero were taken.

MR. STEPANOFF: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOD: Because it was a closed -- it was closed to the taking in that area.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. STEPANOFF: Yeah. And then, well, like caribou in Ivanof now, they were closed for a couple years now, were they? For a year?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: A year.

MR. STEPANOFF: Yeah. And there's nothing down there.

I mean, there's totally nothing. There is moose down there, but no caribou. I don't know what happened. They quit coming down there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We don't know whether they've gone away, or they've gone a different way, you know. Who knows.

MR. HOOD: Yeah, caribou -- as I heard somebody say, caribou do what caribou do.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOD: And they go where they want to, and as many of us in King Salmon understand this year, they didn't come this way, so

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Yeah. And I don't if there's been any reduction in animals. That's why I say maybe, you know, with sustainable yield, Ron, maybe 11,000, maybe 17,

MR. HOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: maybe something in between, I don't know. But if we need to, then we need to start looking.

Did it help any to have that section cut off down at the Aniakchak area? Aniakchak? No, down at Veniaminof area?

MR. HOOD: Yeah, that's the point I was making, is there was only seven caribou taken before the closure and zero after.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. HOOD: And so it's hard to make any judgment at this point on the impact of that, because they could just go to State lands and do their hunting.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Yeah. Okay.

MR. HOOD: Yeah, our big game guides reported 55 caribou for the refuge last year taken.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's Becharof and Peninsula?

MR. HOOD: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Robin, did you have a question.

MR. SAMUELSEN: The seven caribou, were they -- you said they were from the Chignik side?

MR. HOOD: That was the Chignik unit in 93/94 time frame.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Resident hunters or non-resident?

MR. HOOD: No, those were guided hunters.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Guided hunters. I don't know what the budget cut-backs are on that. Have you made trips down and did some winter surveying, or maybe Dick Sellers when he gets up, he'll talk about it, but there's a report on KDLG the other day by Larry Van Daele that the caribou are doing exactly opposite over at the Mulchatna caribou herd. They're staying in their summer grounds during the winter here, and, you know, surely I'm sympathetic with Sam's folks down there, but you can't regulate caribou into an area. They're going to go wherever they want to go, and maybe the caribou are holding off up north like the Mulchatna caribou herd.

MR. HOOD: Well, I think Dick's going to provide you some more information on that.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, if he could make them go to Chigniks, he could probably run for office. Thank you, Ron. We appreciate you coming up here tonight. You'll be around tomorrow and

MR. HOOD: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: help us out? All right. Thank you.

Do you want, maybe we'll do another report and then take a break after this? Okay. How about if we do the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. Andy? It's Andy Aderman, is that

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: No, I'm going to talk today, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, okay.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Mr. Chairman, Council members, my name is Aaron Archibeque. I'm the refuge manager for Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. And I'll go through some highlights that we've had this past years, and some things we're planning on working on this year, and then I'll also address the directive we were given at our last meeting to try to get together with Togiak,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: all those groups, and -- all the groups.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Great. Yeah.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: And so I'll do that right at the end, and I'll

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: have a hand out for everyone at that time.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Okay. First off, we're in the middle of revising our public use management plan. We've had a round

of meetings in the village of Goodnews, Quinhagak and Togiak, and we're in the process of developing some draft alternatives as a result of those meetings and some other public comments that we've received. We expect to have those out shortly, and we'll have another round of meetings probably sometime early this summer, again in Goodnews, Quinhagak, Togiak, and also in Dillingham.

Part of the public use management plan, it outlines specific units where we have offerings for commercial sport fish guiding. We are in the process of completing a prospectus which will go out soliciting proposals for specific units within the refuge that we have scheduled for this year and also some areas where we've had vacant or permits that were given up or that were taken away from some of these other operators. So there's some interim offerings in there, and also some ones that were planned for this year, that will be coming out shortly.

Something you may be interested in, Togiak Fishing Adventures, the native corporation in Togiak, they were issued a special use permit in the past, had competed successfully for that. They have relinquished their rights to that permit this year, and have come up with a lease arrangement with a couple of the sport fish operators in that drainage. And they will have to recompute for that offering, and as of just a few days ago, we were notified that they are relinquishing their rights to that permit.

And on the caribou, we've conducted 12 flights since early October in the Togiak and Goodnews drainages in an effort to monitor the movements of Kilbuck and Mulchatna animals. As you're probably aware, we haven't opened a season in 17(A) as of yet. We haven't felt we've had a significant number of animals in there to do so. We've also continued to radio track the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd, and as of our last count, we had approximately 900 animals, and we may not have had a complete survey. That may be less than what we think is out there.

This year, over 300 -- or 300 permits were issued to the villages of Dillingham, Togiak, Manokotak, Aleknagik, Clark's

Point, and Twin Hills. Of those 300 permits, we have a report of only 20 animals that have been harvested, and

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Only 20?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Twenty.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Twenty is all? Uh-huh.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: And that's probably due to the conditions that we've had, lack of snow and

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: other things, so that's how we stand there.

For moose, we worked with Fish & Game to conduct a trend survey in Sunshine Valley, Youth and Kilian Creeks, the western part of Subunit 17(C). And in other flights throughout this last year, we've flown in 17(A), and it looks like those numbers appear to be the same as we had reported to you last year, so no real increases there.

And if you have any specific questions on those surveys, Mike and Andy are available for any of those.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Mike and who?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Mike Hinkes, our pilot/biologist,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: and Andy Aderman, who is a wildlife biologist.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Okay.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: This summer we plan on continuing to operate our river ranger program, and it looks like we may have funding to do all three rivers. Last year we only operated on

the Kanektok and the Goodnews. This year we hope to be on the Togiak as well. And it looks like we're going to be able to do that. Obviously it will depend on what Congress does, so

We plan to keep our camp going at Cape Peirce, and that's mainly to monitor marine mammals, public use, and also our seabird plots that we have out there. We're looking to expand our efforts over to Cape Newenham, and are working with our Marine Mammals Division and the State of Alaska in a cooperative effort to look at all the walrus haul-outs in Bristol Bay. So we're in the process of a draft study plan for that right now.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA:

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: In conjunction with Cape Peirce, we plan and we did -- we were notified that we have tentatively been awarded funds for a challenge cost share project for our marine mammal education camp, which we operated last year. This year we hope to work with the villages of Goodnews and Platinum. Last year we had kids from the village of Togiak that went out. We have a curriculum set up for the schools, and we work with the teachers, and we put on a little deal on the biology then of walrus, and at the same time we have an elder out there and he gives the other side of the story, so we try to incorporate the two. And this year we're hoping to do the same.

We were also successful in competing for another challenge cost share program, which will allow us to establish some type of caribou education camp, and we're hoping to target Dillingham and Manokotak for this year. And we're in the process of working out those details. And again we'll be working with the kids there, and hope to involve some elders from those villages.

Our RIT program is still going. We've got an RIT in the village of Togiak, and also Manokotak. We have one in Quinagak. Ferdinand Sharp is fairly new to that program. He's from the village of Manokotak, and he's been real involved. In fact, he's down in -- I'm not exactly sure if it's Illinois right now, but he's getting trained up on the steel shot

seminar, and he'll be able to come back and he's going to be holding meetings and seminars in our local villages.

For fisheries, this last year we were able to complete this integrated fisheries curriculum. Dillingham was one of two areas that were selected for that, and it was a partnership effort with the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, Bristol Bay Economic Development Corporation, Fish & Wildlife, and Fish & Game. And what it involved was getting kids to go out and choose an area, which they chose the Squaw Creek area drainage right outside of Dillingham, and they went in there and looked at a variety of things from aquatic insects through the fish that were in that area, and our biologists worked with them on developing a curriculum which will go into the schools. We hope to keep that going and try to get into things like fisheries management, commercial fishing and so forth. And so far it looks real favorable. And we have a video that was completed by a co-op student that we had that was directly responsible for that program, and it's available if anyone's interested, and it kind of goes through the highlights of that program and what was accomplished, so if you're interested, I can make that available.

We were also able to complete the Arolik River rainbow trout inventory. It's a final report. It's out and it's available right now if anyone's interested. We're in the process of finalizing our Negukthlik/Ungalikthluk River rainbow trout report, and also a lake trout inventory for Kagati Lake. So those are near final, and we should have those out fairly soon.

We're currently working on continuing our baseline inventory work for the Togiak drainage, and we'll be working on some areas on the other side, on the Kuskokwim side.

So that's pretty much it for fisheries.

Also, we've worked with BBNA on their freshwater fish survey. It looks like that was complete. Those results haven't been made available pending approval from the villages of Togiak and Manokotak, but that survey was complete and appears to have

been a real success so those should be out as soon as we can get approval from the two villages.

And I guess our last thing was the direction that we were given at the last meeting, and that was to try to get the interested parties, or the parties involved for the caribou and moose issues on -- within 17(A), and that was the Nushagak Advisory Committee, the Togiak Advisory Committee, the Togiak Traditional Council, Fish & Game, and Fish & Wildlife Service, namely the Togiak Refuge. We attempted to do that in December, but because of the federal shut-down, we were unable to have that meeting, so we made a recent attempt here to do that, and we had the meeting scheduled, but due to weather a few of us were unable to make it to Togiak. We tried to do it via teleconference, but unfortunately it doesn't work real well when you're not actually there, and we were not able to come to any real consensus on those proposals. And the majority of our discussions focused on caribou at that time.

So what we're done since then is working with the area biologist, Larry Van Daele, myself, Mike Hinkes, and Andy Aderman have developed a recommendation on those -- for those two proposals, and I have a copy of that here with some background as far as what we're looking at. We developed some management guidelines I guess is the best word to use. It's not a management plan, but some direction. And it is a draft document. It's meant to be the starting point for these discussions. So we don't want anybody feeling that this is a line in the sand and this is what our stance is. But it is probably going to be a little different than what you're going to hear from the staff committee as far as their report on that proposal. And it's basically a compromise to try to address some of the concerns Togiak has, both the traditional council and the advisory committee, and also those of the Nushagak Advisory Committee. And there's one for both the moose and caribou proposals that are in there. So I'll provide those for you now, and it will give you a chance if you have the time tonight to review that, and we'll be available for any comments obviously during the proposal portion.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: That's it.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's your report? Any questions? Go ahead. Robin, go ahead.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Aaron, who manages the walrus down on Cape Siniavin?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's the exact question I was going to ask.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Who manages it? Well, right now I think what the Marine Mammals Office is doing is probably going to work with Ron Hood. Nothing's really been done there in the past. There's never been any real inventory work, and that's always been a concern, and this is the first that we've been able to get folks together to try to come up with a coordinated monitoring effort. And that will be one of the sites that we will look at is Siniavin, Cape Newenham, Cape Peirce and Round Island.

(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. SAMUELSEN: You have pretty close -- go ahead.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Obviously the walrus are managed by Fish & Wildlife Service. I mean, they have management responsibility for that, but there's been no direct monitoring effort out at that haul-out.

MR. SAMUELSEN: And you're planning some?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: And we are planning that right now. We have a draft study proposal that we're reviewing from our Marine Mammals Office at this time.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah, I heard some -- I heard some pretty good comments at a Board of Fish meeting last month, and I was wondering why their walrus are not under a microscope like our walrus over in the Togiak area.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Well, I think ours has been, not -- the camp that's been out at Cape Peirce hasn't been exclusively for walrus. It started that way, but we have a large seabird colony that's out there that we've been monitoring, so we try to get a whole variety of things in there from monitoring the waterfowl migrations, there's a small population of seals that we look at, obviously the walrus and seabirds, so it's an area where we can do a lot with a little less money, so

MR. SAMUELSEN: Okay.

MR. ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes, Peter?

MR. ABRAHAM: You know, for the past couple years the walrus have been climbing that cliff and rolling back down, you know, some dies and everything. The old people in Togiak are suspicious of that, you know, what's causing. Would it be possible to take an older elder, one of the elder people down there, if the parties are willing, to have them observe how they reacting all the time, you know, before the -- it seems like it's the same time last year or round this fall they climb up the cliff and roll down again, or similar -- I mean, the time area.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: It was later on this last time, but

MR. ABRAHAM: Oh, later on? I wonder if we can have an elder down there observe, because if they keep climbing the cliff down there, you know, we'll be running out of walrus down there in the haul-out. How many died this time?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: I don't know what the estimate was.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seventeen.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Seventeen.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Out of how many animals?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Well, I think the peak this last year was just under 10,000?

MR. ABRAHAM: How many?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Just under 10,000 was the peak count.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And 17 died that you know of?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Yeah. For those that aren't familiar, two years ago what happened, we can't explain it, but we believe what happened was there -- typically the walrus when they're hauled out, if there's a large storm, they will go into the water. At this time they didn't. They stayed hauled out, and they may have become disoriented or confused, and in the process, instead of staying on the beach, they worked their way -- a few of the animals worked their way up along the cliffs, and in the process of trying to get back down to the haul-out were sliding off. It was wet, and they were sliding off and falling off of the cliffs. And we had our staff out there, they were able to document it. And we had I believe it was over 100 that we recorded that had died as a result of that incident.

Last year, a small number of those animals went up there again, and that path has kind of become beaten down and they've somehow or for some reason have gone back up there, and this year, this last year 17 animals died.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Any other further questions? Well, the haul-out down there, I'm sure Mr. Hood is familiar with Cape Siniavin, and I've flown the area. It must have 500 animals, I think. Nobody bothers them. They're just sitting there. They die naturally, you know. So I guess leave them along maybe.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Yeah, the Cape Peirce area, it's real -- there's been a lot of problems in the past with aircraft overflights. And you get

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All down there.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: you know, during the herring fishery, you get a lot of folks that are out waiting for an opening, and they're looking for ivory

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: on those beaches, and they'll fly over the area. So it's been a real problem. And we've been working with the pilots and those folks in the past to let them know it is a sensitive area.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I think there's been a reduction on that. I've had friends who've gone to Sandy River, which is right close to the haul-out down there, and, you know, whenever we go by, you've got to be so far away at such an altitude, and you could look down and see the animals. But I think there's been a big observance on don't go near them. You don't have to bother them. There's no reason to even go over there, and which is a good deal.

Any other questions? I have a question. Oh, go ahead, Robin. Go ahead.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Were you going to comment on the Walrus Island walrus hunt? Or who was going to make comment today on that?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: I wasn't. I don't know if the State was going to do that. We didn't have a direct involvement in it, our office per se.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Okay.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: I think the State has something to do with

MR. SAMUELSEN: State of Alaska has that?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Yeah.

MR. SAMUELSEN: You had an indirect involvement then?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Indirect, right.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Through our Marine Mammals Office.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Okay. That's all I had, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. I had a question for you, Aaron. I'm familiar with the area, I've flown pretty much of it, but I'm not familiar with the rainbow trout situation over there. And you talked about in the Togiak Refuge you have rainbow trout. Can you just briefly mention the areas that you have rainbow trout in there?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Sure. A majority of the drainages within the refuge have rainbow trout.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, really?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: In fact the Kanektok and Goodnews are probably world renowned for their resident fisheries as well as their salmon fisheries.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: And we have a similar I'd say issue or concerns are raised over the increase in public use, and that's why the public use management plan was developed over the last

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: It's interesting

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: ten years, and

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: because you can take like where Tim LaPorte's from up there, you know, they have I think rainbow in the -- what's the, Tazimina area, and none in Lake Clark. Go

to Becharof Lake, you've got King Salmon River just a few miles from Becharof Lake, and with a lot of rainbows, King Salmon River. You go into Becharof Lake and no rainbows at all. And so I just thought maybe that was duplicated over much of the area, but it's not true in your case. Quinhagak, is that in your management area?

MR. ARCHIBEQUE: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any other questions? How about if we take a ten-minute break and come back and finish up our reports and go home. All right? Thank you.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We're going to call the meeting back to order. And if we could call the meeting back to order? You can certainly go out in the entryway and carry on your conversation if you like.

There's going to be one little change in the agenda, maybe, with the concurrence of the panel here. For the caribou report by State of Alaska, which is Unit 9(E) caribou closure effects, we're going to have -- Dick Sellers is going to give a report on that tomorrow. He needs an overhead. And we're going to start the meeting tomorrow morning instead of at nine, at 8:30. We'd like to finish up with all the reports tonight, with the exception of 9(E), and that will be Sellers talking to us about caribou, and he'll have an overhead. And we would like to take a little time on that. I know that there's several on this panel that would really like to look carefully at that report.

And we'll continue on now with the rest of the reports this evening, finish about 10:00 o'clock, and we'll recess after that time, and then we will begin again tomorrow morning at 8:30. So the next item on the agenda will be the Bureau of Land Management, and we have Jeff Denton is going to come and talk to us now. Jeff? Thank you for coming here.

MR. DENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The BLM's primary activity in your region has been one related to the changing land ownership patterns. As you know, there's large amounts of lands that are selected by the State of Alaska through the Statehood Act. Many of these are the State's lower priority lands in their selections. We are having the State relinquish some of these lands back at a relatively steady rate back to the BLM.

If you'll look at the map off to the right here, the orange represents the BLM lands. Those were the lands, probably 70% of the lands on there were relinquished back to us last year that show on this map. Over the last 12 months there's probably another third again more lands that are coming back into the federal public land land base, primarily between the Nushagak and the Kvichak rivers, some along the Alaganak, and some more up towards the Koliganek area there. We can expect that to probably continue for a few years yet. The land selection process and conveyance process is going to be a long term activity.

The other things, our activities have been fairly limited to follow-up waterfowl brood surveys in relation to some research that was done down here three and four years ago relative to water chemistry and water body vegetation work. Those are -- the data is being analyzed for those for publication at the present time.

The rest of our activity has basically to do with caribou. COMINCO Mining Company last spring applied to do several exploratory drilling holes up in Koliganek area. They did pay for a short-term caribou survey there, because the activity they wanted was during the calving period. We wanted to ensure that there was no calving concentrations in that particular area at that time, which there wasn't. It was mostly bulls in there.

And the rest of the work that we're really doing is there's -- basically we're cooperating with the Fish & Game Department, and Larry Van Daele, providing some monies for some of the radio tracking for the Mulchatna herd monitoring. We

have some fairly important winter ranges this year up in around Lime Village/Stink Creek area up there. There's probably 70,000 caribou up there right now. And we have also helped in the past put some of the radio collars for this monitoring effort, and hope to continue to do so as budgets allow.

That's all I've got. If you have any questions, I can see if I can answer them.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any questions, panel members? Yep?

MR. LaPORTE: I have one. Maybe you could just refresh our memory, or my memory, I guess

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Tim, could you take that mike?

MR. LaPORTE: I'm sorry. Maybe you could express -- refresh my memory on the lands that are changing from State ownership to BLM ownership through a selection process. Now how -- what's exactly going on on that again?

MR. DENTON: Okay. Let me go back to the very beginning. At statehood, the State of Alaska was allowed so many millions of acres. I think it was like 103 million acres that they could select via the Statehood Act. And they did so over a period of years. They prioritized those selections in the last year as to which ones -- they've over-selected quite a bit, and so the over-selections as they select and get conveyed to their ownership to the State lands, then a certain proportion of those over-selected lands have to be relinquished back to BLM. And so they have prioritized into eight categories their high priority for keeping those selections and wanting the conveyance to the State, down to eight, which are lands that are probably pretty marginal that they would even want. Those are largely the ones that are being relinquished back to BLM at this time. They're usually inaccessible, don't have a timber or mineral resource value associated with them. Oftentimes they're pretty unproductive lands, too. They're a lot of time spruce bogs and tundra. So -- and that's primarily what -- why those lands are coming back first, is that those lands are fairly inaccessible and very -- don't have a lot of values associated

with them for a commercial value.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Do you have anything else, Tim? What about over-selection by native corporations and the allotments and -- you talked about they've relinquished back 70% and then they're going to do another third? That's an awful lot of land?

MR. DENTON: I'm just talking in this little area that we're looking at right here, not statewide.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, I'm talking this area, too. That's still

MR. DENTON: Yeah, the lands that are selected, a lot of the lands from the State's standpoint are the very lowest priority for conveyance to the State. Therefore, from a statewise basis, there may be being conveyed lands and patented lands elsewhere in the state, but the lands that are coming back to us are these lower-priority lands which are concentrated in some of these areas like the Kvichak.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. In my opening remarks I was supposed to ask the question on how accurate that map is. I don't know who put that map out, but if anybody looks at it and feels like it's not accurate, then whoever put that map out would like to get some input on that. Did you do that or

MR. DENTON: I do that once a year before they go to press. Unfortunately this land conveyance process is active all the time, and so it's always changing. The lands that are con-- that are being relinquished back to us, I try to just prior to the publication each year of the Federal Regs for subsistence to update that map to that point in time.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. DENTON: It still changes after that, but we have to then wait for the next cycle to catch it up again.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And all that pink is federal lands?

MR. DENTON: The orange, not the

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Orange?

MR. DENTON: Well, the pink is the refuge lands.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. DENTON: And the purple is Park Service, and then the orange is BLM.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any questions? Yeah, Tim?

MR. LaPORTE: I do have another question on the -- What is BLM's long-term planning goals with this land? I mean, what's the intent to -- once it's transitioned back to your hands, is there a plan what to do with this land or

MR. DENTON: Once we know what our stable land base will be, then I think BLM will decide what kind of dollar and manpower commitments they'll make into doing land use plans like they did in the past. Right now none is on the agenda for Alaska at all, until we get this land ownership thing resolved, because it's much, much too dynamic right now.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. This exploratory work that a mining company was doing, now, where

MR. DENTON: Yeah, COMINCO.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: COMINCO. We know what they're doing at Sharp Mountain, you know, the big find up in that area. That's on state lands.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, that's on state lands. I can't speak directly to what is exactly involved and what their plans are there. Perhaps Dick can, but I can't.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: If your lands are up around Stu you said, or on the other side of Stu or where are these lands at?

MR DENTON: The lands we were looking at are around Koliganek.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Koliganek? Uh-huh. Okay. And that's that little orange area up there?

MR. DENTON: Right, the one to the farthest upper left there.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Just below Koliganek then.

MR. DENTON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that.

MR. DENTON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: State of Alaska, John Morrison.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game.

We have nothing spectacular to report at this time in the way of Department interest or activities here in the Bristol Bay Region. I might review some of the things that we're highly concerned about, however, for the future of the Department's activities in the next year or two. Many of these things are kind of inducing us to be a little bit on hold until we see how they go before we can make certain plans for our management efforts, particularly the actions of the Legislature.

The budget process will, of course, have quite a serious impact on our potential activities in the future. The House Finance Subcommittee, for example, recently released its idea for the Department. It would involve cutting us by about \$1.2 million. That would take 300,000 out of Commercial Fisheries Division, 50,000 out of the Sport Fish Division, 300,000 out of the Subsistence Division, and 550,000 out of the Habitat Division. They did not intend any cuts in the Wildlife Conservation Division apparently, but we still need to hear from the Senate side of the Legislature to see what their idea about

this is.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Could you go through those cuts again? That sounds pretty interesting. It sounds like we should be a part of the sports program if we're not going to keep our budget.

MR. MORRISON: I'm sorry? Could

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Could you go through those numbers again?

MR. MORRISON: Sure. Yeah. Commercial fisheries, 300,000.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Cut?

MR. MORRISON: I'm sorry. 300,000, right. Sport fish, 50,000, Subsistence Division, 300,000, and the Habitat Division, 550,000. These relative cuts, we would assume, indicate the degree of concern that the Legislature has about the activities of these divisions in light of how they would like to see the cuts made.

There are several other bills in the Legislature that will affect us, depending on how they go. Senate Bill 77 for intensive game management states that the highest levels of human consumptive use is the best use of Alaska's best game, and it mandates biologically harvest levels and predator control to achieve these high levels of use, and keeping populations up high.

Senate Bill 81, the wolf as a predator, this bill creates harvest incentives, which is a nice name for bounties, on wolves. We're concerned about that, because it isn't clear if this would pass, where does the money come from to pay these bounties, and what would be the nature of such a program in controlling which wolves are bountied. The idea is to get greater control on certain populations of wolves in order to benefit prey species of concern, but almost all fish and game departments in the West that have had experience with bounties

in the past have found out that it's a very ineffective way of trying to manage anything. We would foresee the possibility of paying bounty on wolves brought in from Siberia and Canada and lord only knows where else. Well, it could come in from other parts of Alaska where we have no problem with wolves currently.

SB 247, the Fish & Game Fund, essentially prohibits using the Fish & Game Fund for wildlife viewing, non-game programs or habitat protection. This is a bill that's particularly of concern in Southeast Alaska where logging has wanted to be free from the Department's interference with logging plans.

SB 262, management of fish and game populations. This bill mandates that for every acre closed to hunting or a method of hunting another five acres must be opened elsewhere. And we're not clear yet on whose acres would be opened elsewhere, or whose acres is it that's being closed. That's something I don't have a clear picture on.

House Bill 313, big game tags for wolves. This would eliminate the non-resident fee for wolf tags, the idea being this would get more non-residents to shoot more wolves to control the wolf populations.

I have no idea how these bills will turn out in getting through both houses and through the Governor's signature.

We're also holding our breath over the Katy John and NARC court cases. These are -- have been joined together. The NARC petition was -- requested of the Secretary of Interior to control hunting on nonfederal land where it is adjacent to some federal land on which it's considered to -- that non-subsistence hunting on the state land or nonfederal land is threatening subsistence hunting on the federal land.

The last word we had was that the federal system is about to release their regulations for conducting the take-over of certain navigable waters wherein they would manage the fisheries. This, of course, the State has appealed to the Federal Supreme Court in Washington. Eleven other Western

states have signed on in that case as friends of Alaska, hoping to induce the Supreme Court to hear the case, and make some kind of decision that might ultimately clear this up. We don't know if the Supreme Court will put a hold on the federal take over pending their decision if they do take on the case. Senator Stevens has introduced a rider to a bill in Congress to hold back any money from putting this program into effect if it does go ahead.

We're concerned also about the National Foundation's study of wolf and bear predation in the State. The Department is having to fork over \$325,000.00 I believe it is to fund this study at the request of the Governor to look into the Department's predator control work with wolves and bears and see if we're doing the right thing or not.

Then we're also waiting to see what happens next fall in the election on the referenda concerning same-day-airborne wolf hunting as it's being called by its proponents, and it is, of course, almost specifically focused on the state regulation that enables trappers on same-day-airborne to shoot wolves on a trapping license if they are 300 feet or more from their aircraft.

And there's also another referendum on reducing the amount of commercial fishing and increasing the sport fish opportunity on salmon, particularly in the Cook Inlet area.

So with all of this going on, there are several Department plans that are being sort of put on ice until we see what we can do, either in the way of permission to do it, or in the way of funding to do it. And that's what I have at this meeting, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other good news? Maybe we should all kill ourselves after the meeting tonight.

MR. MORRISON: Well, it's interesting. Last year when it looked like the Legislature was wanting to wipe out the Subsistence Division, our subsistence people were applying all over for jobs; and now this time around it seems like in the

federal agencies there are some worries about losing jobs, and a lot of people are calling us up and asking us if we have anything open. So we go back and forth I guess.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any questions for John tonight? Yeah, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah, no questions, just a comment, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, a very good report, John. And the House cuts are the friendly cuts. It's the Senate that takes the deep cuts out of your -- the Department of Fish & Game.

MR. MORRISON: Uh-huh.

MR. SAMUELSEN: And as you know, Dan, sitting on the ASME Board, they just cut 800,000 from the ASME contrib- -- state contribution to ASME to advertise salmon.

On the Katy John, I heard the Murkowski was going to hold the Government hostage, and nothing coming out of the Government -- nothing would come out of the Government on Katy John until after the fall, late fall some time.

Yeah, it seems like, you know, we're blessed with an abundance of resource, but we're bound and determined to kill the goose that's laying the golden egg.

MR. MORRISON: Well, this is pretty typical of situations where there are so many desires on how we split the pie, and, of course, it's one of the reasons why we're here together today, and the questions of how do we assign allocation of these resources. It doesn't make the situation any easier when we have all these other things going on in the background to muddy the waters and make it more difficult to come to understandings and agreements that we can plan on. And where it will all end, of course, we don't know.

I think somewhere else in the agenda there's also a point to discuss the Lt. Governor's initiative or study, proposal on how to end all this. And that's another thing that we're curious to see how it turns out, although we're not too

convinced that it will lead to anything serious in the near future.

MR. SAMUELSEN: There was an interesting comment made when these proposed cuts came out of the House and they were done debating them. One of the high-ranking House members made a comment, let the feds manage it. And that was by a -- I was still

MR. MORRISON: Was that a democrat or a republican?

MR. SAMUELSEN: He was one that supported the budget cuts.

MR. MORRISON: Well, we don't know what we'll get out of the Senate, but generally the feeling is that it's going to be a rougher whack from them than it has been from the House.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. You know, John, the -- it's really interesting how that -- this particular legislation -- this legislative session and those who control, whose who are in the inner circle, and the rest on the outside looking in, that don't have any control, and we don't really have much of a representation any more from rural Alaska like we used to have. We used to have power legislators who wouldn't let these type of things happen that are happening now. And then to take and cut any kind of resource budget when, you know, the famous -- the statement I like is that Anchorage, they're a bunch of parasites, and I guess most of you people are from Anchorage, they live off each other. And the State of Alaska lives off the resources of rural Alaska, from McKenzie Point on out.

MR. MORRISON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And the legislators don't understand that. The little guy on Fourth Avenue is going to be affected in his shop if they do cut the Fish & Game budget like they're doing. And that message needs to go to Juneau. Anybody who's going to go there needs to tell those people that if you don't take care of rural Alaska, they're not coming up here to see the Hilton Hotel, they're coming up here to see rural Alaska and

fish and game from these areas. And some of us have organized out here to address that issue coming up here in the future, because we don't want to see that happening, and we don't want to -- this is why I ask you any other bad news tonight, because that is not good news to hear when you've got the resources that we have that this panel knows about, and have it go away by the State of Alaska.

Anyway, if you don't have any further questions, thank you very much, John.

MR. MORRISON: Robert.

MR. HEYANO: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Go ahead.

MR. HEYANO: John, can you -- are you prepared tonight to discuss a little bit more in depth the potential impacts of the -- if the initiative on prohibiting same-day-airborne hunting of wolves will do to the management of moose and caribou populations, predominantly in this area, if that's

MR. MORRISON: You're asking if they -- the same-day-airborne take of wolves might then -- by preventing that, might make more predation on moose and caribou, is that

MR. HEYANO: Well, I asked if you are prepared tonight to maybe tell us what the potential impacts could be if this initiative is successful and does pass?

MR. MORRISON: Well, I'm not certain that it would affect a great many trappers. This is basically who it's going to affect. The state regulation at present, it talks about taking wolves and a few other species by trappers with a rifle or a gun, you know, while they're running their trapline. If they should happen to have the opportunity to see a wolf while they're on the trapline, they could shoot it under their trapping license on the same-day-airborne as long as it's more than 300 feet from their airplane. Well, I don't know how many trappers that would affect. When we had a lot of discussion

about this earlier, when the federal agencies were talking about whether they should go along with this on federal land or not, several trappers testified that, yes, this would bother them, but by and large the feeling over the State as a whole seemed to be that most of the trappers aren't using aircraft to approach their traplines. And right now the only regulation that the State has on the books is restricted to that; otherwise other same-day-airborne opportunities are illegal. So

MR. HEYANO: My question, what would the potential impacts be as far as wildlife managers go? If -- you know, I view this tool as a management tool that the wildlife

MR. MORRISON: Well,

MR. HEYANO: managers use, and under certain circumstances, they can implement

MR. MORRISON: Okay.

MR. HEYANO: actually a control program by the use of aircraft. And

MR. MORRISON: Yeah.

MR. HEYANO: particularly in this area, there's been years where it's been -- well, one year 100% of the wolf take was taken by aircraft, and it's not uncommon to have over 50%, well over 50% of the wolf take in this area done by the use of aircraft.

MR. MORRISON: Right now the Department and the Attorney General's Office together are looking at this very carefully, because there's a lot of feeling that if this bill -- or this initiative passes, is voted in as it's been proposed, there's a question would it prevent the Department from using aircraft to immobilize animals to put radio collars on them. Sometimes from the air the immobilizing projectile is fired into the animal. The initiative specifically asks that the Department would be free to use aircraft in control under specified circumstances where the Department would have to show that there

was a serious threat to prey species in order to justify taking the predators by aerial methods, or same-day-aerial approach. And those two factors, depending on which way this goes, could impact the departments work with certain species in certain circumstances. But as I say, the Attorney General's Office is still not sure, and we're not sure just how that would affect us if it did pass, insofar as putting a crimp on Department activities that rely on aircraft in the taking of -- or capture of these species.

We just don't know really until we get the Attorney General to render an opinion on it. Some of our people and some of their people can't seem to really agree on what the vote would actually do, and that's partly I think a problem of the wording of the initiative itself. It leaves the question open.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Are you satisfied, Robert, with the

MR. HEYANO: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That was a long answer. Yeah, Dan?

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, if I could address John on some of the

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, sir, you'll have to

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You have to -- you've got to come up and talk to the microphone.

MR. SALMON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, for another opportunity here.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You need to state your name there, Dan.

MR. SALMON: Dan Salmon. I've been listening to a bunch of these different gentlemen testify at different agency levels, and I was impressed with I believe it was Fish & Wildlife, with some of the work they've done in the villages in the north

working with the communities on education and being involved in the process of some of the management that was involved with, particularly around I believe it was Togiak, in that area.

And in light of the declining budgets, I think Subsistence, 300,000 ought to pretty much whack this State division out. I could be wrong, but I think that's probably a major portion, if not all, of the budget. I see on these papers moose studies that the feds did that due to weather or whatever didn't get completed. It just seems to me that these agencies ought to be working with some of the, oh, village corporations, entities such as the resource committee of the BBNA, to train local people to get involved in some of these different management tools, information gathering, biological studies, that there ought to be some kind of program that would be a lot more cost effective. I think you could get somebody local that at a certain time of year could get a lot more effective study data done, that's more familiar, can just jump out when the weather's right and take care of a study, versus mobilizing from Anchorage, you know, et cetera, and then being taken out by the weather. And with this compacting and these block grants, et cetera, it just seems to me there ought to be something going on, especially at the subsistence level where young people or whoever are interested in some of these villages can get an opportunity to learn how to gather this information and to be used at some of these various decision-making processes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Thank you, Daniel. Appreciate that. John?

MR. MORRISON: I'd like to add a quick note to Dan's comment. Over the state there are quite a few cooperative projects going on now between the federal agencies, the local people, and the Department of Fish & Game, and looking into several management problems or questions we need to get better mutual understanding, and an idea of what to do. I'm thinking of the 40-mile caribou herd, for example. We have a big cooperative venture involved there. The same thing for the Mentasta caribou herd. We have some serious management concerns there. It's somewhat similar to the relationship of the Kilbuck and Mulchatna herds here in Unit 17 where we want a lot of

Mulchatna caribou to pull into the area, over in the Togiak area, before beginning to hunt them, in order to protect the smaller Kilbuck animals. And that's the same thing we've got with the Nelchina herd and the Mentasta herd. And we have the Lower Yukon River cooperative moose project.

In all of these, the participants sit down and look at all of the questions and problems together and start generating recommendations for management at a low ground level that by the time it gets up to the top decision makers, there's a lot less baggage with it that leads to disagreements and conflicts higher up. And we'd like to see more of that.

I think the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd has a group that works with it, and there are many opportunities for this, but they're best enacted if the people that are most concerned about it would just get together and start thinking out what they might do, and formulate some kind of a group with objectives and figure out what they want to do about it.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any other questions of John tonight? John, thank you. Appreciate you coming here tonight.

We have the next report is National Park Service, draft review of subsistence law and National Park Service, and we have Sandy Rabinowitch to come and talk to us, if you would, please, Sandy?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be back with you again.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. Good, we're glad to have you back.

MR. RABINOWITCH: My name is Sandy Rabinowitch, I'm with the National Park Service. I serve as a Staff Committee member to the Federal Board member for the Park Service.

But tonight I'm here to tell you a little bit about an internal review within the Park Service that's going on, and I will -- I've got to check a couple of facts here before I go too

far. I don't know if this paper, there's copies in the back, I'm not sure if this paper's gotten into all Board books or not, so before I go on, let's clarify that, because if you don't have it, I want to make sure you get it.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We'd like to have it.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. And it would be under old business on the agenda. I can't do the tab number from memory here.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, maybe Helga could just get us a copy from the back, and then we could have it in hand while you

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: go ahead and do your report.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. Well, we'll make sure you get it. Let me begin to explain what it is, and why I'm -- you know, why we'd like you to have it, and where we go.

The primary purpose of this paper is to review how the Park Service does business with subsistence within National Parks. I think a question you might ask yourself is why would the Park Service do this. In terms of ANILCA we've been in business, so to speak, for 15 years now, and one would think that we'd figured something out, certainly not everything, but we'd figured something out about managing subsistence. But one of the things you also recognize is that federal agency staff in the Park Service and others change. You see different people were from year to year. People come and go to, you know, different areas. And one of the things the Park Service has realized is that from 15 years ago when ANILCA became the law to today, a lot of people have come and gone, and come and gone within the agency. It was decided that it was time to undertake an internal effort to make sure that everybody here understood what the law was, understood what the regulations were. So we're trying to do some internal education, and this paper is sharing that product. Now, this is a draft paper, so we're

trying to share what we are doing internally, and how we're trying to educate ourselves, some of whom weren't here 15 years ago. Okay. I happen to be, but I'm probably kind of a rarity within the Park Service, that I was here 15 years ago.

So that's kind of a long introduction. As I said, it's an attempt to gain insight within the Park Service. It's an exercise.

And the one thing we're trying to do is -- with the paper, is we're trying to identify any actions, any actions, that the Park Service might recommend in the future. And that's the point that I want to stress in terms of any comments that you may or may not have, you know, once you've been able to read through the document. It's about nine pages long. It's kind of slow reading. I mean, you have to kind of read it, maybe read it a second time, and, you know, 'cause you'll have questions as I did when I first read this particular draft.

We believe that there is, and there's some comments been made today that there is a need to not keep everything exactly the way it is. We believe there's a need for changes in regulations, okay, over time. And this is an opportunity to try to bring some of those things out.

And one -- I'm going to do one teeny bit of show and tell, because I've found that it sort of helps understanding. I know that all of you are very, very familiar with this book, the -- all the seasons, bag limits, and c&t and so on for the federal program. Okay. The regs. What you're probably less familiar with is that all the agencies, this just happens to be a Park Service one, also have books like this. Okay. I'm not going to read it to you, give you numbers or anything, but in this book are Park Service specific regulations, and in this book there is a small body of regulations that deal specifically with subsistence. Okay. These books -- so these books have some different things in them. There's a little bit of overlap, but there's different things. So I'm only talking about this book, okay, the Park Service one. An important distinction.

Let me read you a real quick little list, and I'm about

three-quarters done here, so I'm going to get off the stage, unless you've got some questions. The topics addressed in this paper are the following: eligibility, access, we heard some access concerns earlier tonight, cabins, trapping, customary trade, and subsistence resource commissions. Those are the subjects that the Park Service currently has a body of regulations about, and so that's what this paper reviews.

Following each of the issues that I just read, there's a discussion of the issue, and then following the issue in this paper, there may or may not be recommendations to make some changes again in the regulations in this book. And that we think is the key in terms of making comments if you have any, to look at those actions that are recommended, and see if you think -- you know, you support them or don't support them. Maybe you can think of some that we haven't thought of, recommend those, so on and so forth.

The time frame on this is not rigid. We're asking people for comments by May 1st. We've taken this to all the regional advisory councils around the state. Native corporations, State of Alaska, it's getting very wide distribution. We're asking anyone who's got written comments, verbal comments to get them to us by May 1st. They will all get collected together, and we'll basically try to figure out what we've been told. Okay.

And there is not a rigid schedule for May 1st on, so a logical question is what are you going to do after May 1st, and when are you going to do it? I don't have an answer to that question. Okay. I just simply don't, but I think it's safe to predict that there will be some follow-up, and what I will try to do, and other Park Service staff is simply keep you posted. Each fall, each winter, we'll just keep coming back and tell you how this moves along. There's nothing urgent that has to happen, you know, tomorrow or the next day for that matter. We're trying to make sure that all the people in the Park Service statewide, you know, know how Title VIII works, know what our regulations do, and see if there is any changes that we might want to recommend be made. And the start doing that if that's the case.

For a 9:00 p.m. time slot, I've tried to keep it real focused. I used to think right after lunch was hard. I've got to think nine at night is probably slightly tougher. I'll leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any questions for Sandy? Yeah, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sandy, this is just for the Department, and the Department's going to take public comment and tweak different regulations? Or are you talking about the Department going back to Congress and amending ANILCA?

MR. RABINOWITCH: No. Short answer. And let me clarify, and this is a little bit bureaucratic. This is only for the Park Service, which is a part of the Department of Interior, so I would say, no, it's not for the Department. It's only for the National Park Service. Okay? Do we envision making any changes -- recommending any changes to ANILCA? No. Do we envision possibly making recommended changes to Park Service regulations, yes, possibly. Do we envision making changes to Federal Board regulations? No. So it's only -- another way to put it is only the purple on the map.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Uh-huh.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Within those areas. Okay. It may be that the consensus is everything's okay, leave it the way it is. I don't personally think that's what we're going to hear. I mean, I've talked in front of -- with you before about issues that I know you have concerns about, the way, you know, certain regulations are now, and I know there are certain things, you know, that you don't like in Park Service regulations. I mean, I already know that. And there's other concerns from other parts of the state, too. So I think we're going to look at making some changes, but I can't guarantee that here today.

MR. SAMUELSEN: One other question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Sure.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Did the AFN board get a copy of this so they could comment on it? And the reason why I bring that up is when the Lt. Governor gave her presentation on a conceptual subsistence plan for the State of Alaska, a lot of questions were dealing with federal lands, not state lands, and I think it would be -- I would advise that the Federal Subsist- -- I mean, the AFN board get a copy of this to comment on also.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. I am not personally aware that they have. I will check, and if they haven't, I'll make sure they get it. They may have, I just don't personally know.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions? Yeah, Robert?

MR. HEYANO: I have a question, just so I understand, is that in the past we've felt that there was some park regulations that prohibited customary and traditional methods and means of harvesting animals in side parks. So this will be the document where if we chose to address that as a group here, is there any way we could do that?

MR. RABINOWITCH: It might be. It -- I would have to have a little more discussion with you to see whether I think the specific, you know, situation that's in your mind fits this or not. So without that discussion, my answer is it might be, but I'm just not sure. I'm happy to talk with you. I'll be here for your whole meeting. I'll be happy to talk with you at any time, and, you know, give you a better answer, a more complete answer.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. HEYANO: Well, two issues that come to my mind that we've always addressed is ORVs and aircraft access.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Right. I think there's room in this document for you to comment on those, yes.

MR. HEYANO: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other questions? Sandy, whenever we think in terms of the National and, you know, there's so many different parts of it you can hardly figure out who you're talking to, and for sure within a year's period of time, you're going to be talking to be talking to somebody different. And, you're right, the rotation of this system is incredible.

What they do in Denver we hope will be different than what they do in Alaska. It seems to me like the system is set up so that everything they do in Denver is going to be the same thing they do everywhere else, and I think what we're interested in doing is it could be different here than it is in Denver, and I realize with the Federal Government it's very hard for them to be different in Denver than it is to be in Katmai National Park. And I know that, you know, when you're talking about a wilderness area, there are some lines drawn in the sand, and some things you can't change, and some things you don't want to change, you know, but if you could -- if you could have some movement to make some things a little more compatible with other boundaries with that -- that we have in this part of the country at least with the resource we have, I think that would be good. I appreciate the fact that something possibly could happen in the future, so we appreciate that. Thanks. Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, it got to be a little more interesting than what you thought at 9:00 o'clock, but that's -- this is a very good issues. Yeah.

Okay. We're down to Bristol Bay Native Association. Ted, come talk to us.

MR. KRIEG: Ted Krieg, Bristol Bay Native Association, Natural Resource Department.

The Bristol Bay Native Association, Natural Resource Department entered into two cooperative agreements with Fish & Wildlife Service this past year. The first was for migratory bird subsistence harvest surveys in 15 villages in the Nushagak Bay, Nushagak River, Togiak Bay, and Illiamna Lake subregions. The surveys recorded household harvests of migratory birds during the spring, summer and fall seasons last year. The results are being compiled by the Fish & Wildlife Service, Migratory Bird Management Office in Anchorage.

The other cooperative agreement included two activities: fresh water fish subsistence harvest surveys for Togiak and Manokotak. As Aaron indicated, these surveys are completed, or were completed last spring, and after village review, the results will be published.

The other activity is caribou, moose and brown bear, or large land mammal subsistence harvest surveys for the 12 Alaska Peninsula villages that BBNA represents.

For all of these projects, surveyors were hired and trained in each village to help administer the surveys.

As far as this Council's concerned, I'm going to focus a little bit right now on the large land mammals subsistence harvest surveys. These surveys were designed to indicate the amount of animals harvested by each household since July 1st, 1994, and included questions about sharing, if the needs of each household for each species were met, and how the harvest for each species for the 94/95 regulatory hunting year compared to previous years. The survey concluded by questioning each household whether they had any questions, comments, or concerns.

There was also a mapping component for each survey which recorded the kill sites for each animal harvested by each household. One large sheet of clear mylar was designated for each household and placed over a large base map which encompassed the subsistence area for each village. The base map consisted of USGS 1:250,000 scale quad maps taped together. Each kill site was marked by an X and labelled to correspond

with the information recorded on the survey form. Excuse me. A different colored permanent marker was used for each species.

In January and February, I travelled for 19 days to eight villages to administer the harvest surveys to 133 households. Last fall two subsistence researchers with the Subsistence Division of ADF&G, they donated some time, and I conducted these surveys in three Chigniks and Perryville, surveying 87 households. Due to the large number of households in Naknek and King Salmon, a 30% random sample of the households were to be surveyed. This would -- this came out to 59 households for Naknek, 37 households for King Salmon. The majority of these surveys are complete, but those two villages have some work yet to be done. When complete, a total of approximately 314 households from the 12 Alaska Peninsula villages will be surveyed. After the villages review the information, the results will be published this spring.

And that's all I have for right now, unless there are questions?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Questions? I have one, Ted. You said you did how many households in the Chignik/Perryville? Did you get to Ivanof?

MR. KRIEG: Eighty-seven. Yeah. Ivanof came later.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Eighty-seven. That's

MR. KRIEG: But last fall we did -- yeah, 87 households in those four villages.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's just about everybody down there.

MR. KRIEG: We had -- yeah, we had pretty good success in contacting every household.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: What did you find different between Chigniks and Ivanof or Perryville, anything significant or pretty much the same needs, or

MR. KRIEG: I guess basically all of those -- yeah, it seemed like all of those villages on the Pacific side had similar needs, although, you know, Perryville and Ivanof are more similar in their needs than the Chigniks. I mean, there's kind of

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Geographical distance there that

MR. KRIEG: Right. Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: separates them with the mountains and everything. Yeah.

MR. KRIEG: Right.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Any other questions? Does anybody have any questions? Well, we appreciate that work, and you'll be around for the next or so

MR. KRIEG: Yep, I'll be here.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: dealing with us on some of the proposals. Thank you, Ted.

MR. KRIEG: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: We have next the annual report review and adoption, 1996 annual report, and our director and manager

MS. EAKON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. It is not on the agenda, because I didn't know for sure that John Borbridge was going to be here, but since he represents the BIA and does serve on the Interagency Staff Committee, I thought it might be appropriate for him to say a few words at this time.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I'll bet you it would be. Yeah. Come on up, John, and talk to us.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members.

Apparently my wife and family have been up in this region much more often than I had, so I thought it was time for me to get back up here and see what is going on in the region.

But I would like to speak briefly from my perspective as a subsistence specialist with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I know that for native organizations that have in the past applied for and received ANILCA funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for subsistence projects, that there is a great curiosity on their part as to when the funds are going to be available. For those who are familiar with the process, usually by the first or second week of December we are able to announce over the signature of the area director of the availability of funds, and in the same letter he invites projects for submission to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We're very pleased in the matter of evaluating of the projects that with the assistance and cooperation of the Alaska Inter Tribal Council, we've had several of their members from various parts of the State who have assisted us in the actual evaluation. Prior to that time, all of the rating was done by BIA employees, and so we're very pleased with this step. It gives us the benefit of the insight that they are able to bring to bear on the process.

Now, the question, when will the funding be available, and the answer to that is that we don't know. It is dependent again on some of the uncertainties occurring in Washington, D.C., and so part of the funding has been made available, and part of it has not. As soon as we in the Bureau learn of what the funding will be and how much will be available for the subsistence projects that will be funded by the ANILCA funding, then the area director will immediately send out a notice and an invitation to submit subsistence projects to the various native subsistence organizations.

I want to be sure to share that with you, Mr. Chairman, and members, because I'm sure there's a great curiosity. So given the normal time table, we would have been moving toward evaluation of proposals, and would have received them by this time. So we're way behind. But I would like to think,

Mr. Chairman, that it's Washington, D.C. that's way behind, and we are ready to go when they allow us to do so.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes, John, I was talking with Helga, and in the report that we were able to get, it was just due to all the federal shut-downs and different things that happened, it was real difficult to get that information to us, and even get on the time schedule. So at least we're glad we're having -- we'd be able to have a meeting and work through these proposals and have something back.

Now, I notice you spent a lot of time, you know, with the chairman and others here, also go to the main BLM -- or to the main Federal Board. I notice you're sitting there.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Maybe you could tell this panel a bit what you do there as far as your responsibilities when you're sitting with the Federal Board and we're out here coming to the main Board saying

MR. BORBRIDGE: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: these are proposals, and we've had a great deal of success. This panel has had a great deal of success in getting what we wanted from the Federal Board.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: So maybe you could just briefly mention that, so they'll have an idea why you're here tonight, but why you're there at that front table with the Federal Board also.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Uh-huh. Well, I think first of all, I appear in a dual capacity. On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, I'm a member of the Federal Subsistence Staff Committee, but I'm not actually the formal spokesman as such. I am the employee of Bureau of Indian Affairs, and as such, we, the Bureau takes a position of very active support and actually a position of

advocacy on behalf of native interests, including most certainly native subsistence rights. And in that vein then it's very clear to us that the more I'm able to meet with subsistence users, be it sitting in the audience, and visiting during and after coffee times and other breaks and beforehand, then the better we are able to do in representing the wishes of the subsistence users.

Here's one example, it's one that you'll recognize immediately. In the past, the Bureau in receiving requests from its Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs Division in Washington, D.C., has usually distributed the requests for comments on specific legislation to various people within the Bureau itself in Juneau. But here's how we've changed that process: I received a comment on legislation addressing how red fish would be used. And, of course, the first thing we realized then was that we needed to talk to the people who actually would be affected by it, not only the agency itself, National Park Service, who's representative I called, but I recall talking to you as well as the chairman of the regional advisory council, talked to Trefon Angasan who had brought -- apparently been involved with the legislation, AFN and others. The point being that we're taking the position more and more and more that we who are sitting in the bureaucratic chairs should not be taking positions that affect native subsistence users unless we go to the subsistence users and find out how they're going to be affected.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah. And that's what I wanted to mention tonight is -- so that this panel would understand that. We do have an advocate out there who's going to help us bridge some of these things to get the work done that we need to do, and we really appreciate that.

Plus you have roots here in the Bristol Bay area. I understand you have family that

MR. BORBRIDGE: Here? Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Just keep nodding your head, that sounds good to me.

MR. BORBRIDGE: I do want to comment before I leave the table, Mr. Chairman, that, let's see, I've been a commercial fisherman in the Bay, and a subsistence fisherman. I put up the smokehouse for Grandma Nicolet, and I was put in charge of that one summer. In case some of you wonder that I didn't learn much about subsistence. And then I did a little sports fishing.

So I think I covered the whole spectrum, Mr. Chairman. But I do want to emphasize for you and members of the committee, that I feel that I'm available whether you want to see me individually before a meeting, after a meeting, any questions you may have, or a question I may take back to the Bureau for that matter that this is why I'm here.

And the other thing I want to make clear is that I feel I need to add to my knowledge about subsistence. Sometimes there's a mistake, if you're a native person, then there's an assumption sometimes that as a native person you know about all subsistence, and, of course, you know that

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah, that's not true.

MR. BORBRIDGE: that can't be done, so I've got to get out into the field and try to add to my knowledge. And that's why I'm here, to learn from all of you really what your concerns are.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Well, let me give you a little advice, okay? On this commercial fishing business, don't give up your day job, okay? Stick with what you're doing.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other comments you've got there? Thank you, John. We appreciate your coming.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MS. EAKON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, agenda item 7(B), 1995 annual report review and adoption. At your last meeting you had

asked that I do a summary of recommendations from day one, and if you will look under tab 7(B) you will find a copy of -- a draft copy of the report for 1995.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Under 7(D)?

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: "D" delta?

MS. EAKON: It's one of these -- it's one of these little post-it flags.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Oh, "B". Okay. Okay.

MS. EAKON: Post-it flags.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yeah.

MS. EAKON: 7(B) as in boy.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Bravo, yeah.

MS. EAKON: "B" as in bravo. And for those in the audience, there are extra copies of this report at the far end of the -- that table over there.

If you look on page two, you will notice that at your last meeting some very important regional concerns as identified by some of you were wanton waste of caribou and moose by sports hunters, the Alagnak wild river, question of reductions in rainbow trout fisheries, and interagency -- the importance of interagency cooperation.

If you agree with this report, probably the way you could dispose of this at this meeting would be to so by motion, Mr. Chair. If -- however, if you do have some important additions that you would like included, you may do so, and I will revise this. I will revise this for 1995.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. We're dealing with the agenda

item C.

MS. EAKON: 7(B) excuse me.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: 7(B), okay.

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: What is the wishes of the panel tonight on this item? Are you prepared to make a motion now on it? Or -- okay, Robin?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd move that we adopt the 1995 annual report of the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Is there a second?

MR. HEYANO: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Robert Heyano seconded. Any further discussion on it? Do all the panel members feel comfortable with accepting this annual report tonight? Okay. Call for the question?

MR. HEYANO: Question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All those in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Let the minutes show that it's unanimous.

MS. EAKON: Yes. The second part of this particular agenda item is the discussion of the 1996 annual report. Just to ask you to be thinking about what are burning issues in your

particular geographic areas, please make notations for the preparation of this year's annual report. And also to let you know that the subject of annual reports is going to be a topic of discussion when the joint meeting of the federal Subsistence Board and the chairs occurs, probably a floor discussion at the fall joint meeting. And that's all I have on this particular item, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Helga, before you leave, just so the panel can be thinking about this, I don't know of any, you know, real burning issues that we need to deal with, but I think, you know, I had mentioned that perhaps the wanton waste thing in October on the Alaska Peninsula caribou. I think another thing that we should look at at that tail end of our meeting, probably under new business or other new business, should be dealing with probably waterfowl migration, and a spring hunt on waterfowl.

MS. EAKON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And I think Ted probably touched a little bit upon that. There might be more information coming to that. But those are just two things that we might think a little bit about. There may be other things, too, panel members, that as we go along and get into proposals, there may be other things that we'll see that we might want to deal with. If that's sufficient for the panel, we thank you for your report.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yeah, one of the -- I guess I can assume, Helga, that one of the items, like that Alagnak River system have not been resolved. They were in our '95 report, and it's fine to put them in the '96 report also and carry them forward?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MS. EAKON: Yes. One of the things the Federal Subsistence Board and the joint chairs are going to discuss is the lack of response to these annual reports by the Federal Subsistence Board. In a real workable world, ideally when a regional council submits an annual report to the Federal Subsistence Board, there should be a response. The only response you have received to date is the one that you did in 1993, the first year that you were in operation. So please be assured that this topic will be

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MS. EAKON: really fully discussed at one of these joint meetings, so that you could be assured of a response. But just because a topic is mentioned in a report doesn't mean that it's going to die. It keeps coming -- it will keep cropping up until there's a resolution of some nature. So long as it is problematic within the region. Did I answer your question?

MR. SAMUELSEN: Yes. And one more question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Sure.

MS. EAKON: Okay.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Is it within this Council's authority to request the different agencies adopt a management plan for the Alagnak River that would take into account man-use days, habitat destruction, trespass onto native allotments, and other private in-holdings?

MS. EAKON: It is -- under Title VIII of ANILCA it is fully within your purview to discuss management plans, and I would suggest that such a cooperative approach be introduced through your annual report, and that, you know, if you want to really flesh it out, you might want to do that tomorrow as Dan suggested under new business, 8(G). So if you want to be kind of thinking about the '96 annual report, we could bring it up again under any other new business tomorrow before adjournment.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MS. EAKON: Okay?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Any other question or comments? Okay. Yes, Sandy, did you have a

MR. RABINOWITCH: Just one additional

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: You've got to come to the mike and give us your name so that the recorder can get all the accurate information. Thank you.

MR. RABINOWITCH: I'm Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service. One other opportunity that I think you can take at any time at the spring Federal Board meeting is that I believe the Chairman usually asks all the council chairs if they have any comments, often in terms of opening comments. So I raise that as simply another place where yourself or your representative then can highlight any issue that you might choose to. I just throw that out.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Good. Thank you. Helga, do you want to carry on?

MS. EAKON: Okay. Yes, Mr. Chairman, moving to item 7(C), 7(C) as in charlie, review of the Regional Council charter for changes, if any. Please refer to tab 7(C) which gives you an overview of the regional council charter renewal process. As you may recall, your charter is renewed every two years under the terms of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. And therefore it has to be renewed in 1996. And on that first page you do have a draft schedule. At the same time about that the Federal Subsistence Board recommendations to the vacancies on the Regional Council go to the Secretary of Department of Interior, will go your charter for renewal.

And if you will turn the page under charter renewal, just to remind you that the following things that you can change in your charter is your name, a name change, a boundary change, the size of your regional council membership, specific subsistence resource commission appointments, and finally

criteria for removing a member.

And you do have a copy of your charter as it is on this very day. So if you are satisfied with your charter, the way you could do it is by a motion to approve the charter as it stands now.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. What's the wishes of the panel? Do you see there on that -- the second page where it talks about charter renewal, boundary, name changes, boundary changes, size of the regional council membership, specific subsistence resource commission appointments, and criteria for removing a member. I think we're all pretty clear on those.

Are there things that this panel would like to change on our charter? Or are you pretty much satisfied like it is, or what do you think? Okay. Quinahagak, is that part of our group?

MR. STEPANOFF: No.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: No? I didn't

MS. EAKON: Quinahagak is within Y-K, Region Five.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: And they want to stay there?

MS. EAKON: I haven't heard otherwise, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. I just -- okay. I'm pretty much satisfied the way it is. I think the number of people we have, the geographical representation is fine. We have good attendance in our panel. I think everyone is -- has a lot of background experience on the resource. We're pretty keyed in on subsistence needs in the area.

Do we have any say-so on members up for re-appointment as part of this, part of our charter, or what's the story on that?

MS. EAKON: You do, if you so wished, you do have the option to endorse an incumbent or if you saw -- I will come to

that at the next

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. That's not part of it today, right now?

MS. EAKON: It's on the agenda item, 7(D) as in David.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Good. Let's worry about that then.

Council members, what's your wishes on the charter? This is an agenda item that needs to be acted on?

MS. EAKON: Yes, it would be nice if -- if you like your charter as it stands on this day, you should so indicate by a motion I think.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: I like it like it is, so I think we should have a motion. Unless there's something really you want to change. Robert?

MR. HEYANO: No, Mr. Chairman. I'm prepared to make a motion that we adopt our current charter as stated without any changes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Is there a second to that motion?

MR. ABRAHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Is there discussion on the motion? Everybody understand the motion on the floor, that we're accepting our charter like it is laid out before us?

MR. ABRAHAM: Question.

MR. STEPANOFF: Question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All those in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Thank you. Helga?

MS. EAKON: Okay. Moving to item 7(D) as in David, Council nominations update. The period for submission of applications ended on February 29th. Let me refer you to this pink sheet here. Where we are is the application, the panel members have been selected, all of the panel members for the regional panels have been accepted, except for U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for some reason has been lagging in picking out who's going to serve on these panels.

You did have a total of 15 applicants who applied for this particular Regional Council, and

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: For this board? For this panel?

MS. EAKON: Fifteen applications for the three seats that are going to be coming vacant this fall. And do you have a listing of these applicants in your packet?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Are you talking about the list of applicants for Regional Councils, February

MS. EAKON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Yes, we have that. It's a white page. Look further, Tim.

MS. EAKON: There should be a total of 15 names.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Who are the members who are up for reappointment?

MS. EAKON: Sam Stepanoff, Tim LaPorte, and Robert Heyano.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: These are the three that are up for

appointment?

MS. EAKON: The three incumbents have reapplied for their respective seats.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. And then you have the other interest of those that would be applying for those positions here, the 15. Okay. And we're on the agenda item dealing with whether or not we want to support those who are -- the incumbents that are up for reappointment?

MS. EAKON: You do have the option of supporting incumbents if you say so, and a simple statement on the record should suffice.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. I would think it would be good, and I'll leave this up to the panel members. I think it would be a conflict of interest for the ones up for appointment to either make a discussion or any comment, but for the ones of us who aren't, we're not obligated. Okay.

And I think that it would be, as far as I'm concerned, we have Tim LaPorte, Sam Stepanoff, and who? Robert Heyano?

MS. EAKON: Robert Heyano.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. I think a general statement by the three members, Peter, Robin and myself, unless you want to discuss this, you know, separately, I think it would be very wise to endorse these incumbents to remain on the panel and to send the Secretary that message. I think it's a very good working panel. I have gotten phone calls at home on support for these panel members. I've gotten phone calls at home not supporting those, some of those who have applied for application, and Togiak has called up and been verbal about they want, you know, these people back on the panel. And if it -- there is a book out, you know, if it's not broken, break it. We don't necessarily need to do that. I think it's fine like it is. I think we have a good working panel, and I would strongly recommend at the chair that this Council send a message to the Secretary that we'd like to keep the incumbents on here. If

that can be accepted by Peter and Robin?

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah, I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. It's not a motion

MR. SAMUELSEN: Mr. Chairman,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: we shouldn't have a motion.
Maybe you couldn't withdraw it if you wouldn't mind?

MR. ABRAHAM: I'll withdraw.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MR. SAMUELSEN: Since we're doing a three straw poll here, it would two against one. I don't agree with you. I think that although the candidates that are up for renomination have done a real good job, I'd just like a level playing field. I'd like the traditional councils to weigh in on this, write letters of support if they want to support Robert or the other members that are sitting up here, that's fine. I wouldn't have a problem with you as the chair writing an opinion representing us all,

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MR. SAMUELSEN: telling the people making the selection what you feel as the chair are the outstanding points, the attendance record and that type of stuff of the individuals

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That would

MR. SAMUELSEN: seeking renomination. But I'm kind of uncomfortable in supporting -- you know, I'm going to be up for renomination, too, so it will benefit me to say, yes, let's do it, but I think that to be a more even, level playing field, that we don't support the individual candidates.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. I'll just write an opinion, if

you don't mind, and I'll send you a copy before I send it off, to you three members, just on what I said tonight. That's my opinion. It won't be a vote or anything, it'll just be that support. And then that will be fine. But it really is important, and I appreciate the other three members not making comment, because it does become conflict of interest doing that, so

Helga, I think that will suffice on that agenda item.

MS. EAKON: Okay. All right. Moving right along to item 7(E), status report, Regional Council training needs. You do have your buff-colored sheet what each regional council statewide felt were its training needs, and remember at your last meeting you said you didn't have -- you didn't have any at the moment, so this is just for your information, what the

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay.

MS. EAKON: other councils wrote down.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: All right. Good. Thank you.

MS. EAKON: Okay?

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh.

MS. EAKON: And then finally we get to item 7(F) update on status of navigable waters/fisheries management and the Northwest Alaska Regional Council petition, and that will be given by Tom Boyd, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Okay. Okay. Tom, come and join us. State your name so that the recorder can

MR. BOYD: Tom Boyd with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

I've been sitting over there, Mr. Chair, looking at my watch, and trying to figure out how I'm going to make this brief, so if you an endure, I'll do my best.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Navigable waters is pretty important.

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: It's a pretty important issue that we're dealing with.

MR. SAMUELSEN: No rest for the wicked.

MR. BOYD: Okay. Well, then I'll get you with both barrels.

Some of you have already heard -- well, you've all already heard Mr. Morrison from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game kind of steal some of the thunder that I had tonight with regards -- regarding his reporting to you concerning the moratorium language that's been introduced by the Alaska Congressional delegation, and some other items related to this issue.

But I think to do this justice, I need to -- every time I find myself speaking about this, I get into it part way, maybe starting in the middle, and I end up having to go back to the beginning. So I'm going to start at the beginning, and some of you, this may be old news, and I apologize, but I think it's easier to follow the thread of what's happening with this if you kind of go back to the beginning.

In 1990 when the Federal Government assumed subsistence management on public lands, in defining jurisdiction or what the public lands are with regard to waters, the federal regulations assumed that only nonnavigable waters within the boundaries of the federal public lands, the colored areas that you see on your map, only the nonnavigable waters within those areas would be considered public lands for purposes of jurisdiction in these regulations. Now, the exception to that was that navigable waters in lands withdrawn prior to statehood, federal lands withdrawn prior to statehood would also be included. So you can see that federal jurisdiction was very restrictive with regard to waters. And that's the way it remains today. Our current regulations have not changed with regard to that.

Shortly after federal assumption, the federal program was taken to court, what's known as the Katy John lawsuit, and the plaintiffs in that case basically challenged our jurisdiction in waters, claiming that all navigable waters within the State should be considered as public lands for purposes of our jurisdiction. It took about four years for the U.S. District Court to make a decision, and that happened in March of 1994. And that decision was that all navigable waters should fall within the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Program. That was subsequently appealed, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal ruled in April of '95, basically changed that ruling from the District Court, and ruled that federal jurisdiction was limited to only in waters where the Federal Government has reserved water rights. And then the case was remanded back to the District Court.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: What is reserved water right?

MR. BOYD: That's a good question.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: That's a good question. Maybe

MR. BOYD: It's waters -- it's late now, so I'm going to have to think a little harder. Reserved water rights are basically waters that were reserved for purposes of the particular land, the reservation or the withdrawal. For instance, on refuges, the purposes of a refuge might be to protect fisheries habitat, and so waters might be withdrawn for that, or waterfowl, or wildlife in general, or recreation. And in short, I've had the opportunity to -- well, I'm getting ahead of myself, so I promised to keep this straight.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Straight line. Good.

MR. BOYD: I'll try to answer your question, too, and elaborate a little more on it as we go.

The Ninth Circuit ruling was much more limited in its scope of jurisdiction than the District Court ruling. I might add that the Ninth Circuit just recently in December of '95 also

revisited their decision and found the same thing.

This case has been subsequently appealed by the State of Alaska as you heard Mr. Morrison speak of, to the U.S. Supreme Court. And we waiting now to hear from the U.S. Supreme Court concerning whether or not they will even take the case. And as Mr. Morrison has stated, that several other Western states have weighed in on the side of the State of Alaska in this case. So we're waiting on that.

And that's sort of the overview of the litigation in this matter.

In the meantime, I should go back to probably '93. We were petitioned by the Native American Rights Fund to do essentially the same thing that the Katy John litigation wanted us to do.

And also in April of '94 the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council petitioned the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to extend jurisdiction to nonfederal lands if the subsistence priority was being somehow impacted by activities on those federal lands on the public lands. And they also asked that jurisdiction be extended to selected, but not conveyed lands. They're a category of lands that Mr. Denton spoke about earlier that -- where lands have been selected but not conveyed to the State of Alaska or native corporations. and this petition asks because it was still in the federal domain that jurisdiction also be included or extended to that. Our current regulations do not. It's strictly to public lands that are unincumbered, have not been selected by anyone. So those were some additional items that were asked for.

As the litigation sort of wound through the courts, the District Court had asked the United States in this case to consider those petitions and some other pending litigation and sort of try to treat all of this litigation and these petitions for rule-making as a package.

As a result of the Ninth Circuit decision that I spoke of earlier, the Department of Interior and Agriculture began

working on a set of regulations, drafting a set of regulations to implement the Ninth Circuit's decision. And pending a court order from the District Court, they have been developing these regulations, and pending an order to do so, they were going to publish these regulations sometime early this year.

Kind of bringing you up to date with some of the items you have in your book now, and kind of moving beyond that in time, -- let me look at my notes here. Okay. Those regulations have incorporated some of the concerns in both the Native American Rights Fund petition and the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council Petition, and the specifics that I'm talking about, they're -- they've drafted a set of regulations that would include waters in which the United States have reserved water rights in our jurisdiction. They've also included a provision that would extend jurisdiction to selected, but not conveyed lands, and they've also -- these regulations have delegated to the Federal Subsistence Board the authority to extend jurisdiction off the public lands to protect subsistence uses or the subsistence priority on the public lands.

Those draft regulations are moving towards publication even as we sit here. And I have just recently been told that these will become an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking. Now, that's a technical term meaning that they're going to be published for the purpose of advising the public that these draft regulations are in preparation. But the official rulemaking process hasn't exactly started yet. That would be technically a proposed rulemaking. But I've been advised that this advanced notice of proposed rule making may be published as early as next week for everyone's review.

Also, simultaneous, you know, in time with all of this occurring, the Alaska Congressional delegation has drafted language that would place a moratorium on funding for either the preparation of or implementation of these draft regulations, so while we may be getting some language out for the public to review fairly quickly, we're also being advised that the Congressional delegation is moving ahead to stop any implementation of these regulations. So

That concludes my report, somewhat confusing.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Uh-huh. Is this mike alive? Okay. So it's just going to have to decide whether it's going to be Dan Cuddy or Senator Ted Stevens?

MR. BOYD: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: It's really interesting though that none of our U.S. delegation supported Title VIII, you know, when it became law. I think they support it in some form then, and then oppose it in another form, so it's really hard to tell where they're coming from anyway. And if navigable waters situation were to change, our whole lifestyle would change, so it really is a big issue.

Any questions you might have, panel members? Okay.

Do we have anything else now coming before us under these reports, Helga?

MS. EAKON: There was 7(G), Unit 9(E) caribou closure effects, but as Mr. Hood reported, it's much too early to evaluate right now, so

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: Tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock Mr. Sellers is going to have an overhead, and

MS. EAKON: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN O'HARA: he's going to give us a report on that, so that's I think all we have. We can recess. Thank you, Tom, for your report tonight. We can recess until 8:30 tomorrow morning, and we'll continue on. Thank you for your help tonight, panel members.

(TO BE CONTINUED)

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Meredith L. Downing, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 74 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the **Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, Volume I**, meeting taken electronically by me on the 18th day of March, 1996, beginning at the hour of 7:00 o'clock p.m. at the FAA Comserfac, King Salmon, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 23rd day of March, 1996.

otary Public in and for Alaska

y Commission Expires: 7/3/98

S E A L

—
N
M