SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME III

February 27, 2003
Ketchikan Indian Corporation
Ketchikan, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Littlefield, Chairman
Marilyn R. Wilson
Bert Adams
Floyd Kookesh
Donald Hernandez
Richard Stokes
Michael Douville
Harvey Kitka
Dolly Garza

Regional Coordinator, Robert Schroeder

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Ketchikan, Alaska - 2/27/2003)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting is called back to order. At this point we were at Proposal 4 Council deliberations. Prior to that I'd like to go over the agenda a little bit and make some changes and adapt to people who have to leave this evening. If anybody requires an early out to make that plane, we could perhaps move them up on the schedule if needed. The way I see it, we are going to do Proposal 4, 5, 6, 7, we're going to go back to 2 and then take care of 10 and 11. We need to hopefully get those proposals done by noon and we can get everything done. If there's anybody that needs to be right after that on the schedule. I know Mr. Boyd and Mr. Rivard are leaving on that plane. If they would like to be moved up, as well as Doug McBride. We know you've got to catch that plane. We want to make sure you can make your presentation. Are there any requests to change the agenda? We'll proceed on that, but I want to remind you that we've got a lot of business to take care of.

Last night, when we recessed, I received a request from the State of Alaska to have some additional time prior to our Council deliberations to present some new harvest data as well as talk about the planning group. What is the Council's wishes? If there's no objection to that, I'd like to ask them to come forward and present that harvest data and planning group and understanding that we are on a time crunch here.

MS. SEE: Thank you and good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Council, members of the public. My name is Marianne See. I'm with the Department of Fish & Game. We did want to offer a couple things this morning very quickly. We realize you have a pressing agenda. There are some pieces of information that my colleague, Mike Turek, will present to try to clarify some of the harvest information from yesterday's testimony. We have two kinds of information that we've brought to this meeting to try and help in the context of these issues that you face with deer on Prince of Wales Island. The population data, which we're obviously going to continue working on, and the harvest data.

The harvest data, I think, just in general, some are problematic because we don't have a good way to look through time at what has been used and how the influences of the changing road systems, the changing populations of people, how all that plays into how the resource really is used for subsistence. It is the State's priority, by law, that we provide for subsistence. I want to make that very clear. That is why we are in dual management and that is why we are here today, to try to bring you useful information, but it's not easy to do that.

If there is information, as was said yesterday by some of the speakers, that is not representative in the survey data we have, there may be a reason to go back and look at the need for more current information about what really gets used in communities. If that were the case, we would certainly want to work with our Federal colleagues, with the communities involved and try to do what needs to be done or help support what needs to be done to get the best information for these kinds of decisions.

Under dual management, the State has to look at these things just as closely as anyone. In order to influence the Board of Game, we have to bring them the best information, the most current information and help them make decisions or help them look at information by which they make decisions on these same issues. As I said, if the information is not current or not complete, then that might mean that other information needs to be brought to bear.

The communities involved would need to be full participants and partners in that and that has been problematic in recent time. So we would just urge that if that needs to happen, the communities need to join in or lead that kind of effort to make sure that the information is accurate.

I'd also like to note that because these issues are so complex, we really are finding one of the more complicated situations we've come up against recently around the state with this deer issue in terms of how the harvest picture looks, how the population picture looks. We don't have the best information on these things that we would like to have. And the press of the different user groups involved. It's a very complex issue.

And we know, as we presented yesterday,

that even if today there may not be compelling information about where we are in the decline of deer, eventually there will be a decline in deer. Our population experts are quite certain of this. So this really lends itself, I think, to the kind of planning effort, and I use that term sort of loosely, it's the stakeholder effort that's needed by all the participants in the concerns about subsistence use in fish and wildlife. Those folks need to be able to get to a place where they can really work through these issues. The kind of planning that was done in the Redoubt Lake issues on the fisheries side, for example, has really engaged people and I think that something like that really could be very beneficial here.

This is not going to get solved overnight. It's very complicated stuff and they're very legitimate user concerns that are compelling for subsistence. In order to allow both State and Federal entities to provide for and protect subsistence, it's going to take some time, so we would really urge your consideration and support for the kind of planning that's been discussed I think primarily the day before yesterday. With that, I'd like to turn it over to Mike Turek, who provides some clarification on harvest information.

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chairman, Council. I'd just like to clarify something from the harvest data that we do have. Speaking yesterday, I didn't make it clear about the 1999 harvest data that we have from Craig and Klawock, the household harvest data of deer hunters. What we did in Prince of Wales Island, we have three communities -- excuse me, two communities that we've done face-to-face household surveys three times, that's Craig and Klawock, and that was in 1987 when we asked about all resources, 1997, again we asked about all resources, and then 2000 for the 1999 harvest year when we asked just deer hunters just about deer.

What we have from those household harvest surveys in 1987 in Craig, we have an estimation of 600 deer taken, in 1997, 963 deer, in 1999, 744 deer. For Klawock in 1987, 445 deer, in 1997, 503 deer, and in 1999, 476 deer. So, in 1999 there was a decrease in deer harvest in Craig and Klawock from our face-to-face surveys. So those are the two communities that we have the most face-to-face household harvest survey data for Prince of Wales Island.

For the Department of Wildlife Conservation deer ticket surveys, which for most of the communities we think is underreported on Prince of Wales Island, but we think it gives us an idea of the trends of harvests. Nothing from that data shows a serious decline in harvest yet. So I think one thing that should be done on Prince of Wales Island is work a bit more on trying to improve our harvest data and that will take the communities to really buy into helping us get better harvest data, whether it's face-to-face surveys or trying to improve the deer ticket returns or doing something with the check stations. I think something, maybe a combination of all three.

But a key on Prince of Wales Island, like anywhere in rural Alaska, is you have to have the communities buy into it. The hunters have to agree to do it or you're not going to get good data. So I just wanted to clarify there was indeed in 1999 from our surveys a slight decline in harvest from Craig and Klawock from our survey data. As was pointed out by Patty, in the year 1997 there was a slight decline in Hydaburg for deer harvest from the '87 data. So we have some of that face-to-face data and a lot more of the deer ticket data.

Now, with the check station, perhaps a combination of doing something with all three of those we can get some better harvest data. That may be the best way to get an indication with data on paper showing a decline of deer harvest and that may be what we really need, at least to go to the Board of Game, to get something done by the Board of Game. That's all I have unless you have any questions.

MS. SEE: We'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: First, a comment. We would like that in writing, too. If you could provide that to us in writing so we have that for the record. We have it on transcript, but I believe it's important that we have that in writing to add to the additional data, the '97 and 2000 surveys that we have. Also, was that a per capita? What are those numbers? Are they per capita?

MR. TUREK: Those are total numbers. What we give you, what we write up, I can include the per capita for those three survey years for those two

communities.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. If you could summarize that and get that to us in writing, we would appreciate that. Any other questions from the Council? Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you for that report. I think the State is way far ahead of the Feds as far as gathering this data. Floyd and I, we've been talking off and on about where does local knowledge come into this and I think your household surveys accomplish that for us. So my compliments to you for doing that. The last survey I understand was done in 1999. Anything being done since then to now?

MR. TUREK: Chair, Mr. Adams. No, the survey was actually done in 2000 for the 1999 harvest year and that's the last face-to-face surveys we've done on Prince of Wales Island. At that time, in Klawock, we were told that they really didn't want us to do any more surveys. They'd been sort of surveyed out. We'd been there a couple years for the household harvest surveys and did a lot of work on deer while interviewing people. So that's one of the keys. We have to get the communities to say, yes, we do want you to do this work. We have to do more work on Prince of Wales Island, in particular in Klawock and Hydaburg, to get those communities to really buy into this.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council? Follow up. Go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: Yesterday, I can't remember who it was, but I have it down here somewhere, made a statement about the habitat and that the deer are kind of harder to see when the growth is getting thicker and thicker. I'm just wondering, you know, if that was taken into consideration. That's about it. Thanks.

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Adams. When we asked people -- we didn't ask them in particular what the impacts of the second growth was having on their finding deer. We asked them if it was easier to get deer or if they were spending more time getting deer, more difficult and if they were seeing fewer deer, and we didn't get the details, an explanation of why they weren't seeing more deer. But, in general, when we've asked those questions on Prince of Wales Island, people said it is more difficult to get more deer, they're not

seeing as many deer as they did in the past five years and spending more time to get the deer that they need.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: I'd like to see one of your survey forms. Is it a standard form that you -- is it like a document that's never changed? Like you mentioned habitat. I'd like to see what your material looks like.

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Kookesh. When we did the household harvest surveys for all resources, it's a standard statewide survey, but we alter them for particular communities for particular resources or if we have extra questions that we're asking. In 2000, for the deer survey, we came up with a deer survey form. I think I have copies of the form we used in 2000 with me I can share with you. I can get you a copy of the household harvest survey that we used in '97 on Prince of Wales Island. We try to use a pretty standardized form, but we also can add extra questions or change it, modify it for the particular community or the particular resource we're trying to find out about.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Floyd, go ahead and follow up and then Ms. Phillips.

MR. KOOKESH: I guess the reason I want to see your data is because we always talk -- not your data, but your document, because we always talk about not having enough complete data to make decisions and that some of the decisions we made don't have any bearing or grounds to stand on because of apparently the way we go after the information or based on the money. I'd like to see the strength in the data process form for ourselves.

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Kookesh. Yeah, I can give you a copy of the survey form. What we do also is we work with the local communities. We show them the survey form and we get some input from them before we conduct the survey, especially when we hire local people to help with the surveys and get their input, what they might like to have added to the survey or perhaps alter the format a bit. We try to get as much local input as we can on that and we try to improve that now, getting that input as early as possible helping with the survey form. I can give you a copy of that probably at this meeting. I'll check. I think I have that with me.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Turek. I have a comment and then a question. There used to be a program called RAP, which is Rural Apprenticeship Program, which is a high school student program, that works through Federal agencies to give them part-time jobs, sort of like mentorship programs. Possibly you could get high school students to work with you to survey community members on POW. My question is, in 1999, did the survey ask if subsistence needs were being met?

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Ms. Phillips. I'd have to check and see how we worded that, if it was worded -- a needs question, how that was worded in '99. I don't remember. I believe we did have some kind of a wording in the question about needs. The problem we have with needs is that managers on boards, State boards, they want to see numbers and they want to see it backed by something, harvest data, some kind of survey. They won't just accept if you say, well, X community says they need X amount of deer, so we have to come up with something that they'll accept that they accept as scientific. That's why we have to figure out a way to get at those needs.

The best way for us and the data that we can defend the best is through harvest surveys. If we have a number of years showing how much people have reported using, that's the best thing when we go to the State Board of Fish or Game to say this is what people need because this is what they've been harvesting. That's just the way this system works with the State. So they want to see those hard numbers when there's questions of amount necessary the way we term it in the State system.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. I'd like to address some of your comments, Ms. See. You talked about the planning and you'd mentioned specifically there was a priority in State law as well as guaranteed that the deer were going down and also talked about Redoubt as an example. I would suggest that the State can implement this planning process quite rapidly and take care of this because of the constraints that was explained to us earlier that we operate under as a Federal advisory committee.

What I would suggest is that you go ahead and do this under the State auspices as soon as possible

and what you're going to need, in my opinion, this is just my opinion, is, number one, a good moderator, you will need to have the realization that under Federal law as well as State law subsistence is a priority in preference, although they're talked about differently, and then you'll need to get the stakeholders involved. Let's call them consumptive users rather than stakeholders. You'll need to determine who those people are. And then you will have to have a short time frame. You don't want to drag this out for two, three years. You'll either come to some consensus or not and I would suggest a series of rapid meetings over a month and you will know by then whether you can come to some consensus and I think at a future meeting that would be very helpful. I think you can put this together not in years, but in months. Certainly by the next meeting. That would be my suggestion.

MS. SEE: Mr. Chair, if I may respond to that. We have actually been discussing this with the Forest Service at great length and it's my understanding that they mentioned something about this to you on Tuesday. I was not here then. Our understanding is that, because we do agree that it needs to happen soon or get off the ground soon, that they are planning to get a contract in place very quickly to start a person as a facilitator to basically check in with these different consumptive users, as you call them, that's a good term, to see whether or not there's a degree of engagement that we could mobilize and get something like this going. We would do this -- the State would do this in a collaborative mode with the Forest Service since they have money allocated to start this already. We very much want to work with them closely to make sure that this happens.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree that that approach should go forward. I'm just saying that under State management this could proceed quite rapidly. There are certain rules and regulations that the Federal government has to follow and it might take a lot longer and I'm thinking that under the State it could be done speedily and that's why I recommend it. It also, as you mentioned in Redoubt, worked quite well. Not everyone was satisfied. In a consensus, generally no one is. It could be either accomplished or not and you would know that within a month I would think. So that was my recommendation. You guys can get this taken care of much quicker than we can. And not to discourage what we're doing and I'm sure it's going to continue. Any other

questions? Thank you very much for making this presentation.

We are at Proposal 4 Council deliberations, as well as 5. Council wishes. Ms. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move to support Proposal 4.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: On what page, please? Is the suggestion language to your motion on Page 105, is that correct?

MS. GARZA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on Page 105 is support the proposal, at the bottom of it. C&T use determination. Residents of Unit 1(A) and residents of Units 2 and 3. Four deer; however, no more than one may be an antlerless deer. Antlerless deer may be taken only during the period October 15 to December 31 by Federal registration permit only. The season is July 24 through December 31. As a point of order, I'm not sure if we adopt or support.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would make a motion to adopt.

MR. STOKES: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion to adopt the language on Page 105 and it's been seconded. It's before the Council. The maker of the motion, would you like to speak first? Discussion on the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. STOKES: Call for the question.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I do have some reservations on this proposal I'd like to express and see if any of the Council members agree.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Don, if you could move forward so that everyone can hear you. Also, I'd like the Council Members to remember that we need to use the rationale for recommendation so that the record is clear for the Federal Subsistence Board on why we made this decision. Go ahead, Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I do see this as an increase for subsistence opportunity. My reservation has to do with whether or not it will benefit enough subsistence users. I do see a bit of a problem with an earlier opening. That is a very busy time of the year for a lot of people engaged in commercial fishing. I'd also point out that the third week in July is the peak sockeye week for subsistence people who are going out subsistence fishing for sockeye. I know in my area, Salmon Bay, Red Bay, Shipley Bay systems where people subsistence fish all peak in about that third week in July and that's the time we're going to be harvesting subsistence sockeye.

I have one other reservation. We've heard a lot of substantial evidence in the last few days that we do have a decline in the deer population. This proposal may or may not -- I can't say for certain, but it may or may not increase the harvest of deer. I'm not sure I'm comfortable with a proposal that will increase the harvest of deer in a time when we're talking about shortages in deer.

My last reservation is that if we are in a situation where we may have to be talking about more conservation in the future and if one believes this has a tendency to increase the take of deer, if we need to take conservation measures in the future, this action we take now would put more of the burden on the non-rural hunters in any future decisions. We could not take this away as a restriction to subsistence hunters. It would tend to make us more inclined to restrict the non-rural hunters in the future if we feel we are in a conservation situation. However, it is not certain that this will increase the take of deer and I would be interested in hearing what some of the other Council Members think about that. As I said, this may be our best solution to the problem, but I would be interested in hearing some opinions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Stokes.

MR. STOKES: The reason why I'm supporting this proposal is that it would -- myself, I take my grandkids out and they have an extra opportunity while school is out and they're able to camp, I'm able to show them how to catch the fish and I'm able to show them

how to hunt. I don't believe this will hurt the conservation at all. I just believe it's an added opportunity for our youngsters to accompany us and learn the ropes.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman. I support this proposal. One of the reasons why we were put in this position was for the purpose of creating opportunities for the rural areas. Decisions we make we know certainly affect non-rural areas, but I believe that our actions are intended to benefit the rural areas. The burden, well, that's something that's just considered, in a sense, collateral damage and just have to learn how to live with that because of this legislation. I think the maker of the proposal understands that the one-week time frame is small and that there's not going to be a huge gain for them, but that the benefit, although small, will certainly help. I think that this being a week, I don't believe that we're asking for the moon. I think they're just trying to take a little jump off the ground there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak in favor of the motion for several reasons. First, it was not designed to solve this problem. It's more like trying to put a Band-Aid on a cut that really needs stitches. However, our duty is to provide continued access to the resource and this is following in that manner.

There's some reasons for this proposal. Some of the subsistence users are not getting what they need because of competition and this is designed to help alleviate that. Realizing that some subsistence users are doing other things, well, we're not all going to go hunting at the same time. But some of those that do need meat more than others will be hunting at this time should this go through the Federal Subsistence Board successfully.

There's many issues here that prompt me to support it. One is that we have -- I agree with the ADF&G that the decline in deer is slight. In some places, I could tell you that it has crashed drastically

on some of the islands and other places I see where it is actually improving. That is not the real problem. The real problem here is habitat that has been degraded through clear-cut. Not all of Prince of Wales Island is good terrain for hunting. Some of it is too steep, some of it is full of blow-downs. There are many reasons why select areas are more productive or more acceptable to hunting. It has to do with those things. If you clear-cut an area, you don't go back and hunt anymore. It's ruined. So, while there is deer in those areas, you don't use them. You never have used them for those reasons. In any case, while this proposal would be a small step, it is a step in the right direction and I support it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, support this proposal, maybe for different reasons. I realize that the fisheries business has bottomed out and dropped and there's no money coming in to these communities and they need some help and some way to survive through the year and they do need subsistence. For these reasons I would support this motion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield. There's been overwhelming evidence presented in public testimony that individual's subsistence needs are not being met. The Staff analysis shows that deer populations are likely to decline over time due to decreased habitat capability and without effective thinning and second growth management, deer populations will further decline. We've heard that there are empty houses on Prince of Wales Island, that the population of humans is declining, but with the depression in the economy, I see that as their subsistence needs are going to be increasing and that we should be managing the resource to have an increased population of resource.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other Council. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I'm going to direct this question to Mike Turek. Thank you. On Page 101 of the book here it says under data on deer numbers and harvest information, this information was provided by the Department of Fish & Game

and my question to you, Mike, is did this come as a result of your household surveys for the previous years or where did the State get this data from?

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Adams. Let me get my book and take a look at 101. I think they're referring to the deer harvest ticket data, which is collected by the Department of Wildlife Conservation. Yes, that's what they're referring to there.

MR. ADAMS: Let me just read that for you. It says for the period of August 2001 to January 2002, the ADF&G reported that deer harvest was about seven percent higher than the long-term average but lower than those harvested in 2002. To me, it tells me that there probably is a potential for a conservation issue here, but I don't think it's that serious at this point. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Mr. Adams. I really couldn't say, but that's one way to look at it. I wouldn't make a comment on that.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would remind the Council that at this time we have this proposal before us, so it's probably not appropriate to ask others to comment on it. We've had that time, so let's keep it within the Council if we can. Are there other Council? The Council has, I believe, adequately shown all of the items that were in the rationale. I would just like to note for the record that this is also supported on Page 104 by Staff as well as the State support, although it was qualified to the doe harvest, it still supported the proposal. If there are no more comments, are you ready for the question?

MS. GARZA: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would like to ask if a Council Member will please summarize the four points for the record. Ms. Garza, would you like to do that?

MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The four things we must consider are conservation. Under conservation I have heard from Federal and State that the population is fairly stable. There may be a slight decline, but not a substantial decline. So I'm not concerned as much about deer as I have been in the past few years. Under the next point, subsistence

opportunity.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Substantial evidence.

MS. GARZA: You've got four different points than I've got on my sheet. Substantial evidence. I think that we have several very good reports in front of us. Patricia brought her report from last year. We have reams of reports on deer from Prince of Wales. From the testimony we received yesterday, there is substantial evidence in my opinion that the Prince of Wales residents subsistence needs are not being met.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, is the effect on subsistence users. Does it support customary and traditional uses? Yes, it does. Mr. Chairman, I have heard from several of the Council members the concern about the earlier opening and conflicts with fishing or it's a warmer season, but I think if it provides opportunity for some subsistence residents, then I'm happy.

Mr. Chairman, the last point, the effect on other users, those are primarily the Ketchikan residents. The reason this proposal was brought forward by this Council was that it was an attempt to provide an opportunity for Prince of Wales subsistence users without taking away from Ketchikan users, so they still have their August opening. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. That summarizes it and I believe covers it. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has been called for and the vote before you is to adopt the language on Page 105, effectively setting an earlier date. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is

carried. It is recommended to adopt the language on Page 105. We are on Proposal 5. We have heard all of the previous information, so we are at Council deliberations on Proposal 5. Please refer to the page that you're talking about when you make a motion. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Page 113. I move that we adopt Proposal 5 as it is written on Page 113.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion to adopt the language for the proposed regulation as shown on Page 113. Is there a second?

MR. KOOKESH: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded. The language on Page 113, proposed regulation for Unit 2 deer is before the Council. Would the maker of the motion like to go first? Other Council.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: I seek to amend the proposal.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please proceed.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. If you look at the proposed Federal regulation Unit 2 deer, we have the C&T determination, the August 1 to 31st for rural residents, then we have separately non-Federally qualified hunters on Federal land. Federal public lands are closed to the taking of deer from August 1 to September 1. Harvest limits for deer on Federal public lands for hunters who are not Federally qualified subsistence users is two bucks. Mr. Chairman, I would move that we amend that Federal public lands are closed to the taking of deer from August 1 to August 10.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a motion to change the date. Substitute August 10 for September 1 in the first sentence. Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded. The amendment is before you to substitute August 10th for September 1st in the first sentence of

1 the bold language on Page 113. Maker.
2
3 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. As
4 a Ketchikan resident, I realize that the intent of this
5 Council is to ensure that we have subsistence
6 opportunities for rural residents. However, the Council
7 has always strove to represent all of Southeast and as a
8 non-rural resident I know that Ketchikan hunters use
9 Prince of Wales, they take their families over. August
10 is the best month. As Mr. Stokes has stated, this is
11 when they can take their kids up into the mountains and
12 hunt and teach them good skills, so this would remove a
13 substantial opportunity for families if it is September 1
14 because school will be starting. So I ask that we
15 support this amendment.
16
17 Thank you.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Is
20 there any other discussion on the amendment?
21
22 MR. KOOKESH: Call the question.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has
25 been called for. We'll stand down for a few minutes.
26 Please grab a cup of coffee. We'll be back in a couple
27 minutes only.
28
29 (Off record)
30
31 (On record)
32
33 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're back in
34 session. We have before us an amendment to substitute
35 August 10th for September 1st on Page 113. Council, are
36 you ready for the question? Before the Council at this
37 time is an amendment to the main motion on Page 113. The
38 amendment would substitute August 10th for September 1st
39 in the first line of the last paragraph. Does everyone
40 understand that? Dr. Garza.
41
42 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. So it would
43 then read Federal public lands are closed to the taking
44 of deer from August 1 to August 10th and this is for non-
45 Federally qualified hunters.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Does everyone
48 understand the amendment before you? Are you ready for
49 the question? You will be voting on the amendment to
50 substitute August 10th for September 1st in the first

sentence on Page 113. All in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is carried. August 10th is substituted for September 1st. The main motion is before you. Ms. Phillips, Mr. Douville, Ms. Garza.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield. Title VIII of ANILCA, Section 801.5, says the continuation of the opportunity for a subsistence way of life by residents of rural Alaska requires enabling rural residents who have personal knowledge of local conditions and requirements to have a meaningful role in the management of fish and wildlife and of subsistence uses on public lands in Alaska.

Policy 1 says the use of the public lands in Alaska is to cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents who depend upon subsistence uses of the resources of such lands. Number 2, non-wasteful subsistence uses of fish and wildlife shall be the priority consumptive uses of all such resources. When it is necessary to restrict taking to ensure the continuation of subsistence uses of such taking, such populations shall be given preference over other consumptive uses.

Preference for subsistence use. Section 804 states the taking on public lands of fish and wildlife for non-wasteful subsistence uses shall be accorded priority over the taking on such lands of fish and wildlife for other purposes. Whenever it is necessary to restrict the taking of populations of fish and wildlife for subsistence uses to continue such uses, such priority shall be implemented through appropriate limitations based on the application of the following criteria. Customary and direct dependance upon the populations, the mainstay of livelihood, local residency and the availability of alternative resources. Whenever it is necessary to restrict the taking of populations of wildlife on public lands for subsistence uses to continue such uses, such priority shall be implemented through

appropriate limitations.

The SERAC, when reviewing and evaluating proposals, has provided a forum for expressing opinions and recommendations by interested persons. The SERAC has encouraged local and regional participation in the decision-making process affecting taking of fish and wildlife for subsistence uses. Several tribes and numerous individuals have testified that their current and anticipated subsistence needs are not being met.

Household survey data, Page 128 of SERAC February 2003 meeting booklet states, respondents in Craig, Hydaburg and Klawock were asked in the 1998 surveys whether community needs for deer were met in the previous year. In Craig, 62 percent said harvest was somewhat lower or much lower than needed, 69 percent of Hydaburg and 62 percent of Klawock thought harvests were somewhat or much lower than needed. Hydaburg has said 500 deer will meet their subsistence needs. This is their substantial evidence to continue the customary and traditional way of life.

The SERAC is recommending to the Federal Subsistence Board to exercise its authority to restrict non-rural harvest of deer in Unit 2. Staff analysis says, Page 96, that long-term habitat capability for deer in Unit 2 is declining due to harvest of productive old growth forest, reduced value of clear-cuts and further reduction in habitat suitability of second growth stands. It was further stated that clear-cuts reduced the carrying capacity of deer winter range and results in long-term reduction in deer population. The stem exclusion stage creates a dense undergrowth with very little deer forage for up to 200 years. Effective commercial thinning, planting of red alder and second growth management are needing immediate implementation to enhance deer habitat to increase deer populations.

The Craig Community Association came up with careful and responsible advice for management of harvest for deer in Unit 2. The Craig Community Association contacted several tribes on Prince of Wales Island to identify common needs concerning deer harvest. There is increased hunting pressure due to easier accessibility to POW. The lack of an economy indicates an increasing need for subsistence resources. Harvest data does not reflect the actual harvest of rural communities on Prince of Wales. Harvest data research by tribes needs further funding. Overall, total numbers of

deer needed per capita is increasing.

The data shows little or no harvest decline because individuals have not been meeting their subsistence needs in the first place. Most everyone has testified that their subsistence needs are not being met. That their subsistence needs are not being met is a significant impact that has been occurring for years and will continue to be a significant impact until management tools are in place to recognize their subsistence priority. The public testimony given is the substantial evidence documenting subsistence needs are not being met.

Thank you for the multitude of comments. This process works only as well as the dedicated effort we put into it. I appreciate the depth of knowledge shared with us. My charge as a Member of the SERAC is to protect the subsistence priority of ANILCA for the health of our communities and resource. Not to pit neighbor against neighbor, but to protect the customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska residents.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you speaking for the motion or against the motion?

MS. PHILLIPS: I am speaking in support of the motion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I would remind Council, that was very good information, but please indicate whether you're speaking for or against the motion just for the record so we know. Other Council. It would be Mr. Douville, followed by Ms. Garza.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak in favor of the motion. As I stated before in some of my comments in speaking in favor, I was going to say similar things as far as the habitat and subsistence users have many obstacles. It's not like they can go out and go shopping and get a deer. They're having a hard time and they're telling you that, but there's a lot of reasons why. I said before habitat is one of them. Some of them are working. They only have weekends. The window of opportunity is smaller. Some are also involved in other subsistence activities or livelihoods, such as fishing. So there's many things to consider when doing this. Anything that enhances their opportunities, such

as this proposal, is going to benefit subsistence, which is what we're here for, to enhance opportunity to do that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to support Proposal 5 as it has been amended. I would like to go through the rationale. Under conservation, as we have heard, the deer population is stable and, if not, is only slightly declining. We understand that there may potentially be larger declines in the future as much of the logged land will move into stage two, where it's exclusionary for deer passage. However, I don't think that this proposal, as it is written, will affect the conservation of the deer.

Under substantial evidence, Mr. Chair, the main point that I am bringing forward on this is that by providing an opportunity for rural residents only to harvest in the days of August 1 to August 10, we are meeting our obligation as a Council by providing an opportunity to subsistence users. That is our obligation under ANILCA. We have heard, as Ms. Phillips has indicated, that the Prince of Wales residents are surely not meeting their deer needs. They have continually taken the same number, but as we have heard from Vickie LeCornu, who was on this Council for several years, the number that they are taking has never been enough and the number that they needed was far higher than what we are aware of.

In terms of the effect on subsistence users, Mr. Chairman, this gives subsistence users an opportunity to harvest with less competition in the area. Generally speaking, subsistence users are on the lower economic scale. They don't have the best boats, they don't have the best cars, they don't have the best anything, so this gives them a little bit of an edge.

The effect on other users, Mr. Chairman. The data that we have been provided states that on the average Ketchikan residents are taking somewhere around 1.2 deer. I think cutting back the permitted number from four to two, if we follow that line of evidence that we've been given, will not substantially decrease the opportunity for Ketchikan residents. If the average is 1.2, there will be some who are taking four, there are

others who are taking zero, so there will be some limited cut-backs, but I think on the average it should not affect Ketchikan residents.

My amendment, in terms of affecting other users, by providing a 10-day closure as opposed to a one-month closure ensures that Ketchikan residents can have family hunting activities before school starts by going over to Prince of Wales and hiking up with their families. So, Mr. Chairman, I think that this proposal, as amended, is a very good compromise. It works to provide opportunities to rural residents while not substantially having a negative effect on non-rural residents.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I spoke in favor of the motion, but I also want to point out one other thing. Unit 2 is not the only place to hunt. Ketchikan has a wide area that has a four-deer limit also, so it's not like we've deprived anybody of hunting opportunity.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: To paraphrase what you said, a reasonable opportunity will be provided for -- is still available for those hunters to fulfill their bag limit even if we were to adopt this motion?

MR. DOUVILLE: I believe so, Mr. Chairman. We're only talking about Unit 2. I don't know what the units are, 1(A), (B) and 3 are unaffected. This only affects Unit 2.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other Council. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also would like to speak in favor of the motion. With this motion, we have placed a restriction on non-rural hunters. I feel that a high level of evidence to support that restriction is necessary. I feel, in the course of our testimonies here this week from residents of Prince of Wales Island, Staff, I felt we had a very substantial amount of evidence that any reasonable person could draw

conclusions. We are seeing some decline in the deer population in Unit 2 and that subsistence users are not having their needs met. One of the things that I wanted to see from our actions was to not place too much of a burden on non-rural residents. I felt that eliminating all of the August hunting abilities for non-rural hunters would be unfair to families who have always taken the opportunity to go to Unit 2 and hunt deer together before school starts. I didn't want to take that opportunity away. I feel the August 10th date would have the least adverse impacts on the non-subsistence users and I'm happy with that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Prior to that, I'd like to add just a couple comments. The State had opposed this proposal on Page 112 and, of course, the very first sentence said that they did not believe we had within the authority of SERAC to consider this. We have evidence to the contrary; so, therefore, we know that we can do this. This was also opposed by Staff and I refer you to the language on Page 131 and their justification of why they did not support it was that there was no substantial evidence to indicate subsistence users are unable to meet their subsistence needs. Clearly, we heard evidence to the contrary that's been presented. Any other discussion? Are you ready for the question?

MS. GARZA: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question before you is on the main motion as amended on Page 113. The amendment added the language August 10 to September 1st. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I haven't stated the call yet. You have the floor. Go ahead. The motion has passed. The amended motion has passed and has been adopted by SERAC. Please go ahead.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would like

to thank the Council for accepting my amendment for allowing part of August to be open for Ketchikan residents. It is very important for Ketchikan residents who are working to establish rural status. If you look outside, live in Ketchikan, despite the fact that we have 180 inches of rain because we love this area, we live here because we use this land, we use these fisheries and we need this opportunity, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other comments before we proceed? The next item on the agenda would be Proposal 6. Before I do that, are there any requests from Staff to make an early presentation? Ms. Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Did we vote on the main motion yet? We voted on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We voted on the amendment. The amendment was passed for the substitute language of August 10th. Subsequent to that, our last vote was on the amended motion and the motion was carried. Is that clear? Does anybody else have any question about that? This is done. We're going to proceed with Proposal No. 6. Staff. Please come to order. Mr. Brainard, please proceed.

MR. BRAINARD: Good morning. My name is Jim Brainard. I'm a wildlife biologist for the Forest Service stationed in Petersburg. Unit 3 has quite a history. In the late '60s, early '70s, deer populations crashed throughout the entire unit. It was so bad at times when people walking in the woods would walk up and find a deer track and everybody would come look at it. It was that unusual. It took about 20 years for the deer population to come back to a huntable level. Parts of Unit 3 have had severe restrictions on the take of deer since then.

With this proposal, portions of Unit 3 on Kupreanof Island would be brought in line with most of the rest of the unit with the exception of Mitkof, Woewodski and Butterworth Islands. This proposal mirrors what would bring the Federal hunting opportunities in line with the State with what the Board of Game has done and it would move it back to 1 August to 30 November with two bucks on the entire island of Kupreanof.

Here's more of the discussion I started with earlier. Petersburg, the community of Petersburg

still has a restricted one-deer season for a very short season. This would allow a lot of the residents of Petersburg to get to another area that's very close where they could hunt two deer. The Lindenburg Peninsula has a road system and people are able to go to this road system at the existing log transfer facility and hunt that area and this would provide more opportunity for those hunters.

We believe that the population has rebounded sufficient on Lindenburg Peninsula to allow this hunt to continue. Our pellet group data that the State and the Federal and the Forest Service has conducted on this area is showing quite an increase in trend. So this looks to be a very good opportunity to give people in the Petersburg area a better chance of harvesting more deer without having to go long distances.

Here's the pellet group data. It shows it goes up quite rapidly. Here's what the island looks like, the portion we're talking about. The dotted line to the right of that is the Lindenburg Peninsula. Petersburg is on the island just to the right of Mitkof Island. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions from Council on where these deer came from. Are there any questions for Staff? Thank you very much, Mr. Brainard. ADF&G.

MR. TITUS: Good morning. Thank you. Since this is a Department proposal, I'll keep it short in saying we have no comments other than we're pleased to come before you and try to, in this case, align the State season and the Federal season and provide more opportunity for deer hunters.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any questions from Council? For the record, I'd like to note that both the State and Federal Staff support this proposal. Other agencies, any other agencies. Any tribal governments that wish to testify on this proposal? Fish & Game Advisory Committee comments. Summary of written public comments.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we have no written public comments on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Public testimony.

Do we have any public testimony on Proposal 6? I have no cards before me. Is there anybody in the audience that wishes to testify? We are at Regional Council deliberation. What are the Council's wishes on Proposal 6? Mr. Stokes.

MR. STOKES: I just want to say that I speak in favor.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You need to make the motion first, please. Also, please show the page. Would you please tell what page so that everyone can refer to the same page. I believe it is Page 145 that you're talking about.

MR. STOKES: I make a motion to adopt Proposal 6.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion to adopt Proposal No. 6 and I believe the correct language is on Page 145. Do we have a second.

MS. GARZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the language on Page 145. Is there any Council discussion? Are you ready for the question?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: I speak in favor of the motion. It's my understanding there is no conservation issue. We have a good report from Federal Staff. The effect on subsistence users is to increase opportunities. I don't see that there's an effect on other users, so I support.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. That was a good summary. Any other Council? Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I also speak in favor of the motion. I see a good demonstration here of the Feds and the State working together. If we can get that working relationship with all of our proposals, I'm sure that we would breeze right through these in no time at all. So I speak in favor of the motion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. Any

other Council comments before we proceed to the vote? Are you ready for the question?

MR. ADAMS: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has been called. The motion before you is to adopt the language of Proposal No. 6 as shown on Page 145. All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing none, the proposal is adopted on Page 145. Proposal No. 7 is next on the agenda. We're ready for Staff.

MS. REECK: Mr. Chair, can we have just a couple minutes, please.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes. (Pause) The meeting will please come back to order. We are on Proposal 7. Staff presentation. Jill, please proceed.

MS. REECK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Council. My name is Jill Reeck. I'm lead Forest Service biologist for this proposal. I'd like to refer the Council, please, to page number 149, which is the beginning of this proposal. This proposal was submitted by Alaska Department of Fish & Game on mountain goats. We'd like to request closure of all harvest on Cleveland Peninsula and for reasons of consistency and conservation, we'd also like to reduce the harvest limits elsewhere from two goats to one goat.

Existing regulation. Revillagigedo Island no open season. Unit 1(B) north of LeConte Bay, one goat by State registration permit. Unit 1(B) between LeConte Bay and the North Fork of Bradfield River is currently two goats. The first one by State registration permit, the second goat is by Federal permit. The remainders of Unit 1(A) and 1(B) is currently two goats by State registration permit.

I'd also like to refer the Council to the map on Page 155. This may help explain where some of

these different areas are. The proposed regulation. Revillagigedo Island would remain at no open season. Portions of Units 1(A) and 1(B) on the Cleveland Peninsula south of Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet would be closed. Then the remainder of Units 1(A) and 1(B) would be reduced from two goats to one goat by State registration permit.

What I'd like to do for the Council is kind of break this discussion up by these different areas, starting with Cleveland Peninsula. We have a picture of Cleveland here kind of showing all the different sub-population areas of Cleveland Peninsula mountain goats. They occur in very small isolated sub-populations. I believe back in the 1980s some of those sub-populations were as small as five goats. Also back in the late '60s through the '80s fairly consistently seeing probably roughly 50 to 80 goats. All the current year surveys have been consistently going down. The last few years survey numbers have been down to approximately 10 goats. Data definitely suggests we probably have a conservation concern for the Cleveland populations.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Jill, I have one question. Could you go back to that previous slide. The numbers that were circled, those are the -- refer to the amount of goats in the herd or what does that refer to?

MS. REECK: I would have to ask Mr. Porter that question. It's actually his slide.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Porter, go ahead.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. These are estimates of what occurs in these small, fragmented groups of goats. They're our best counts during the last five years or so.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: So these are your estimates of the number of goats in those sub-populations?

MR. PORTER: Yes. I might note that there's not a whole lot of movement between those groups. The viability of those groups of goats that remain isolated is dependant on the billies moving between the groups of nannies and kids. That occurs in October when the season is open, so it makes them quite vulnerable to

hunting pressure. If those billies were taken out, there wouldn't be pregnant females, obviously, in the spring.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. That's enough. I just wanted to know what the circles meant. That's fine. You'll be given a chance. Thank you very much.

MS. REECK: I'd like to move next to the portion of 1(B) between the Bradfield River and LeConte Bay. This area has currently been two goats, one goat by State registration permit, one goat by Federal permit for, I believe, at least the last 10 years. I believe longer than that actually. Within this area there have only been 11 Federal permits issued for that second goat since 1991 and there's actually only been four goats harvested during that period. In fact, there have been no permits issued since 1997. This, to me, suggests that subsistence users are not having a big impact on this population and suggests to me, at least, that it would unnecessarily be restricting subsistence users to have this reduction within this area. We do not have a lot of early survey data, so I was not able to compare just what that population has done historically to now. I believe the current information, the State survey has put it roughly at about 100 animals. Like I say, there have been very few second permits issued for subsistence use within the last 10 to 11 years.

Moving on to the portion that would actually be the remainder of Units 1(A), 1(B), this has also been a two goat harvest limit. Both of these have currently been by State registration permit. From what I was able to tell from the census data, goat survey numbers have fluctuated over the years since about the late 1960s, but appeared to me to be pretty comparable with what they were then. Some of the early data was shown kind of a range between 500 and 700 animals and that's kind of what I've gotten out of the survey data for the last couple years. It goes up and down by individual sub-area within this remainder but overall it seems like a fairly stable population.
Rural users within this area have only accounted for 21 percent of the harvest and they've only accounted for -- about 18 percent of that was female harvest, which one of the other concerns was the number of females being taken out of these areas.

Overall, I believe there's been approximately 30 to 40 second goat permits issued within

this remainder of Units 1(A) and 1(B). The data, to me, looking at just strictly mailing addresses on the hunter harvest report indicated that the majority of those second goat permits within this area were to non-rural users. Therefore, to me, the data suggests that subsistence users are not having a big impact also on this area under a second goat permit.

Therefore, it was Staff's recommendation to agree to close the portion on Cleveland Peninsula. This would be a slight restriction for current subsistence users, but we agreed that the population data indicates there is a conservation concern and that any additional harvest within this area right now could threaten the long-term viability of those sub-populations.

Just for a little bit more information, I believe there's only been one to nine subsistence users that have taken goats out on the second permit on this area. Generally, it's been more one to three. A lot of years zero. So we're not talking a large restriction, but we do feel it's a conservation concern and should be closed.

In light of the fact it didn't really appear from the data that there was a need to restrict subsistence users, we recommended the following modification you'll find in your book on Page 167. It would leave Revillagigedo Island the same as it is now, closed. It would leave the portion north of LeConte Bay as it currently is, one goat by State registration permit. It would close the Cleveland Peninsula south of Yes Bay and Santa Anna Inlet. And then it would leave the remainder of Units 1(A) open for two goats for Federal subsistence users. The first would be under State registration permit, the second by a Federal registration permit. This will be a separate, not aligned with the current State regulations, but I just did not feel the data supported restricting subsistence users for these other areas. I guess, with that, I'll take any questions the Council has.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions from the Council. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jill, I'm just trying to remember. On Revilla Island, were goats planted there originally or are they native?

MS. REECK: I know there was a transplant. I believe it occurred approximately 1983. I'm not positive whether that was a supplemental transplant or a full-fledged initial transplant.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm just wondering if you can attribute the declines on Cleveland Peninsula to anything in particular. Is it predation or is it hunters that are causing the declines? What is your best guess there as to why we've got a problem on Cleveland Peninsula?

MS. REECK: I believe it's a combination of factors. There's actually data under some of the research papers that were done in the early 1980s on Cleveland that talked about the potential threats to viability of that population due to the number of small isolated sub-herds and the inbreeding and, as Mr. Porter was talking about, the movement of the billies having to move between those small sub-populations of females. Predation is definitely one factor that comes into play. Hunting pressure has probably contributed to that. Like I say, a lot of these areas have had a fairly high portion of female harvest some years. So I think it's probably just a whole combination of factors, plus the way this Cleveland population is so spread out and isolated into little sub-populations is finally coming into play.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I'm kind of disappointed to hear that. I've hunted goats on Cleveland Peninsula in area 1(B) and both north and south of LeConte Bay, hunted all those areas. It's been a while. I was a younger guy when I used to go up and do that kind of stuff, but there seemed to be a fair number of goats up there. I'm sorry to hear they're having problems there. How about in the 1(B) districts there, do you have any information as to what the breakdown is between subsistence hunters and non-subsistence hunters?

MS. REECK: Actually, yes. If you will turn to your proposal book on Page 163. Table 2b breaks down the number of rural hunters and number of goats harvested versus the non-rural hunters and goats harvested for that particular area.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. One other question. Could you inform us as to what the regulations are regarding the use of harvested goats. Is all the goat required to be used? There's not a trophy hunt in

other words. I know a lot of the non-subsistence use is not for meat, it's for the horn and the trophy. So what are the regulations there?

MS. REECK: I do believe under Federal subsistence regulations you are required for almost all species, and definitely including goat, to utilize all usable parts.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Thank you. You may want to stay there. We're in State presentation. Hold on one second. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You did state what the reasons for this decline was. Would you restate those?

MS. REECK: You're talking about the Cleveland population?

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MS. REECK: Yes, sir. I believe that it's a combination of a lot of factors. Predominantly the fact that the Cleveland population does occur in a lot of very small, isolated sub-populations where inbreeding is a problem. Plus a lot of the females are bred by billies that move between the different sub-populations. Predation is also a factor and also hunting, I believe, has contributed in some way to the decline of the population. I think it's all these factors coming together. Like I say, in light of the small, isolated sub-populations, it's really having an impact.

MR. DOUVILLE: Is there any hard data that would suggest whether it's wolf predation or actual hunting? I do know that when you have inbreeding on islands on deer, it really doesn't deplete them or anything, but it makes them get smaller. I don't know if goats are similar.

MS. REECK: I believe it can be a factor and I can also believe that there may actually be nannies that are not being bred every year just because of the vulnerability of those billies moving between the populations during hunting season. I guess I'd like to also refer that question to the State, who's probably got a better idea on goat biology than I do.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You state here that Staff supports this proposal and it was a conservation concern that's listed in your justification and then referring also to the data. Was that conservation concern mainly driven by rural hunters taking too many or non-rural hunters?

MS. REECK: For the Cleveland Peninsula, yes, we did support closing it for conservation concern. The State has actually closed the State season this year by Board of Game action for the last two years by special emergency order. The concern by the Staff analysis was additional harvest by rural residents. Like I say, we've had a high some years of nine rural hunters. We figure if that many hunters or even some number less than that continued to take goats from this very isolated, small population right now that it could jeopardize long-term viability.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm referring to Table 2a on Page 162. I believe this talks about the Cleveland Peninsula and, to me, maybe you can correct me there, but it looks like the total rural hunter take or number of hunters was 24 and there were 100 non-rural hunters. Rural hunters took seven, non-rural hunters took 43. This appears to me to be that the conservation concern that you have has been caused by the non-rural hunters and you're asking the rural hunters that utilize the Cleveland Peninsula to also sacrifice. Is that what you're saying?

MS. REECK: I'd like to reiterate that the State season has now been officially closed down through Board of Game action. Yes, it is my biological opinion that any further harvest, regardless whether it's rural hunters, non-rural hunters, could put that population in jeopardy.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any other questions? Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason I ask these questions, if you address one part of the problem, which may be hunters, and there is predation, you still have only taken care of part of the problem. I guess if you close it to hunters, you're still just making more goats for predators.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other questions for Staff? I'd like to ask you to stay there.

Before we go to ADF&G, I have an introduction. Mr. Adams, would you make the introduction, please.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would the real Clarence Summers please stand. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Clarence Summers. Mr. Summers, what is your title?

MR. SUMMERS: Subsistence coordinator.

MR. ADAMS: For who?

MR. SUMMERS: National Park Service.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: State ADF&G.

MR. TITUS: Good morning. For the record, this is Kim Titus speaking. A couple points I'd like to clarify, especially as related to the Cleveland Peninsula goat population. We took this issue before the Board of Game and one of the issues that may be relevant to this body is the fact that also within the State system we have to provide opportunity in a subsistence type context and when that came up when we proposed closing this season and Mr. Porter can answer much of the details about our emergency orders and the history of this, along with some other clarifying points, one of the issues for this board to recognize in our desire to see Cleveland Peninsula closed for conservation reasons is the alternative areas to hunt goats in southeast Alaska and within the Ketchikan area here and up through Petersburg and Wrangell. In general, goat herds are very healthy. There's hundreds of goats here. So, the closure of the Cleveland Peninsula relative to goat hunting does not preclude other State or Federal subsistence users, in our opinion, from alternative locations to go hunt goats. There are many healthy goat herds right behind town here, so there are lots of alternatives. It isn't like this is the only goat herd. This is a goat herd that's in trouble.

So I'd just like to bring that to your attention because that was a standard we also had to deal with relative to the State system and I think, to some extent, it's a similar type of standard that you may have to meet here. Are there alternative places for Federally-qualified users to hunt goats and, in our opinion, yes, there are, nearby, where there are very healthy goat herds.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: One quick comment on that. There is a different State standard and Federal standard on that. Under State standards, if you provide a reasonable opportunity in other areas as well as time limits, that's fine, but under our standard, what we have to talk about, is the continued opportunity for rural users who have been using that Cleveland Peninsula. So there are two different standards. They're similar, but they are different. Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. I could address the question from Mr. Hernandez earlier. He asked two questions. One was about the translocation of goats to Revilla Island. There have been two of those in the recent past. One in 1983 to an area north of Carol Inlet on Revilla and another in 1987 to near Ketchikan here on Deer Mountain, both of which are doing quite well. The one north of Carol Inlet is currently being hunted. There is a season on that one. The one right above town here in Ketchikan is not yet, but we expect to open that on a limited basis in the near future.

I could say, again, the numbers that you had looked at on that map and the circles were our best estimate and those are based on on-ground observations and aerial surveys that we try to do every year. Those, we feel, are fairly accurate, but the Cleveland is very unique. Probably some of the most unique goat habitat in the state. I'm not so familiar with habitat in B.C., but the alpine is very distinct on the Cleveland and, consequently, the scrub timber almost comes up into the alpine, so you don't really have an open alpine habitat and it makes it very difficult to survey, so those numbers are our best extrapolation given our highest counts and on-the-ground best estimate.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Again, I refer you to the table on 162 where the rural hunters averaged 1.4 goats per year. Nobody gets .4 of a goat. But given that that was the number, whether it was one or two, and the chart that you presented earlier had 36 goats by my count as the estimate there, could a rural hunt, this is rural hunters we're talking about, be safely conducted without conservation concerns if they were to take no more than two goats from the estimated populations that you have here?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair. The standard that we try to approach goat populations is around 100

goats as a viable population or sub-population. With the Cleveland Peninsula at the level, given our best estimates, and the current level of harvest, we felt that any harvest of this population could potentially endanger it. That's not to say if it were open under Federal regulation that maybe some of those groups couldn't sustain a small harvest, but you wouldn't be able to direct people in to where on the Cleveland Peninsula that they were hunting necessarily. So they could impact one of those very small, fragile groups of goats.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Council questions for ADF&G Staff. Dr. Titus.

MR. TITUS: Thank you. There was a comment before about meat salvage requirements and essentially they're the same under State and Federal law for all big game. You have to remove all of the meat before you remove the hide and the skull and the horns. So, the State regs and the Federal regs are very similar in that vein for all big game, that the meat must all be removed.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions? Thank you for you presentation. Thank you, Jill, for staying with the. We're now to other agency comments. Any other agency comments? Tribal governments. Are there any tribal representatives presentations on Proposal 7. Fish & Game Advisory Committee comments. Any Fish & Game Advisory Committee? Summary of written public comments.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we have no written public comments on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Public testimony. I do not have any cards on this Proposal 7. Is there any member of the public that would like to testify on Proposal 7? We are at Regional Council deliberations. What is the Council's wishes and please address, again, the page. I believe the page is 167. Go ahead, Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Before we make the motion, I still may have some questions here. It reduces the number of goats from two to one. Is there a provision there for a rural user to get that second goat?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Maybe Jill could come forward. I believe the language on 167 does allow a

Federal registration permit. Could you please clarify that for the second goat? Any other Council questions concerning the possible motion? Mr. Douville, go ahead.

MR. DOUVILLE: A Federal registration is required for the second one, but it is not for the first one? You have to go through the State to get that?

MS. REECK: That is correct. It seems like it's been kind of a long-term history to utilize State registration permits where possible since this would be a departure from existing State regulations. That's why the second goat would be by Federal permit. This adopts the language that is currently in the existing regulations for that portion between LeConte Bay and North Fork of the Bradfield. Just extending it to the other areas to take in the second goat.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead and continue, Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. I move to adopt the proposal on 167.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a motion to adopt the language on Page 167, Proposal 7. Is there a second?

MR. STOKES: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion has been seconded. Before the Council is the adoption of the language as shown on Page 167 for Proposal 7. Council. Maker of the motion, would you like to go first? Is there any discussion on the motion? I want to remind the Council that we still have to go through the rationale for why we're going to make this recommendation. We can't just simply adopt it. We do need to address the four points. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, thank you. I support the Proposal 7. Staff analysis has shown closing the season on the Cleveland would have a minor impact on subsistence hunters and the goat populations may not sustain a yearly harvest of greater than two to four percent of the population. Recovery of the goat population would have a long-term positive effect by providing subsistence use into the future.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other

Council. Mr. Stokes.

MR. STOKES: I support this. In the past, I've hunted most of these areas and I know this will be good for it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council on other rationale. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that it meets the conservation criteria in Title VIII and I believe there is substantial evidence presented by Staff to support this proposal and I believe that is has minimal effect on subsistence users and there are other areas to help support their needs. I don't believe it will have an effect, very little if any, on other users.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Douville. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I see evidence here of the State and the Feds working together and, for that purpose, I think that's sufficient enough for me to support this motion.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any other Council speaking to support or oppose? I believe we have addressed all the points. Is that correct? Any other discussion?

MS. GARZA: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question has been called. The motion before you is to adopt the language on Page 167 on Proposal 7. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing none, the motion is adopted for the language on 167. We have a tabled motion. If someone would like to bring it off the

floor. We did table No. 2. The correct motion would have been postpone it to this time, but it is tabled, so if someone would like to take it off the table, this might be the time.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I would move that we take Proposal 2 off the table.

MR. ADAMS: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any objection? Proposal 2 is before you at this time. What's the page?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. The executive summary for Proposal No. 2 is on Page 59.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Page 59. Council's wishes. Meredith, I would like to ask you to review the minutes, if you could, or the transcript and bring us up to date on exactly where we were on this proposal if you would, please. Oh, you can't do that? Dr. Schroeder can do that.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. Where I think the Council was at on this proposal, we had gone through and Council had heard a briefing on this proposal. This proposal concerns the designated hunter program and whether or not this proposal would extend designated hunter provisions across all ungulate species around the state. For our region, I'd refer you to Page 70 of your Council book. The ungulate hunt sorted by regions and species for the 68 hunts and regulations. Of 66 hunts and regulations, 21 at the present time provide for designated hunters.

In our region, we have a designated hunter program, which has been implemented very successfully for deer in all units. We have no designated hunter program for goats in any units and we have a designated hunter program for moose in Game Management Unit 5. The way the existing designated hunter systems in southeast have come up have been by proposal acted by the Regional Council and then passed by the Federal Subsistence Board.

What the proposal before you would do would establish a standardized way of doing designated hunter permits. It would also, if passed as written, establish designated hunter provisions for moose hunting

in Units 1 and 3 and for goat hunting in Units 1, 4 and 5 in our region. When we gave the presentation yesterday, we noted that there was some concern about whether or not ungulate populations that are small should have designated hunter provisions applied to them. These would mainly be goat and muskox and sheep populations around the state.

There's some discussion that is not reflected in the printed materials that perhaps the blanket designated hunter program around the state should apply to deer, moose and caribou only. The Council wanted to do our goat proposal before we acted on this and, for that reason, you postponed action on this proposal. I think that brings us up to date, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr. Schroeder. By my notes, I have that we adopt -- there was a motion and a second to adopt the language as shown on Page 72. Subsequent to that we tabled the motion, postponed. Is that correct? Okay. So the motion before you at this time is to adopt the language on Page 72 and it's open for discussion.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Mass confusion. Mr. Chairman. While I understand that the intent of this proposal is to make the regulations a little bit more in line with each other, I will speak against the motion. I think there are too many exceptions we would have to make for Southeast; the goats in Unit 1, the moose in the Unik River area. We heard yesterday that that is a small population, a small number of take. And in regards to deer, we heard that in some units where there are smaller seasonal takes, if there is a year where there's only two deer that you can take, then someone may want to have more than two designated permits in order to provide for additional families. So I think we could spend half the day providing exceptions to this proposal and it would be easier just not to support it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other Council. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We addressed this same proposal in our Subsistence Resource Commission meeting last week. One of the concerns that I

brought up at that meeting and I'm going to bring it forth here is that this proposal was submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management. Again, you know, I think that we -- I have a problem with proposals coming from the top down. I really believe, you know, that they should begin at the grass roots and I think we talked about that the other day. It should come through the process. If it's begun with an individual even. If they get an organization of some sort to support it, that proves to me that it has gone through the process of public hearings and comments and so forth. When it reaches our level, we know that it has been adequately researched so that we can make an intelligent decision on it. I remember asking the question in Tazalina last week about this, did it go through public comment and so forth, and I think the answer was, yes, it did. Again, you know, I have this problem with proposals coming from the top down.

What we did with this proposal, and I might open it up for discussion, is that we went ahead and supported it with a modification. That modification was that it would align with State regulations. Other than the fact that I think there was a provision in the State regs where it says something about the elderly, 65 years or older, or 70 percent disabled of some sort. We crossed that out and said must demonstrate a need. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other Council. This is somewhat different than our rationale for why we're making our recommendation on this. It's different than proposals on the effects on the users. Also, I'd remind you that we have almost virtually all of this language in unit-specific regulations right now for Unit 1 through 5. Other Council. Ms. Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chair. You mentioned that there's other regulations in our units down here in Southeast. Is that for deer and moose and all the ungulates? I also have a question if we could change this proposal to just name the deer.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder, could you please answer that.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Wilson. The Regional Council in Southeast did excellent work in establishing designated hunter programs in previous meetings. You'll see on Page 53 of your Board book the

existing regulations for Southeast for deer in 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. There also is a regulation in here that covers moose in Unit 5. So these were specific regulations brought forth through the Regional Council system to address our needs. These regulations would disappear if there was an adoption of statewide regulation. The statewide regulation would then permit our existing designated hunts to continue under a slightly different wording of new regulation.

I did point out to you that there was what I considered to be a minor change in wording in the new regulation that's shown on Page 50. In the second paragraph on Page 50, the wording of our regulation at the present time says the taking does not violate recognized principals of wildlife conservation. The four lines after that are added in in the proposed regulation. I'm not sure that these are substantive changes. I think they're there basically to mirror action that was taken on other proposals, so we want to have proposal consistency.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please go ahead, Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe we're dealing with Proposal 2 here and I think 50 is Proposal 1, so we've got some confusion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza, we are on Proposal 2. Let's just make sure everybody knows we're on Proposal 2 on Page 72 and the question asked by Ms. Wilson was unit-specific regulations that are referred to in that language. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. As Bill alluded to yesterday, I may be dumb as a piece of kelp, but I'm awfully confused here. Mr. Schroeder didn't help it any for a short span there. I understand we're looking at Proposal 2 as a more statewide designated hunter definition and we're trying to look at Page 70 and try to get a feel for Southeast. There's deer, goat, moose, units all hunts, units designated hunting. In the right column where it says units designated hunting on Page 70, is that currently where we have designated hunting opportunities, Mr. Schroeder?

MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Garza, I must be

getting a little dizzy after three days of meetings. I meant to point you to Page 74, which talks about the existing designated hunter provisions. We do have designated hunts for deer in 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. For moose, in Unit 5. We do not have designated hunts for goat at the present time. We also do not have designated hunts for moose in Units 1 and 3.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Wilson, did that address your questions on what the unit specific ones that we'd already adopted were?

MS. WILSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any other discussion on this? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: We're still confused over here. So, I'm back-pedaling here, changing with the tide, so to speak, this dumb piece of kelp here. So, if we supported this proposal as is and there would be designated hunting for moose in all units in Southeast, goats in all units in Southeast and, as it currently stands, deer in all units in Southeast. Is that correct?

MR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Garza, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you like to follow up, Dr. Garza? Other Council. We'll stand down for a few minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The meeting is back to order. I'd like to remind the Council where we are and the public. We are considering the language as shown on Page 72. That's the motion before you. Is there any discussion? Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just one portion of this that I'd like to bring up and discuss and that is the number of permits that the designated hunter is allowed to use and the instances around some of the communities like Sitka where I know the distance to travel during the subsistence hunt is considerable. Two permits doesn't really make sense to these people because they need more than that to be able

to hunt for four and five families at a time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I believe the language would cover that. Not at this time. This would be the default State two harvest permits and then under unit-specific regulations that are in the remainder of the text, Units 1 through 5, could then apply for more than two. Other Council. Are you ready for the question?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. This dumb piece of kelp has shifted with the tide and is now going the other way. So I will speak in favor of this motion. It's my understanding that it will increase the opportunity for subsistence use. I need a clarification on procedure if we support this motion. Once we pass it, would we amend it or would we amend it now for the specific unit criteria?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I will refer that to Dr. Schroeder. I do not believe the unit-specific regulations are on the table at this time, but I will ask for a clarification.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. My reading of this is that this proposal is dealing with the kind of omnibus designated hunter proposal. I'm not sure whether we're set to pass a proposal that would deal with unit-specific regulations at this time. I would like to refer that to Mr. Rivard. Perhaps he could help us a little bit.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Unless there is no objection, I would like to ask Mr. Rivard as well as Mr. Boyd to come forward and answer the questions. This is a proposal from OSM and the Council would like some clarifications. Please proceed.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. So I can understand again, I would like to have the question repeated, please.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I believe the question by Mr. Kitka was whether the unit-specific regulations could be -- did not fit his needs as well as Dr. Garza's comment was unit-specific regulations on the table at this time. In other words, could we specify those unit regulations. Is that correct?

MR. BOYD: If I could take just a moment to look at this and then turn back and look at the appendix, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Now you know why we're going both ways with the tide as well as a piece of kelp. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. I guess the intent is if we support this proposal and we have concerns about either increasing or decreasing an opportunity in a unit in a specific ungulate, can we make the amendment to the motion before or after the motion has passed?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Boyd and Mr. Rivard.

MR. BOYD: Well, I'm struggling with this, Mr. Chair, probably for the same reasons you're struggling with it. I think the intent of the proposal, as Mr. Schroeder said, it was a blanket proposal to try to standardize the approach we're dealing with with designated hunter permits. I don't think we evaluated it within the context of specific situations that this may apply where you may want to modify pieces of this. That was the original intent. So we haven't evaluated the proposal with other situations in mind where you may want to deviate from this blanket approach. However, I think I'd be remiss in saying you shouldn't think about that, nor should you bring those issues up and make those recommendations if you want to do that. I would suggest that you consider those if you have some specific changes in mind.

Saying that, I'm not exactly sure where that's going to end up in the overall process going to the Federal Subsistence Board. That's something we're going to have to think about more specifically with regard to what I don't know right now and that is what you're going to recommend with regard to specific changes and what the implications are with regard to other things, like the conservation issues associated with a particular population that you're dealing with and maybe there are many other factors. But I think it would be appropriate for you to go ahead and make those recommendations at this time and then we can sort that out as we go.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: As I understand

that, you believe it is appropriate at this time to go ahead and offer an amendment to this that addresses unit-specific requirements?

MR. BOYD: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Rivard, do you have anything to add?

MR. RIVARD: Well, if I understand Dr. Garza's question as well, I think procedurally you'd probably want to offer these as amendments or your modified language to the proposal before voting overall.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Could you please stay with us on this. Council. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chair. It is my understanding during testimony that should we approve this proposal as proposed in the case of unit-specific concerns or conservation concerns, there was opportunity for emergency regulation dealing with those so that we may not necessarily have to address those types of concerns in an amended form at this time. Such concerns could be dealt with as they arise by emergency action. Is that correct or am I mistaken?

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. That's really difficult to discuss this in the abstract. It would be more helpful if you had a particular case in hand that you were looking at. I'd say generally you can apply emergency actions or special actions to deal with conservation issues, but it may not be appropriate in every case.

MR. HERNANDEZ: To be specific, we have a conservation concern with the goat population in some areas. If one of those areas were to become a conservation concern and it had a designated hunter option there due to this proposal, would there be the means for Staff to eliminate that designated hunter opportunity for goat hunting as an emergency order or would we have to make an amendment to the proposal now to disqualify goats for designated hunters?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hernandez. My understanding is the designated hunter program is not

really seen as a management tool such that it could be used for raising or lowering harvest in that way. If it is a bona fide subsistence activity, before it would be restricted we'd need to consider restricting other hunts on a particular population. So I'm probably back to what Mr. Boyd was saying, you really have to look at all the factors there. Designated hunters is specifically not a management tool to raise or lower subsistence hunts and probably shouldn't be used that way if other hunting opportunities are being provided to other people.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Did that address your question? Next is Ms. Wilson followed by Dr. Garza.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I tend not to support this proposal unless we can make amendments to it. I keep thinking of the Hydaburg people wanting more than two designated hunter permits in their possession. I think Marty mentioned too that sometimes when you go hunting for deer -- I'm thinking of deer specifically, I think. If you go a long ways and you have to spend all that gas, you need to have more than two permits on you if you're going to hunt for the people. And I wanted to know what the unit-specific regulations in Section .26. I don't know what that is.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder, would you please clarify the unit-specific regulations? I believe they're on Page 74.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll try not to go back to Page 50. Unit-specific regulations are listed there. These would be existing unit-specific regulations. For example, in Unit 9(D), the last sentence there, the designated hunter may hunt for any number of participant recipients but may have no more than four harvest limits in his possession at one time. This existing unit specification would trump the wording of the regulation we're talking about passing. There may be other examples of that nature. I'll leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Schroeder, you've once again confused me. On Page 74, under deer Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8, I see it's two, not four, so are you reading for a different region?

MR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Garza, I was pulling

out an example where the existing unit specification provides something different from what the new regulation provides. That's the case for Unit 9(D) and it may be the case for a number of other units. At the present time, our existing regulations allow two bag limits.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, if I can follow up. I am speaking in favor of the motion. I think I understood the point that Mr. Hernandez was making and the response to that. My initial concern was what about regions where there are conservation concerns. However, even in those events, we still have elderly people and other people who still need whatever it is they need. Even under conservation concerns we still have those subsistence needs.

In terms of the ungulates, thinking of goats, we still have elder people who have to have their goat meat. We have elder weavers who need those goat hides for beautiful ravens tail garments. That's a very important customary and traditional use and those women are not women that can go hiking up these mountains and need designated hunters to do this type of work. So I'm speaking for the motion as it is and the only concern that I had was for Unik River moose. I'm not sure what to do with that, if we would deal with an amendment here or what.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: As advised, I would suggest that we deal with that amendment at this time. Any other Council. Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel that in the Sitka area the subsistence hunting period they set aside from January 1st, I'm not sure how long the period is open, but during this period it is open for subsistence I believe the carrying of permits for a designated hunter should be more than two and only during that period.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it your wish to amend the two harvest limit to a higher number?

MR. KITKA: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second to that amendment to change two harvest limit to -- excuse me. First you need to specify in the motion how many harvest limits you recommend.

MR. KITKA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would recommend four to six designated permits.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Five?

MR. KITKA: Five would be a reasonable number, I believe.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a motion to amend to change the language two harvest limits to read five harvest limits. Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded to amend the motion to substitute five for the word two under the number of harvest limits. Discussion. Mr. Kitka, I would like to ask you to clarify, is the five harvest limits in your amendment meant to include only the deer in Unit 4 or is it meant to include all of the ungulates that are talked about in the main motion?

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To clarify, I was speaking to the special set aside season for subsistence within Unit 4. The distance that we have to travel to get the ungulates in that time is a considerable distance and it doesn't make sense to spend the whole day running back and forth to get more permits when we have to travel a distance of half a day to get to this area of subsistence.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just for clarity, the way I understand this, is that you are desiring to substitute five for two in the unit-specific regulation Unit 4 deer only.

MR. KITKA: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Does that meet with the second? Who seconded? Mike, does that meet with your recollection what you seconded, that it was specific to Unit 4, that it raised the deer harvest limits from two to five? Designated harvest permit. Changing the words from five to two. You seconded it. We clarified that. I want to make sure you're satisfied that that meets your approval to second it.

What we should do is we should look on the screen and make sure that that was the intent of the

maker of the motion as well as the second before we discuss it. Mr. Kitka, is that your amendment?

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: And the second concurs?

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Before the Council at this time is an amendment to the main motion. The amendment to the motion is as shown on the screen, which reads the designated hunter in Unit 4 in the January 1st - 31st portion of the hunting season for deer may hunt for any number of recipients but may have no more than five harvest limits in his or her possession at any one time. This is unit specific under discussion. Council. Ms. Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I just need to know where Unit 4 is and what areas does it include. I don't have my map.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Wilson. Unit 4 is the ABC Islands and I believe Ms. Phillips is showing you this boundary at this time.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is everyone clear what Unit 4 encompasses? Is it available to have a map of that? Make sure the book goes around so we know what Unit 4 is and note this was proposed by a resident of Unit 4 who has that information and maybe he could elaborate on that if you have any further questions. Any other Council? Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman, I think I want to speak against the amendment. It seems to me that the issue stated for the reason for this amendment is to align State and Federal regulations statewide. I guess I feel uncomfortable in making unit-specific amendments at this time. It would have to possibly send this proposal back through the whole process again. Things would not be in align necessarily throughout the state if we make amendments. I think I'd rather vote the original amendment up or down.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just so it's clear in my mind what we are doing, the language that's on Page

72 says the designated hunter may hunt for any number of recipients but may have no more than two harvest limits in his or her possession at any one time, unless otherwise specified in unit-specific regulations in Section 26. This is what I believe we are trying to address, is a unit-specific regulation. The default limit for the state of Alaska would be two harvest limits. We are trying to address the differing requirements that each unit may require. So we are not affecting the default limit, only the unit-specific regulations with this amendment. Further discussion on the amendment. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: I, too, will not support the amendment. I believe that sort of a change should go through the public process with the public being able to testify on the increase of a harvest limit.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other comments. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I seconded this motion to get it on the floor for discussion. I do not support it and I'll tell you why. You now currently can take two harvest limits. I don't see one person going out and collecting six limits in any unit. I don't care which one it is. You simply couldn't handle that many. On the other hand, you could take two or three hunters that can have two harvest limits in their possession. If you have three hunters, you could take six. Let's redo this. Three hunters could have six possession limits, which is quite a number of deer. So I speak against the amendment.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other Council. First we'll go to Mr. Stokes and then to Mr. Kitka.

MR. STOKES: I speak against this amendment. When we go out, there's normally three or four guys going any length from town. If it's anything like Wrangell, we've got a couple three predators there that you could go out and shoot and shoot and shoot, so I'm afraid this might happen.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I didn't make myself clear. It isn't like we can

get the deer back in one day. Most of the time we only have to go hunt for the subsistence things. It might take a day of travel. If you limit us to just two permits a day, maybe we need to make it in possession per day. I don't know how I can make it back from a trip that might take overall two days to do.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Dr. Schroeder, if you would please put the amendment back on the screen. Is Council ready for action? If there's no further discussion, the amendment is before you. You'll be voting on the language as shown on the screen. The amendment is the designated hunter in Unit 4 in the January 1st to 31st portion of the hunting season for deer may hunt for any number of recipients but may have no more than five harvest limits in his or her possession at any one time. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed same sign.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is defeated. We are back to the main motion as shown on Page 72. Council action. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Call for the question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any further discussion? Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield. I'm inclined to vote against this proposal. I think it should be on a case-by-case basis. The moose populations in some areas are difficult to get to. To have two harvests of a moose, it's hard enough to take care of one moose. To put another one on top of it for some areas is not good conservation to me.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Ms. Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I was for the

more than two designated hunter permits in your hands, but I thought maybe we could do that with the process of public input also, but we voted it down. The other thing is I think we need to be unit specific in this and what we do have on hand now is unit specific, so I want to vote this down also because Patricia just mentioned about the moose and then there's a question about the goats. I really think it needs to be unit specific and so forth.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I will be voting in favor of this motion as it is to provide the opportunity to have two designated or yourself and one designated hunt permits in your hand for all of the ungulates in Southeast. I think we are confusing the issue of regulation with the opportunity for subsistence users. If we provide that opportunity and someone has the opportunity to go get two goats and one of those goats will be given to a weaver, I don't think we should deny the weaver that opportunity because that population is low if the hunt will take place anyway. The same with moose. If there are conservation concerns and that will be dealt with with the total number of moose that are taken without denying the opportunity for subsistence uses and for the recipient of those resources by elderly and people who cannot otherwise go out and get those resources. So I speak in favor of the motion as it currently stands.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Stokes followed by Ms. Wilson.

MR. STOKES: I speak in favor of this. My reason is that there are only -- the hunters that go out, they're after their own meat and they're not going to have an extra ticket with them as far as moose is concerned in the Wrangell area. I hunted goat in my younger years and one is sufficient to pack out because you can't leave anything on the mountain. I know we've had to make two or three trips just to get the goat and the head. So I speak against the motion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Mr. Chairman. I change my vote. After listening to Dolly's rationale, okay.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council? I would support this motion and urge you to adopt it for

the same reasons that Dr. Garza talked. It does increase the opportunity to subsistence users. The word ungulates is an improvement over the word deer. It can be addressed. The two harvest limits that are talked about at this time are no different than the unit-specific regulations that we have in effect right now. There are two. I would expect and fully encourage others to bring forward a higher number if they want to in a proposal form. Are you ready for the question?

MS. WILSON: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The language before you is on Page 72. The amendment had failed, so the language that's shown on that page is before you at this time. I'm going to call for the vote on this. All those in favor of Proposal No. 2.

MS. GARZA: Do we have to do the rationale?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't know if we have to or not. This is different than a proposal that has to do with users. Is that correct, Mr. Boyd?

MR. BOYD: You're not changing harvest limits or anything like that, so I would agree that the rationale statement does not have to be as extensive as the four points that you were using previously.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion before you is on Page 72. All in favor of adopting Proposal No. 2 please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed same sign.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion has carried. The language on Page 72, Proposal No. 2 has been adopted. We are now on Proposal 10. Thank you for your help, gentlemen. Proposal No. 10. Staff presentation. This will take us a couple minutes. You have a few minutes to grab a quick cup of coffee. We're doing pretty good, folks, but we want to get these done before noon.

(Off record - Ms. Wilson leaves for rest of session)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Proposal No. 10, opening the Federal wolf hunting season six weeks earlier. We are at Staff presentation.

MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Council. My name is Kurt Aluzas. I'm a wildlife biologist with the U.S. Forest Service out of Wrangell and I'm here to discuss Proposal No. 10, which would look at opening the unit to wolf hunting season six weeks earlier for Federally-qualified subsistence users. This proposal was submitted by the Southeast Regional Advisory Council and the general gist of the intention was to increase the opportunity for rural wolf hunters, allow for wolf hunting during the peak in wolf hunting activities, with the idea that most of these animals are taken by hunting opportunistically while people are out deer hunting and there's not necessarily a concerted effort to go out solely in search of wolves during hunting activities, so it's something that happens during the deer hunting activity. It's an opportunity they're given and overall just allow a greater use of this subsistence resource by hunters.

The proposed Federal regulation for Unit 2 wolf hunting, basically all it's doing is allowing for an earlier opening beginning October 1 instead of November 15. Let me back up real quick and just say that this is starting on Page 183 in your workbook there. The bag limit stays the same, five wolves, and the ending day of March 15 stays the same. This is the Unit 2 map, which you're well familiar with by now.

The wolf conservation issues that we're dealing with here are predominantly, at least for this particular proposal, I'm going to focus on the human-caused aspects. In Southeast Alaska, the vast majority of wolf mortality is human-caused, so the initial concern would be that if you lengthen the season, that would increase the mortality to perhaps unsustainable levels, but the ADF&G database shows that, just on its own, hunting contributes to a much smaller proportion of wolf mortality and trapping and snaring. It's anywhere from 15 to 20 percent of the total mortality or total harvest that comes from hunting, so it's relatively small. It does tend to occur earlier in the season, especially when you look at times past where the season opened earlier and you can look at your regulatory history, Page 189,

and that will show you in some years past it did open much earlier, the wolf hunting.

The State currently has regulations that provide for closure of the hunting and trapping seasons on wolves in Unit 2 when 30 percent of the estimated population has been harvested in order to avoid overharvest. This proposal could certainly recommend adopting that code of Federal regulations regarding wolf hunting as well and that's kind of been an implied part of this proposal from the start. By adopting a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota, what you'd be doing is keeping the harvest level of wolves at or below 30 percent of the estimated population. Thirty percent is the current harvest quota. That would be irrespective of the season during which the wolves are harvested. In that sense, it doesn't really matter when the wolves are harvested, if they're harvested early in the season or later from a conservation perspective if you have that cap.

The State currently has in-season monitoring of wolf pelts in order to monitor whether they're approaching the quota. So, in a sense, there would be no need to tie that in with the State, focusing with the Federal so that a closure could be coordinated. This is just a table that you have on Page 191 that shows the annual legal wolf harvest from hunting and trapping in Unit 2 during the last 10 years and it kind of breaks it down by method of take. Shooting contributes to a smaller proportion than trapping and snaring.

As far as the subsistence issues, the subsistence value of early season wolves is something that's come up in Staff discussions. What I've gotten from discussions with individuals who are trappers and other folks is that while there is some debate about the exact time in which these pelts are prime, there's a general feeling by the people that are using these animals that animals harvested during that -- you know, beginning October 1 would have a value, would have subsistence value, you know, in terms of tanned hides and rugs and so forth. And there's also other uses of wolf parts, such as the claws and teeth and so forth that have been used traditionally in regalia and other ceremonial functions that would not be effected by the primeness of the pelt or the season during which they were taken.

As far as the actual opportunities that this would create, this would likely increase

opportunities for federally qualified subsistence hunters. There would be less competition with the nonrural hunters for a period. There would also be the opportunity basically to take an animal, or take a wolf during the peak in deer hunting activities when most people are out there in the woods. Again, the feeling I got from folks is that subsistence hunters don't necessarily go out on their own to harvest these animals by hunting just for that sole purpose, but it's something that given the opportunity to do that during deer hunting season when they're out there, that they would take that and be able to use that resource.

Something else that would need to be at least discussed is the potential for an impact of an emergency closure on federally qualified subsistence trappers. By having a harvest quota, imply that once that quota is reached, that you would be closing down the trapping season as well, or perhaps through other measures.

The information that I have suggests again, because the hunting portion of the harvest is relatively small, the potential for this to impact, to have a substantial impact on the trapping, you know, user group would be also relatively small. Probably looking at, you know, 15, 20 animals, you know, that might additionally be taken by hunters by opening it up earlier. And the way that I arrived at that number is just by kind of looking at some of the harvest numbers of animals that were taken prior to the current dates. It's a real ballpark number, but you're looking at a small number of animals, so again the idea is that it probably have much of an effect. And I talked to several trappers as well who agreed, and they were not very concerned about any potential effects on their user group there. And some of them are -- would take the opportunity as hunters then, so it kind of works out.

As far as nonrural folks, they've always been a relatively small proportion of the annual take, around seven percent or so, so it's not -- wouldn't be expected to have any early closure brought about by having a harvest quota would not be expected to have any significant effect on them as well.

The effect of the proposal again, staff analysis seemed to indicate it would provide for an increased opportunity for subsistence hunters, kind of evening out the proportion of the use of this resource a

little bit between the different user groups, with minimal impacts to the other user groups such as the trappers.

Again, adopting a 30 percent harvest quota would minimize potential for over-harvest of Unit 2 wolf populations and address conservation concerns.

So the preliminary conclusion by Staff then would be to support the proposal with modification. And this would be -- let's see, 193, the language, that the Forest Supervisor has the authority to close the season, close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G when a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached.

And with that I would gladly take any Council questions.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council questions for Staff. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. This must be my morning to be confused. So the proposed language on Page 193 is different than the language that was submitted on Page 183 in that it addresses the Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G when a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached. So that means that currently there is a 30 -- if 30 percent of the wolves are taken, an estimated, then the season closes?

MR. ALUZAS: That's correct.

MS. GARZA: And does the season close for everyone?

MR. ALUZAS: That would be the intention of this.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Kurt, I wanted to ask a little bit more about this 30 percent harvest cap, and I have some questions dealing with that. I know I have some strong suspicions, I wouldn't say I could say for sure, but strong suspicions that there is a number of wolves that are harvested by hunting that are

never reported. And I was wondering if you would agree with that. And have you accounted for that in your 30 percent harvest cap?

MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hernandez. I would ask that the State also be given the opportunity to answer that, because ultimately they have the best answer for that, but I will do my best. Mr. Person is not going to be back until after lunch, and he's certainly the person that has the best knowledge of that.

To answer your first quest -- or at least one of your questions, the 30 percent harvest quota does not take into account the unreported mortality. The second part of that with respect to reported mortality is, yes, there is pretty good information based on radio telemetry data collected by Mr. Person that suggests that there is wolf harvest that goes unreported. And again he would be the best one to answer that, but perhaps other members of the State might be able to talk about that as well.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. One other question on the 30 percent harvest cap. I'm a fisherman, and I know in, you know, managing things, when you start talking about percentages of the total populations, and it seems like we don't deal with that very often in wildlife, but this particular issue does. It seems like it's usually a good idea to index those harvests to the abundance. And my question is, this is theoretical, but I'm just kind of wondering about your, you know, opinion on it, seeing as how we're dealing with a harvest, a percentage quota. Have you -- can you give me some idea if you've considered if the abundance of the wolves should start to decline rapidly, would you alter the percentage harvest to deal with declines like that, or should the abundance rise unexpected, or, you know, at some point, would you consider raising that 30 percent harvest cap, or is 30 percent good under all circumstances?

MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Hernandez, the 30 percent, or having that harvest quota, that percent of the estimated population, allows the percent of the population harvested to track the level of the population. So if you had 100 animals as your estimated population, you would be able to take, you know, 30 of those. And then if it went all the way up to 200, hypothetically, you take 60, assuming I'm doing my math right in my head, and I think I am. so in that sense,

the quota itself allows for tracking of the population as it grows.

As far as the ability to change the -- what we believe or the State believes is a sustainable percentage, that actually -- there is -- that is something that I guess, and again the State might be able to speak to this better, but the -- when it was first implemented I believe in '97, the harvest quota the State used was 25 percent. And this is based on -- the quota itself is based on the idea of mortality studies from Southeast Alaska, other areas of Alaska, and other areas of the Lower 48 and so forth where deer are the primary prey of wolves, and they're based on what's the maximum amount of mortality that a wolf population can sustain and still be viable, you know, without depressing that population, sending them into a tailspin. And the number that they roughly came up was -- came up with that as far as a pretty good estimate was 35 percent of overall mortality.

And so what they were attempting to do in this case is set a level. The 25 percent originally allowed for 25 percent human-caused mortality plus 10 percent natural mortality. So you still ended up with 35 percent total. And so in that sense they're allowing for some natural mortality.

What happened in the intervening years since that what that they -- you know, Mr. Person came up with some new information through his research that showed that the natural mortality rate was lower so that therefore we could increase the amount of human harvest that was permissible and still keep us below that threshold, total threshold of wolf mortality. So in that sense there is -- as information becomes available, the ability to, you know, and the State has shown this, that they have changed that quota slightly in terms of what they learn about the different factors of mortality and the effects on the population. Does that answer your question in a long-winded way?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, it does. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think you've answered part of my question, but I have one remaining. Is -- so the 30 percent, given the studies that have been done in the Prince of Wales or Southeast

area, does that reflect the general harvest level for wolf populations, or in other areas? Is it conservative compared to other areas, or areas so specific based on the habitat that you can't really compare across regions?

MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza, I'm afraid I don't the answer to that one. I would defer that to the State.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. I have a question for Staff, and this has to do on Page 193 with your preliminary conclusion and the language. I'm looking at the first part there where it says the Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season. If that was a period there, isn't that within their authority right now?

MR. ALUZAS: In terms of such as through emergency type of venues? I would probably defer to other members of Staff, but I believe that is something that's an avenue. Bob?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, I believe the intention of putting this wording in here was to allow the Forest Service, the Forest Supervisor to do this closure and not require going through the Federal Subsistence Board process with emergency order or a special action request. Since this action would be in accord with a long-term plan for managing wolves on Prince of Wales and a successful working relationship with Fish and Game on wolves for this area.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. That's all I've got. Mr. Douville? You're okay? Any other Council? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So one final question on that, this language, when a combined Federal/ State 30 percent harvest quota is reached. What do we do if the State under this new administration increases it? Do we also increase?

MR. ALUZAS: I'm not sure if I understand. If the State increased their harvest quota? Then I would guess that we would consider, you know, certainly it would be -- at this time we're relying on their information, so it would be something, you know, that we could change as well.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza, go

ahead.

MS. GARZA: So I guess I'm thinking specifically through the Board of Game process, if someone submitted a proposal and said we should be able to take 35 or 40, because there's too dang many wolves on Prince of Wales, they're killing all our dear, and the Board of Game, which has certainly changed. They have a different view of wolves than the previous Board. They support it, then there's a 40 percent for the State and a 30 percent for Feds.

MR. ALUZAS: I think the idea, Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza, would be to keep them aligned. Some of that would certainly depend on the rationale for that, what the State's reasoning was. And we've been relying on their information, you know, them having the best wolf research information, so my guess that those would stay aligned.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Rivard, please go ahead.

MR. RIVARD: Yes. Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management. Dr. Garza, there would have to be a separate Federal proposal come forward to align back with the State if that were the case. You couldn't automatically do it, unless this was part of this proposal, which it's not.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. So then can we just change this -- take out 30 percent, when a combined Federal/State -- when the combined Federal/State harvest quota is reached.

MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, Dr. Garza, yes, you could propose that as a modified language to this proposal if you so chose.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Rivard, I have a question. If the language was to end with a period after ADF&G, in other words, not referencing a quota at all, in other words the language would be the Forest Supervisor has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with the ADF&G, would that give the ability to the Forest Service to go upwards with the State as needed? In other words, if the words from when a combined Federal/ State 30 percent harvest

quota is reached, were not in this language, would that still give the tool available to the Forest Supervisor to raise or lower the quota as needed?

MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair, by deleting that language that you said, that would give the Forest Supervisor more flexibility to do just that. Right now, the way it's worded, it would have to reach that 30 percent. So it could even be a lower harvest quota if that were for conservation concerns, maybe they could only harvest 25 percent in any given year. And that might get at Mr. Hernandez's question, is if your population got really low, you might want to only allow 10 percent of that population to be harvested in a given year. So the answer to your question is yes.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you. Other Council questions for staff? Okay. That's all I -- ADF&G, please.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, this is Boyd Porter. I'd like to read in the ADF&G comments with a slight modification.

If the 30 percent cap is maintained, adding six weeks to the start of the wolf hunting season in Unit 2 could redistribute the harvest from trappers to hunters. Trappers currently take about 85 percent of the wolves harvested in Unit 2, and trappers would be impacted if an increase in the wolf harvest by hunters resulted in the 30 percent cap being reached earlier in the year before the trapping season was closed. Wolves taken by trappers later in the season will more often yield pelts suitable for sale or home use, whereas wolves taken in October and early November, and I would like to change that to may not have prime pelts. Wolves harvested under the Federal subsistence regulations should provide additional opportunity for subsistence users of these animals. Subsistence uses of these animals.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: For clarification, that is the language that's shown on Page 185, and I thought I heard you add something after -- in the middle of the paragraph, 30 percent cap being reached earlier in the year, and then you said before. Was there some other language there you wanted to add?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, prior to the close of the trapping season.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you like to continue, or is that it? Dr. Titus.

MR. TITUS: Thank you, and good morning again. One of comments I'd like to just reference is the idea of stripping out of the regulation the harvest cap that's currently in the Federal book, and also is in the State regulation. You know, I guess there's pros and cons to that issue. And in terms of granting flexibility out there. You know, currently I would suggest that the fact that they're the same and it's one of the regulations that's the same in the book has some merits in terms of everyone understanding what sort of the ground rules are. And effectively all the hunters and all the trappers are federally qualified users, so having the regulations be the same is useful.

If in fact the State Board raised that limit, and it took a while for the Federal system to catch up with it, then in fact those Prince of Wales trappers could in fact then effectively trap to that higher limit under the State regulations. And that just continues to add confusion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other comments. Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chair, I'd like to add that the counts of wolves on the island, the estimated population of wolves on -- in Unit 2 is based on work that's been done during the last nine years on about a third of the northern portion of the island, and then extrapolated to the rest of the island, and those are from radio-tagged animals and then visual sightings of pack size.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Prior to questions, a lunch announcement, please.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, Saxman camp ANS/ANB, Camp 15, are ready for us to eat. It's a Chinese luncheon, $7. So whenever we want to break there.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We will recess for lunch. One-hour lunch. We will come back at 1:00 o'clock, and if you gentlemen will join us at the table again, we'll continue. 1:00 p.m.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're going to continue with ADF&G presentations. Okay. Please come to order, the meeting is back in order. We are on Proposal 10. Wade Porter and Dr. Titus are doing the ADF&G presentations. Questions from the council Excuse me, did you have something that you wanted to add first?

MR. TITUS: No, I just spoke with Dave Person. He's on his way here.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Council members. No other questions from Council. Dr. Titus, would you like to have Dave Person come back later and made an additional presentation? Excuse me, Dave, could you please come forward. You are on the hot seat. For clarification, we've gone through the Federal Staff analysis and presentation. We're nearing the end of the State proposal. We were just ready to go, so if you have additional information, I know you don't know what they presented, but go ahead and make a presentation on wolf.

Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: While Dave's catching up there, I just wanted to announce the Alaska Native Sisterhood and Brotherhood, Camp 15 made $320 today, and they're very appreciative of the opportunity to be able to fund raise here. So they give us a big thanks.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If you're ready, go ahead.

MR. PERSON: Thank you, Chairman Littlefield. Actually I guess I really don't have much to say. We don't oppose this proposal at all.

The only concern, or I should say the only comment I would like to make is that we don't oppose it primarily because if the 30 percent cap that we have on the harvest guideline that is in place now works, this shouldn't matter, you know. And as long as we're allowed to do our job in terms of deciding when and if it's necessary to close the season, then it really doesn't matter who takes those wolves, and at what time they take them, because they guideline is in place to prevent any risk of over-harvest.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman. Then, Mr. Person, you may not like the amendments we're about to make, because it is our intent, or at least mine to amend it to take out the 30 percent so that it is just in consultation with ADF&G, realizing we're going for good management, but we have found in fisheries that we put a cap in that matches the State and then the State increases it or decreases it, then we're stuck with an out-of-date cap, and so it would just say that Forest Service has the authority to close Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G.

MR. PERSON: Yeah, Ms. Garza, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The State would support that?

MR. PERSON: Yes, I believe.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Titus.

MR. TITUS: Yes. This is Kim Titus. Yeah, the State really has no feeling about that one way or the other, because we have our harvest guideline. It's in effect and it's in statute, so it is there.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Other questions? Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: I just have a question, like when you feel that the harvest guideline has been met, you're doing do it off the top of your head, that you are using some sort of hard data to verify that that is the case, and then you will make your judgement then, is that correct?

MR. PERSON: Yes. And it's based on both my research work in the center part of the island, and also complimented by some computer modeling.

MR. DOUVILLE: I would be more inclined to think that you would use probably -- well, to use the sealing data, since we are obligated to seal those, so you know the exact number and it's not an arbitrary number, it is a fixed hard number.

MR. PERSON: Yes, Mike, that's true. I mean, we're looking at the harvest data as representing

what's being taken, absolutely. Of the mortality.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other questions for ADF&G? Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman Littlefield. On Page 191, table 2, it shows 19 deer, or I mean 19 wolves. Why is it so low in comparison to the other years?

MR. PERSON: I'm not sure. Let me just see if this list is actually correct. I don't think it's all the data. I think that's an incomplete -- that's not the correct value. 2001 I believe was 74 wolves harvested in that year.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any other in the table besides that year that's inaccurate? Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: The State has recently changed the bag limits and/or seasons for Units 1 through 5. I don't believe they took any action on Unit 2. Can you explain that procedure, and why they did it in other units and why they did not in Unit 2?

MR. PERSON: Okay. First let me mention that the State of Alaska Fish and Game was opposed to those changes. However, the Board of Game did make changes in Units 1, 3, 4 and 5 to eliminate the month of August for hunting wolves, and also the month of April in the trapping seasons. So in other words, they shortened the total seasons.

The rationale for doing that was, first, they felt that the seasons were liberal as they are. There's no bag limit during the trapping season, and secondly they felt that taking wolves in April and taking wolves in August would potentially cause problems with pups. In other words you might be orphaning pups because you're removing the adults, or removing the breeding pair. And that there were concerns dealing with orphaning pups.

MR. DOUVILLE: In the first part you said what was ADF&G's stance on the Board of Game action?

MR. PERSON: We were opposed to that measure, those changes. That's what you're asking?

MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah.

MR. PERSON: Yeah. We didn't think that the seasons needed to be changed. We also basically didn't think that the changes that were made will matter much in terms of the changes in harvest, because most of the harvest doesn't occur in those months anyway.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza. Other Council. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: dave, in the briefing book it says that in 1997 the hunting season was shortened to December 1st through March 31st due to conservation concerns regarding harvest levels, and that was only five years ago, six years ago now maybe. What's changed since then?

MR. PERSON: Really nothing has changed since then. We still have concerns about harvesting wolves on Prince of Wales Island in Unit 2, and concerns about over-harvesting, primarily because of the road access. It's very easy to trap wolves on Prince of Wales and gain access to most of the island, with the exception of the very south end, by the road system. You know, traditionally trapping was mostly done along the beaches. The interiors of islands were relatively more or less a refuge from hunting and trapping. With all the development that occurred on Prince of Wales Island, there was concerns about over-harvesting wolves because of not only the numbers of trappers active, but also the accessibility.

The action taken by the Board of Game at that time was also a reaction largely because of a petition that was filed in 1994 I think by a group, the Bio Diversity Legal Defense Fund or whatever, to list wolves in Southeast Alaska as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. And the Board of Game at that time felt that they could off that listing or at least have an influence on the decision by the Fish and Wildlife Service to list wolves by showing that they were reacting to some of those mortality concerns or harvest concerns in at least Unit 2. And Unit 2 was special simply because of the road system, because of the accessibility. That's why it's not as much of an issue anywhere else in Southeast.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm just trying to make sure we're covering this rationale dealing with

conservation concerns. Are you saying there is or is not a conservation concern?

MR. PERSON: Yeah, I am concerned about over-harvesting wolves in Unit 2. And that's why I personally and professionally support the harvest guideline. I do have concerns, because it is very accessible and there are a fair number of people involved. There's eight or nine trappers on Prince of Wales Island at least that are capable of harvesting between 10 and 15 wolves. At least. And when you're looking at a population that we're estimating between three and 350 wolves, it can be -- the harvest can reach over 100 animals, and that's about a third of the population, and that's getting to maximum sustained yield. 1996, 136 wolves were taken on Prince of Wales Island. We believe that that was beyond maximum sustained yield.

MR. HERNANDEZ: So you're saying that as long as the 30 percent cap is adhered to, there is no conservation concern?

MR. PERSON: That's correct.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. I just have one comment, and that is on your comment on Page 185, the last sentence.

MS. GARZA: 193?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: 185. ADF&G comments. Wolves harvested under the Federal subsistence regulations should provide additional opportunity for subsistence uses of animals. I do not know how that got in the State comments, but I commend you for putting it in there.

Thank you.

If that's it, thank you very much.

Tribal governments. Any tribal governments, would you like to comment on this proposal? No tribal governments? Oh, there's a tribal government. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Dr. Person. I had another

question for you. I'm slow and confused just like a -- yeah, just like what was?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A chunk of kelp.

MS. GARZA: Just like a chunk of -- dumb as a chunk of kelp, that's what I am today.

So when Mike was asking you about the Board of Game looked at changing the wolf regs from -- did you say it was from July to -- no, from August to September, and that was done for Units 1, 3, 4 and 5. So with Unit 2 then, the State regs still have an August 1 opening?

MR. PERSON: No, the State regs on Unit 2, there is no hunting season early hunting season. It's starts with the same date as the trapping season, which is December. There is none. So in other words, the season in Unit 2 is still shorter than the seasons in 1, 3, 4, and 5. Is that still confusing, Dolly?

MS. GARZA: No, but can you give me the rationale for that, from the management perspective?

MR. PERSON: Of why Unit 2 is different? Okay. Remember Unit 2 was changed at a different session of the Board of Game, what, four years ago, 1996. Secondly we don't have, as a Division, we don't have harvest concerns currently about wolf mortality or wolf harvest in those other units. We do with Unit 2, because of the potential at the over-harvest. So we still consider Unit 2 to be different than Units 1, 3, 4 and 5. Well, actually 1, 3, and 5.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chair, so the major concern with Unit 2 is human take?

MR. PERSON: Yes. And my radio collared wolves, 85 percent of the mortality is from human causes.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr. Person for coming back.

Other agency comments. Any other agencies? Fish and game advisory committees. Any comments from fish and game advisory committees? Summary of written public comments.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we've

received one public comment from Paul Joselyn of the Alaska Wildlife Alliance. Mr. Joselyn does not support Proposal 10. He believes that making the season earlier would increase the amount of wanton waste. Wolves aren't eaten. They're not -- he believes that wolves taken at this time are not marketed for their trophy value. He shows that -- he refers to ADF&G records that show that almost all wolves taken by trappers occur in December onward. Except in those circumstances where control programs have been authorized, hunting of wolves at a time of year when the pelt has little or no value only serves -- serves no purpose. It contributes to lost opportunity for those who do not value the resource.

That's the only public comments we've received. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Public testimony. I don't have any white cards. Do you have any white cards?

MR. SCHROEDER: No, I don't.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any member of the public that would like to testify on Proposal 10? Last call, Proposal 10.

Okay. We're at Regional Council deliberations, Proposal 10. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would move that we adopt Proposal 10 as stated on Page 193 of our document, at the bottom of Page 193, Unit 2 wolf hunting. Is it five wolves?

We need a two-second at-ease.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: At east, two seconds. Was there a second?

MR. STOKES: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Go ahead, take a minute.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready? Please proceed.

MS. GARZA: Apparently I'm serving as someone's secretary, so I just had to clarify what I was doing. He just doesn't know how expensive I am.

Mr. Chairman, for Unit 2 wolf, hunting, not trapping, five wolves. The Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G, when a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached, with a season of October 1 to March 15th. That is the proposal. It's my understanding there will be several amendments.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second? Mr. Stokes, did you second?

MR. STOKES: I seconded it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. The language before you is as written on Page 193, Proposal 10. Any discussion or amendments.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend Proposal 10 to strike the words following the ADF&G, comma. So it would read The Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G, period.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second to that amendment?

MR. STOKES: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded. The amendment is to strike when a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached on Page 193. Does everyone understand that? That is the amendment before you at this time. Council.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's the intent of the motion to still stay within the guidelines of working with the State, but with the thought that this 30 percent could go up or down, and this just allows for that variation without sticking the federal management with a particular number. And it's my understanding there's no objection from the State with this.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any other discussion on the amendment, or are you ready for the question?

(No discussion)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Hearing no objection, all those in favor of the amended motion to strike when a combined Federal/State 30 percent harvest quota is reached, and the correct language should be shown on the screen in front of you. All those in favor, please vote aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is carried. You have the main motion before you as amended.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: I move to further amend the proposal striking October and adding September.

MS. GARZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please clarify that for me and make sure that we've got it right on the board.

MR. DOUVILLE: October 1 would change to September 1. March 15 would remain the same.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'm not -- yeah. It's been moved and seconded to change the words October 1st to September 1, and the language should be before you on the screen. Is that language correct, maker of the motion? Is there any discussion on this amendment? Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: I just would like to as Mr. Douville his rationale for the change. I don't have any problem with it, but I think that needs to be brought

out.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The rationale being that Unit 2 guideline harvest is 30 percent, and it really does not matter when the 30 percent is harvested. It doesn't change anything else, only the window of opportunity is moved up a little bit, so.....

MS. GARZA: And September 1 is in.....

MR. DOUVILLE: It's in line with State regulation for State users on the other -- or Units 1 through 5 State regulation.

Also is it appropriate at this time to tell you why -- the wolf hides are better quality earlier than they are later from personal experience, so it's preferred to get them earlier than later.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council on the amendment. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. If, Mike, one of the reasons for your amendment is aligning with State regulation, I see that under current State regulation for Unit 2 the season runs until March 31st, and the season that we are proposing runs through March 15th. Would you see any reason to change the closing date on this proposal to match State regulation?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville?

MR. DOUVILLE: Repeat the last sentence?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I was just wondering if you see any reason to change your amendment so that it aligns with the State regulation for District 2, which is two weeks later than the Federal regulation as of right now.

MR. DOUVILLE: I think it's desirable to align with the first part, but the last part like I said, it's more desirable the beginning of the season than it is later, so to me it's not an issue, but.....

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is it something that would be objectionable, that would align them? Is it something maybe we should add? If it's not bad for us, should we go ahead and do it to make sure that we are aligned?

MR. DOUVILLE: If there's no objection, I have no problem with it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If the maker and the second have no objection, it would be to go from September 1st to March 31st. Is that correct? Is the language correct, the amendment there? No, it's not.

MR. SCHROEDER: Now? Did we have a friendly amendment?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, the maker was allowed to change that, he suggested September 1st in his original, September 1st to March 15th, and the maker and the second approved to change that to March 31st. Counsel. Are you ready for the question?

MS. GARZA: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment -- you will be voting on the amendment, and the amendment is to change the dates from September 1st to March 31st as shown before you. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment is carried. You have the main motion as amended before you. Council? Dr. Garza?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the motion as it has been amended. In terms of conservation, which seems to be one of the issues, the majority of the take is not by hunting, but rather by trapping, and there is a limit on five wolves per person, so I don't see that this will substantially increase the hunt.

In terms of substantial evidence, I think the reports we've received here are very nice. I'm very comfortable with the evidence in front of me.

The effect on subsistence users. The intent of moving up 'til September 1 is to align that September so that it's the same as the other four units in Southeast for wolf hunting, so that it's an improvement.

The effect on other users, I don't see any. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Just the effect on other users, I believe the testimony was seven percent of those were nonrural, and that was minimal.

Are you ready for the question? You have a motion before you that's been amended twice as shown on the board, and the language reads, Dr. Garza?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 10 would read, Unit 2 wolf hunting, five wolves, September 1 through March 31st. The Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal hunting and trapping season in consultation with ADF&G.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Everyone is clear on that? All those in favor of supporting the amended motion, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amended motion has carried. Proposal 10 is adopted with the two amendments as shown on Page 193, and also as shown on the screen.

Proposal 11 is before us. We're going to go to staff comments.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: We've got to get our clump of kelp to be flowing one way here. When I read that there, this whole proposal deals with hunting. Yeah, I'm just going up and down. Deals with hunting, and yet the language in there deals with hunting and trapping. And so we're not dealing with trapping, Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Dr. Garza, the trigger for closing the season is a 30 percent cap no matter how the wolves are taken, so both would close simultaneously, both hunting and trapping in my understanding.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: It is not the intent to change the trapping season in any way. However, the intent of this proposal was to increase the window of opportunity for hunting. So we're not moving the trapping season up. We're not doing anything with the trapping in my opinion. We are only changing the window of opportunity for hunting.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Just a clarification. We've already adopted this motion. Is it the wish of the Council to reconsider? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I guess that's what we're trying to clarify, is whether or not we need to reconsider, whether or not we have inadvertently affected trapping by supporting this language. So maybe we need somebody from the Feds to come up and tell us, or someone from the State or something.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Prior to that, I would suggest that you reconsider and we put it back on the table. We'll be back right where we were before with the language as shown there, except there will be no motion and it's open for discussion.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move -- quit cutting me off. Mr. Chairman, I move to reconsider Proposal 10.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a motion to reconsider made by one who voted in the affirmative. Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any objection to the reconsideration of this motion? The proposed language that was on the board before you back as if nothing had happened, and we are talking about the language that is up here. So discussion. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: My last day here and I finally figured out how to work that. Mr. Chairman, on Page 185 under ADF&G comments, it says here that if the 30 -- season in Unit 2 could redistribute the harvest from trappers to hunters, and I think that's the issue that we have before us. Is that the question we're trying to resolve at this point?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. I would like to call the State ADF&G. Dr. Person, is he still available? Would you please -- Kurt, would you also come forward, please so we can get these discussions. Do we need a lawyer, too? You could start it off, Mr. Titus, and maybe the three of you can give us your interpretation of what we're doing here, and I think you know where the council wants to go on this.

MR. TITUS: This is Kim Titus. I think Mike Douville was correct. You haven't done anything to tinker with the trapping regulations. What you've done was increase the opportunity for hunting regulations.

And Mr. Schroeder was also correct in asserting that the trigger mechanism with regard to the harvest guideline cap is a combination of all the human-caused mortality of wolves. So what you've done from my perspective and our agency's perspective, and I think Mr. Douville's perspective, is quite logical, in which case you haven't done anything to tinker with the trapping regulations, and you've provided significantly more opportunity for the hunters. And fact, just so you understand this, in both the Federal and the State side of things, hunting regulations for wolves and trapping regulations for wolves are sort of two separate issues, and so in some cases they get combined, and in some cases they're separate. But from my agencies perspective what you've done is very logical and it makes sense.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Kurt.

MR. ALUZAS: Mr. Chairman, this is Kurt Aluzas again. This gets into some policy stuff that's not necessarily my forte, but my understanding of the issue would be to agree with what Dr. Titus is saying in

terms of, you know, looking at having increased the opportunity for hunting opportunities without affecting the trapping opportunities, but in the same -- but recognizing that that trigger is a combination of hunting and trapping mortality. And I think the desire to keep that explicit, that that trigger is combined.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Person?

MR. PERSON: For once I have nothing to say.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council questions? Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that when we submitted this proposal, it did not include trapping. It was only a hunting issue at that time, and I don't know how trapping got into it. Do you understand what I'm saying?

And the reason for changing this is because the hunting season opens the same as the trapping season, and the hunters are at a distinct disadvantage. It's just a means just to give hunters more opportunity. It's not changing anything else, just the hunting.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville, you're correct. The original proposal did not include any of the language in bold, starting at the Forest Supervisor. That was added by Staff, and that was to give the Forest Supervisor the authority to close. Would you feel more comfortable if that said Federal hunting and deleted and trapping? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, perhaps if we just had it read the Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal season in consultation with ADF&G.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would that meet with Staff? Comments, please.

MR. ALUZAS: Yes, I think, or at least the Forest Service, I think that would be adequate.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Person, Dr. Person.

MR. PERSON: I'll let Dr. Titus deal with that one.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just through the Chair, Dr. Garza, just to clarify the way this would work. The reason for the wording in there is so that the Federal Subsistence Board would not have to take up emergency closure or special action requests if in the what's been the unlikely event that the all harvest quota is met. Is it your intent that the Forest Supervisor would continue to have -- would have that authority under the regulation that you passed, knowing that the quota combines as Dr. Titus and Kurt Aluzas said, it combines the wolves taken by both trapping and hunting.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Yes, you know, if you look at the regulation on the bottom of 193, it says, Unit 2, wolf hunting, five wolves, date, September 1 to March 30th. The Forest Service has the authority to close the Federal season in consultation with ADF&G. It's that simple. I mean, if it's under wolf hunting then that's what it's under.

My concern with keeping trapping in there is that somewhere down the line we could separate those two so that there's some difference in when you would close one or the other. Don't shake your head at me, because that has happened with fish when we set a cap and then reset a cap to align with State and then the State Board of Fish turned around and increased their cap, and then all of a sudden we're with a lower cap and we have to go through a whole another season, and then we have to remember to change it, and then we have to change it. And so this just leaves it open enough so that the Forest Service knows they have that regulatory authority. But it doesn't force something that may change in the future.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Do any of the doctors wish to respond to the Doctor's question? Dr. Douville. Okay. Apparently there's no problem with taking the words hunting and trapping out as far as you see, so is there any other questions for Staff? Are there any other questions for the Staff? Okay. Thank you, gentlemen.

The motion before you right now is before

you on the board as previously adopted but it is as if we had not voted on it. Are there any amendments?

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have a point of clarification. It's critical to the Council.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any objection? Please come forward. State you name.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Council. Everything up there is really good with the exception that the Forest Supervisor should be scratched and replaced with the RAC. That's how the law reads. The RAC makes these decisions, and then in the past that's how it's worked before. If the Department had a problem that they recognized, they'd contact the RAC, the RAC would concur and then they would issue the announcement regarding particular closures. The Forest Supervisor has never been part of this language in the past.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Thomas, if the language, we understand it, has not been amended yet, but if it was to read the Forest Supervisor, because that's the land manager in the area, has the authority to close the Federal season in consultation with the ADF&G and SERAC, would that be acceptable? Because that has been the process at least in my case in Sitka. I've been called by -- the Federal biologists call me as well as the State, and ask my opinion. Would that language be acceptable?

MR. THOMAS: Well, in your case you were talking about Sitka Tribe business. Sitka Tribe necessarily. And normally I've had -- have been in consultation with Sitka also on occasion where Mr. Suminski would contact me with regard -- if he recognized something, and then in turn would get ahold of the Department. And then that three-way triangle is what worked before.

The thing that is possibly -- I'm getting like the State now, that could lead into a longer list of people in the loop of authorization, and it might not be as positive as it has been. So now I'm speaking in hypothetics.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you. But I don't -- with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how SERAC is going to issue an emergency closure

of the season at this time. That's a function of the land manager. Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Calvin Casipit, Subsistence Staff fisheries biologist, Forest Service.

Maybe I can clarify how we do things on the fisheries side as far as the in-season management, the special actions that are issued to manage fisheries in-season, but in the delegated authority that goes to, in this case, the in-season managers, the various rangers that have the in-season authority, they have the responsibility before they undertake a special action to consult with Fish and Game, the Chairman of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council and affected Council members in the area that have a knowledge of what's going on in their local area. That's the standard for Federal fisheries in-season management. I'm sure that would be similar to what would happen with wildlife.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: If I understand you correctly, perhaps that could be worded, the Forest Supervisor has the authority to close the Federal season, period as being good enough and understanding that the Federal land managers would consult with ADF&G as well as the SERAC members and other affected users.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not sure what's in the Federal regulations as far as the wildlife special actions. I was just saying what is expected of us in fisheries in-season action. You know, you may want to have that in your proposed language to ensure that that carries through into the regulation.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I'd like to let the other Council address questions. Dr. Garza first.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I kind of wish we didn't reconsider this now. In what I remember in being called, and I've been called I think more on the game issues, the Yakutat moose and those were some years back for emergency closure, that this language would actually not -- would allow Forest Service to make that decision as not an emergency closure, but as a closure with ADF&G based on guideline harvest or whatever it's based on. And that that would be done without consultation of SERAC, because we make recommendations on seasons, bag limits, blah-blah-blah, but we're not into in-season management, and I think that's where it would

1 put us, although I think it would be important that we
2 are notified if such activity takes place.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.
5 Mr. Kookesh.
6
7 MR. KOOKESH: It's my understanding from
8 reading the letters that I got from the Federal
9 Subsistence Board that the -- for example, the Admiralty
10 District, the monument manager had in-season regulatory
11 authority which only allows the closure to occur for a
12 period of only 60 days. Am I correct? I'd like to know
13 though.....
14
15 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
16
17 MR. KOOKESH: .....what you're saying and
18 what he's saying, I'd like to know who's right, because
19 it sounds like you're making a decision for us
20 without.....
21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I don't mean to do
23 that at all. Mr. Boyd, would you come forward and please
24 answer Mr. Kookesh's question.
25
26 MR. BOYD: Well, when you're dealing with
27 regulatory language, I think what we're trying to do here
28 in this phrase, the Forest Supervisor has the authority,
29 is for the decision-making authority to delegated from
30 the Board to the Forest Service or to the Forest
31 Supervisor in this case. Currently, without that
32 language, that authority resides only with the Federal
33 Subsistence Board. So this is more of a convenient way
34 of annotating in the regulations that that authority has
35 been delegated for this specific purpose.
36
37 And I think as, you know, Mr. Casipit
38 tried to allude to sort of the parallel of what currently
39 happens under the delegated authority with in-season
40 managers for fisheries. That's more of a blanket or a
41 broader delegation by the Federal Subsistence Board
42 that's made by letter from the Board to the in-season
43 managers. In that case, the guidelines to the in-season
44 managers are that they consult with Alaska Department of
45 Fish and Game, and other affected users, and the Regional
46 Advisory Council representatives for that region.
47
48 The Council itself does not have the
49 authority to make the decision on the regs as you've
50 pointed out, Mr. Littlefield. So in my view it would be

inappropriate to put that kind of language in the regulations. However, consultation is appropriate and can be directed by the Board. Consultation with the Regional Advisory Council.

In a nutshell, I think the language that you have up there is sufficient.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Could you please comment on the 60-day emergency closure?

MR. BOYD: This is where I need to consult my regulations.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I was correct, we did need our lawyer up here.

MR. THOMAS: He's sitting right here.

MR. BOYD: Okay. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please proceed.

MR. BOYD: Excuse me. Let me read from the -- if I may, Mr. Chair, let me read from the Federal regulations under the heading special actions. There are two kinds of special actions. There are emergency situations or emergency actions, and there are temporary actions. Under the emergency situation, which I think this would parallel, because we're dealing with an immediate conservation need, i.e., we've reached the threshold where harvest limits have dictated a need to close. It -- let me just read. The Board may immediately open, close or liberalize or restrict subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on the public lands, or close or restrict nonsubsistence uses if necessary to assure the continued viability of a fish and wildlife population. So that's this situation. Prior to implementing an emergency action, the Board shall consult with the State. The emergency action shall be effective when directed by the Board, may not exceed 60 days, and may not be extended unless it is determined by the Board after a notice and public hearing that such action should be extended.

So what that entails is an immediate action to close for 60 days and then a follow up action which would then require public notice and public hearing, the opportunity to be heard to extend such an action. That's the way our regulations currently read.

I presume that that sort of or possibly confounds the language that we're dealing with up here now.

And it's something I think we're going to have to think about as to how we might implement these emergency closures for longer than 60 days without going to a notice and public hearing. Or we may have to do that. So I'm sitting here thinking out loud how we might proceed given the constraints in our regulations. I'm wondering if it would be more of a temporary reg.

It's possible that we, and this is something that I'm going to have to consult on. I certainly didn't come into this meeting prepared to answer the question, but since it's come up, I think I would like the opportunity to do a bit of research on this obviously before this goes to the Federal Subsistence Board to determine whether or not this can be determined to be a temporary regulation under our regulations, which then the closure would be in place for the duration of the existing season, or the current season, and I just simply don't have the answer for you right now.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions from the Council. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: No question. Just a comment, Mr. Chair. So perhaps it's better if we stick with the original proposal which is just to change the dates, and when we figure out how we can do it properly so that we're properly align, blah-blah-blah, then it can be done later. So, Mr. Chairman, if we're ready for action?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: At the present time you have the language -- thank you. At the present time you have the language on Page 193 as amended twice before you. Go ahead, Dr. Garza.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, if I might interject, you went all the way around the mulberry bush without it touching me, who was the person at the podium. And there was a reason for me being here. You guys are getting too complacent in what you're doing. These regulations wouldn't be on the books if it wasn't for your action. You have the responsibility of representing that action at all times. And I saw that disappearing just now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr.

Thomas. Council action. The motion is before you as amended twice. Are you ready for the question. The motion is before you at this time. When we reconsidered, we brought it back as if it had not been voted on. The motion is before you as you previously passed, which was changing the date from September 1st to March 31st, as well as dropping the last sentence. That is still before you as if it had not been voted on.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the Proposal 10 to strike all of the language below five wolves, September 1 to March 31st.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There is a motion to strike all the bold language added by -- from the Forest Supervisor on. Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You have an amendment to strike the bold language. It's been seconded. Discussion on the amendment. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. The intent of the motion is that it would just change the season and when we can figure out how to align the State and Federal in terms of closures, then we'll gladly look at the language when it's correct.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other discussion on the amendment. Mr. Hernandez?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I just have a question. You know, I'm new here, but prior to this meeting, was the Forest Supervisor language included in regulation? That's been added new since we started discussing this? Okay.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would Staff like to come forward and answer that? I'm not going to give any more comments.

MR. JOHNSON: Dave Johnson, Forest Service. That is correct. The concern was raised that with an in-season management decision that would need to be made based on a harvest cap, that potentially by having to go through the Federal Subsistence Board and the time that it would take, additional wolves would be harvested and would exceed that harvest cap. By putting in the Forest Service language that you see, or the Forest Supervisor language you see currently before you, in consultation with ADF&G, that would take care of it.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. So the proposers of this proposal, they did not include that language. That language was added afterwards, correct?

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct. The proposal was submitted by the Regional Advisory Council, and it was added later for clarification and to minimize a potential over-harvest of wolves.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Hernandez, if you look on Page 183, that was the initial proposal submitted by SERAC, so it just changed the date. And then Patricia who seems to have the only wildlife regulation pamphlet here, we did go over that several times to make sure that that language is not already in there. So it was added by Staff.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amendment. Further discussion on the amendment to strike all the bold language?

(No discussion)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready for the question?

MS. GARZA: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's been called on the amendment, and the amendment is to strike all of the bold language on Page 193 starting at the Forest Supervisor. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The bold lettering has disappeared, and we are at Unit 2, wolf hunting, five wolves, September 1st to March 31st as amended is still before you. Any discussion on the motion.

(No discussion)

MS. GARZA: Call for the question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's been called for, and all those in favor of the motion as amended, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion, amended language is carried. Unit 2, wolf hunting, five wolves, September 1st to March 31st. Five minute break, and we've got lots of stuff to do. We'll come back with Staff on 11.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. PARSLEY: My name is Chuck Parsley, I'm a biologist for the Forest Service on the Hoonah Ranger District.

WP-03-11 is a simple proposal that would allow for the use of motorized land vehicles for trapping activities. This analysis addresses Proposal WP-02-15 from the 2001-2002 proposal cycle concerning trapping regulations in Unit 4.

The Federal Subsistence Board deferred this proposal at the recommendation of the Southeast Regional Advisory Council until a meeting could be arranged with Federal Staff, trappers, and State of Alaska managers.

The Hoonah Indian Association submitted WP-03-11. They request the current regulatory ban on the use of motorized vehicles for the taking of martin, mink and weasel on Chichagof Island to be lifted to allow for the use of any motorized land vehicle.

State regulations do not limit motorized access on Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area. The differing regulations governing the season length and access have caused much confusion for the local trappers. It is legal for a trapper to use motorized vehicles as long as they are trapping under State regulations. But if they declare they are operating under Federal regulations, they can be cited.

The Southeast Regional Advisory Council discussed Proposal WP-02-15 during their spring of 2002 meeting in Juneau. The Council's recommendation was to defer the proposal. At the suggestion of ADF&G, Division of Wildlife Conservation Manager, the Council requested Federal Staff meet with trappers and State of Alaska managers in Hoonah to see if a consensus solution to questions concerning trapping, trapping seasons, and the use of motorized land vehicles for trapping in the Hoonah area could be reached. The Federal Subsistence Board concurred with the Regional Council and deferred this position.

October 11th, 2002, a meeting with the State of Alaska, myself, Dave Belton, HIA, Hoonah Indian Association, and several -- excuse me, and several local trappers along with Dave Johnson was held to discuss issues associated with martin trapping in Hoonah area. A compromise was agreed upon that would maintain the current Federal season, and allow for the use of motorized vehicles in Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use area and the remainder of northeast -- or Chichagof Island.

Jack Witman stated that there currently is not a conservation concern with the martin population on Chichagof Island. ADF&G and Forest Service biologists will monitor the harvest to ensure over-harvest does not occur and conservation of the resources is provided.

Currently Federal regulations are more restrictive than the State regulation regarding access to trapping sites in the northeast part of the unit. Under the existing Federal regulation, a large part of the area is not accessible to subsistence users because of vehicle

restriction. Removing this restriction would allow motorized vehicles to be used, and as a result increased access would be provided. The change would also allow access for hunters -- for trappers, excuse me, under both Federal and State regulations. The subsistence trapper would be able to trap for two and an half months using motorized land vehicles, while trappers operating under the State regulations would be limited to a one-month long season.

With requested change in regulations, subsistence users will be able to use a motorized vehicle for trapping. The existing season, December 1st through February 15 will remain in effect. This action will allow the use of motorized land vehicles for the taking of mink, martin and weasel during the entire season similar to what is currently allowed by State trapping regulations in the State's shorter trapping season.

Preliminary conclusion. Support proposal with modification. The modification is to add the requirement that the Forest Service and ADF&G will provide the in-season management by examining sex and age ratios. And there also is the same wording the Forest Supervisor authority. Any questions.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: In other words, the proposal's been modified to add the bold language we just talked about in similar form?

REPORTER: Your microphone.

MR. PARSLEY: I apologize. You're correct. Also the sex and age ratio requirements were added in there as well.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council, questions. Mr. Rivard, did you have anything? I almost made you a doctor. Did you have anything to add on that?

MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Don Rivard with the Office of Subsistence Management. I was just looking at the proposed regulation on Page 209, and in the bold language. Because the proposed regulation is talking about marten, mink and weasel, I was just asking Chuck here whether it ought to be made very explicit that the bold language is just talking about martens.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any

questions for Federal Staff. ADF&G.

MR. TITUS: Thank you very much. The Department comments are that we support this proposal with some amendments. First of all, we recommend closing the Federal trapping seasons for marten, mink and weasel on December 31st to match the State season, closing roads in old growth reserves and fully implementing all the standards an guidelines for martens as described in the Tongass Land Management Plan.

We do have some reservations about the in-season management scheme described in the proposal, and believe that a shorter two to four-week trapping season would be a more responsible way to manage marten populations on northern Chichagof Island.

Although differences between State and Federal trapping season in the regulations on northern Chichagof Island has caused considerable confusion and should be rectified, liberalizing the season length is not warranted in our opinion. The conservation concern for marten populations which resulted in the season closure in 1989 and 1990 has not gone away. Even without the use of motorized land vehicles on Federal lands, northern Chichagof Island has consistently produced some of the highest harvest levels of martens per land area anywhere in the State of Alaska.

In 1996 an estimated 80 percent of the marten population was trapped even with the road restriction in place at that time. In fact the road closure may have benefitted the harvest of marten by creating unharvested refugia from which martens dispersed to fill areas vacant by those that were trapped. This system may result in higher long-term sustained yields of harvest than having the entire roaded portion open to the island of trapping. It's a question of whether you want a short-term gain or perhaps longer-term fluctuation in those populations.

Closing roads in old growth reserves would help to mitigate the opening of other roads to trapping with motorized vehicles, and, in fact, if that was the case, we would then go to the State Board to do the same thing. And in doing this, we believe this would also meet the requirements in the Tongass Land Management Plan.

Allowing the use of motorized vehicles

for trapping of Martens would very likely have negative effects on the populations and long-term sustained yields. Effects of trapping from roads have been documented on Chichagof Island. In a nine-year long radio collar study of marten at Salt Lake Bay on this area, we have determined that all martens in a watershed were vulnerable to trapping from only one road in the watershed. Streams at valley bottoms were often boundaries of home ranges for resident animals and riparian corridors were travel routes for transient animals. Therefore they would all be vulnerable to trapping from one road. As a result, that's why we suggest if the roads are opened, that you go with a shorter season that aligns with the State season.

The in-season management season described in the proposal will likely be an unreliable tool for management. Sex ratios in the harvest is often cited as a traditional management tool. However, it has never been quantitatively analyzed for reliability. In some unpublished work done by Rod Flynn who's been working with marten there for over 10 years, he has found that based on live trapping study of animals and an extensive sample of trapper carcasses, sex ratios of the harvest provide little usable information on the state of the marten population. In years of high and low harvest when martens were abundant and scarce, males always comprised more than 50 percent of the martens trapped, therefore sex ratios of the harvest would be unlikely to ever detect a decline in the population. The ratio of juveniles to adult females also has questionable power to predict the state of the population. Several adult females collared on Chichagof Island for a four or five-year period in a row never produced young, so it cannot be assumed that each female produces off spring.

Reproduction on Chichagof Island is also strongly related to the abundance of long-tailed voles, the primary prey of martens there. Vole populations fluctuate widely from year to year as does the reproductive success of marten. And our data indicate that in years of low vole abundance, few juvenile martens are produced or survive, which links to the in-season management strategy.

Certainly in-season management has some certain benefits trying to gather that information, but one of the real questions is how really in-season can it be.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Questions for ADF&G. Thank you.

Tribal governments. Any tribes wishing to comment? Other agencies? Fish and game advisory committee? Summary of written public comments.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, we received no written public comments on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Public testimony is now open. I don't have any white cards. Do you have any, Dr. Schroeder. Is there anybody in the audience that would like to testify on this proposal, Proposal 11?

We're at Council deliberation. What's the Council's wish? Ms. Phillips?

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to adopt Proposal 11.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please state the page where the language is?

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, Page 209.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There is a motion to adopt the language on Page 209, Proposal 11. Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have a second. Maker of the motion. Please proceed.

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to amend to insert for marten, the Forest Supervisor may close the Federal trapping season for marten in consultation with the ADF&G when sex and age ratio thresholds are exceeded. And then the parenthesis stuff.

MS. GARZA: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please -- are you getting that?

MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you read that one more time, please, Patty?

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, the Forest Supervisor may close the Federal trapping season for marten in consultation with ADF&G when sex and age ratio thresholds are exceeded. And in parenthesis, total males harvested above 55 percent, and total young of the year:adult females fall below four to one, parenthesis.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded to insert that language on the amendment on Page 209. Discussion on the amendment.

(No discussion)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ready for the question on the amendment? All those in favor of the amended language, which would add make sure that it's marten, for marten on Page 209, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The amended motion is before you. The language is on 209. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, this proposal came before us at previous wildlife sessions because there was as conflict between the State regs and the Federal regs on trapping for marten. And at the request of the SERAC, Forest Service biologists go together with Hoonah -- members of the Hoonah Tribe to try to resolve some of those differences, and the result is the proposal we have before us.

While I do value the information from Dr. Titus, I have a differing opinion on the Marten populations. Number 1, they are not native to Chichagof Island. They've been transplanted there. The marten are highly transitory while voles are not transitory at all. Marten will cross over mountain ranges to access other areas of Chichagof Island in search of food.

I happen to live in a leadtoo area. I'm

1 surrounded by surrounded by leadtoo and wilderness areas.
2 And if you go to the grassy flats in the spring after the
3 snow or when the snow is melting or just after the snow
4 has melted, you will find vole trails all over the flats,
5 all over the beach fringe.
6
7 The marten tend to eat the tiny song
8 birds, or tiny birds like spruce grouse or tiny birds
9 like that, other birds such as that, and I would rather
10 have our native bird population on the increase.
11
12 And staff analysis has shown that there's
13 currently not a conservation concern with marten
14 populations on Chichagof Island.
15
16 The State currently allows the use of
17 motorized vehicles for the taking of marten, mink or
18 weasel.
19
20 To ensure over-harvest does not occur,
21 ADF&G and Forest Service biologists will monitor the
22 harvest and determine sex and age ratios in the harvested
23 populations.
24
25 Thank you.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other
28 rationale for recommendation. Dr. Garza, comments? Are
29 you ready for the question? I don't know if we
30 rationalized this good enough. Are you satisfied with
31 that? We have an amended motion before you. Are you
32 ready to vote on that?
33
34 MS. GARZA: Question.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's
37 been called to vote on the amended motion as shown on
38 Page 209 and as amended to add for marten. Proposal No.
39 11. All those in favor of the adoption of that language,
40 amended language, please signify by saying aye.
41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed,
45 same sign.
46
47 (No opposing votes.)
48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The motion is
50 carried. This is last proposal. Proposal 11 has passed

with the amended language on Page 209.

I don't have any idea where we are. Just give me a second. Yeah, we know that several of the Staff has to make connections, but we also have people who have been asked to testify, public testimony, and we're going to give them that opportunity.

Mr. Willard Jackson, would you please come forward? Public testimony on making Ketchikan rural for the purposes of ANILCA.

MR. JACKSON: My name is Willard Jackson. I'm Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 14 president. I want to welcome you into our ANB hall. As you look around to your back, you're going to see some of our elders. Some of them are still living today, lifetime members. I'm just merely an instrument of what they've taught us over the year of today.

I was given a box here in coming up to give out to the Council members.

Within this Council I have many family members. The Tek-wa-dee. Through Richard Stokes on my grandfather's side from the Stikine. Harvey Kitka who's father is Herman Kitka, who knows our Tek-wa-dee story very well. To Mike Douville, who's also a family member of mine on my mother's side, Esther Shay Takyey.

We brought with us also a resolution that was brought before this floor two days ago. I'm merely just a rookie. I'm just beginning in what I'm doing, and I'll be 56 in May, just a young man in trying to understand our cultures and our traditions and our way of life that is still amongst us today.

We do have a box here we want to hand out. We want to hand out some things to the Council. And it's a gift from Camp 14.

We want to thank you for coming into the Ketchikan area through Bill Thomas. Bill Thomas is my mentor. You noticed I stood way over by the door. I got tired of being hit with his cane. He reminds me of my grandpa. Bill is also related to me on my mother's side.

My mother, Esther Shay, is still with us today. She'll be 87 in April. And she brought me up in my culture and my traditional values. And it's real good

to see they're still alive and well today and being taken care of, not only by our Tlingit brothers and sisters, our Haida and Tsimsian, but also by our others in our manageability of where we're at today and guardship for the future of our grandchildren.

I would like our secretary, Duandare to read the resolution that was signed by myself, Willard Jackson, ANB President, Camp 14, and signed by Merle Hawkins, ANS camp President.

MR. STANLEY: Hello. My name is James Stanley. I'm the secretary for Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 14, Ketchikan. I'd like to read a letter.

To SERAC Committee meeting February 25th, 2003, from ANB/ANS Camp 14 Presidents. Date, February 25th, 2003. Topic, Ketchikan made rural for ANILCA.

Whereas Ketchikan has undergone many changes since ANILCA was passed due to declines in the timber and fisheries industry, and

Whereas many of the residents in the area use the subsistence resource due to the high unemployment and poor economic opportunities, and

Whereas Ketchikan has one of the largest native populations in Southeast, about 4800 individuals in KIC and Saxman IRAs, with a high percentage being underserved and unemployed, and

Whereas these people live a life of cultural and traditional values which are connected to the land and sea, much like that enjoyed by their brethren in surrounding villages and cities,

Now therefore be it resolved that the Alaska Native Brotherhood, Camp 14, Ketchikan, and Alaska Native Sisterhood, Camp 14, Ketchikan do request consideration that Ketchikan be converted from urban status to rural status, and its citizens be allowed to enjoy the same privileges that many of their relatives and family currently enjoy.

Signed Merle Hawkins, Camp 14 President, ANS, signed Willard Jackson, ANB Camp 14 President.

Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Bill Thomas. I'm a member of Camp 15, so we're a rival camp. I didn't bring any bribes for you. And this is Camp 14's style. They're used to bribing, and you guys fall for it.

But the resolution is a good resolution. I think the timing for it is right, and I want to extend my thank you and appreciation to Mr. Boyd yesterday for clarifying the timing of the process, and when the process will start and when notices will go out with regards to considering these types of requests on cycle, when the determinations are out for review and consideration.

The resolution mentions the demographics in pretty general terms, but they're accurate. And from what I heard yesterday from the non-tribal members, that they're interested in not being left out and considered second-class situations. You know, I don't mind being a second-class citizen, but some people have objection to that. But I think the timing is right, and I haven't necessarily done a feel on a community-wide basis with the non-tribal members, but the catalyst of the society, this community is used some access to the abundance of natural resources that are available. And it's not respect to any single culture. We all share one culture in common and that's the culture of survival. And we want to take advantage of what is better for our health. Some of us are born with inherent dietary needs, others have acquired a taste for that, and they also realize the benefits of the health that is derived from being able to harvest these resources.

And so I think it will go further than that. It will also give people that haven't bothered to read Title VIII an opportunity to see the positive intent that Title VIII had for making these resources available. I shouldn't say they made them available. They've been there a long time. The resources. And we've used them longer than Title VIII's been in place. However, I kind of like bureaucrats, you know, so we try to include them in our way of life.

But we're asking for your support in our request to be considered when the time comes to consider our status as being eligible for rural status in the Federal arena for consideration to be beneficiaries of Title VIII.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, all three of you. We certainly have indicated in the past that that has support from some of the Council. I can't speak for all of them. I can speak for myself, and I've publicly said it in previous meetings as well as this one that I fully support Ketchikan's rural status for ANILCA purposes.

I will ask the Council what their wishes on this. They may have questions for you as well as possible action. I don't know. Council. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: You be nice to me now. I've got all the power. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

To the Alaska Native Brotherhood/Sisterhood Camp 14, I very much appreciate your presentation. It's a concern that I have as a Southeast resident, as well as a Ketchikan resident, that we need to encompass all of our residents in Southeast into subsistence rights and opportunities. And in this process of this 10-year review, it's been very ambiguous to me as to how we as a Council provide the input to the Federal Subsistence Board, and the Federal Subsistence Board has not decided when they will be entertaining these ideas and making decisions, and I understand that they have a process they have to work through.

But I think it's very smart of you to just take the lead and say, okay, here's our resolution. This is what we want you to support. Take it forward and go forward however you can, because it does help us to have marching orders, and it's my intent to work with you as much as I can to try and reach this end, because I do believe in what you have said. There are so many Ketchikan residents, 4800 of them which are native, but in addition, the others that are non-native, the many of them that testified yesterday, are living here not because they're making lots of money, not because it's really warm, not because they can drive to another town in 10 minutes. They're living here because they love this lifestyle, because they love this heritage as the one girl yesterday morning spoke to. And so I think that we all have characteristics, which is I guess the word we have to use, and what will go forward to Federal Subsistence Board, we all have characteristics of rural residents in this community. And for that reason, I think we need to support you.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, thank you, and thank you, Camp Number 14, and is it 15, Mr. Thomas? I didn't know there was a Camp 15 in Ketchikan, so, okay, thank you.

But anyhow, I really appreciate, you know, your warm welcome here, and I just wanted to emphasize, you know, the importance of not only supporting this resolution, and I think we're going to probably try to do that from this forum here today, but also to get as much, you know, community support as you possibly can.

I was talking to a gentleman yesterday. I think his first name was Merle, and he was sitting here, and he wanted to know the process and how to go about, you know, getting Ketchikan recognized as a rural status, and I kind of, you know, gave him some guidelines, but I emphasized the importance of community support in this issue, and I think you've got some of these people that will be willing to support you in this effort, so I would deeply encourage that. And I think the forum is there, I think the interest is there. This guy said that he was even going to, you know, get it highly publicized in the Ketchikan paper. So with that, you know, I would just encourage you to go that forum and we wish you good luck.

And for the sake of Mr. Thomas, we are going to miss you. We already do. And you provide us with, even today, you know, with words of wisdom that we all open our ears for. So thank you and that's all I have, Mr. Chairman, for now.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do support your resolution. However, should you be successful, you have to agree not to dig clams where I do, or pick berries or hunt. I'm only joking. But I do support you, and while -- if you did achieve rural status, it's not the answer to everything, but certainly it would be a help for you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think the

vehicle might be that with the Council's wish, if it's the Council's wish to endorse a resolution similar to what we've done in previous years, we can then send that around for the final wording, but we can get it real close that our intent is real clear what the Council would like to do. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, if the Council would allow me to take this proposal up out of the agenda? Hearing no objection, Mr. Chairman, I would Move that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council support the resolution of the Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 14 in their efforts to have Ketchikan included in the rural definition under ANILCA. Further, Mr. Chairman that we develop a resolution of our own, including criteria that will somewhat match the ISER report that we can present to the Federal Subsistence Board.

Thank you.

MR. STOKES: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. As I said, we were going to revise that language so that it meets everyone's intent, but clearly it is in support of the resolution before you from ANB/ANS Camp 14, and also other information that we've got. Is there any question on that at all? Dr. Garza?

MS. GARZA: No, we can vote on it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you. Does everyone understand the motion that's before them? It's two-part. Number 1 is to support the resolution of the ANB/ANS Camp 14 as well as develop our own that will embody the ISER recommendations. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The resolution is hereby adopted. We support you and we appreciate your presentation, and as we've said in the past, we will do what we can, but we encourage you to do what has been

suggested. You need to reach out to your neighbors. You need to have them also step up to the bat with you and I think that would be most effective. Thanks. Great presentation.

MR. THOMAS: Our president has spoken. Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: There's an old song, cha-day, may our voices be heard across our grandfathers' land. Cha-a-day. As I grew up in this community of Ketchikan with my father Milton Jackson and my mother Esther, the values that my father taught me at the table, and the language and the culture that my mother bestowed in me as a Tongass man, Kek-wa-dee. We will forever be grateful for you being here and hearing our voice, that you will carry this across our grandfathers' land. That the values that we look at today are merely just here for just a few more moments, and I've always got to look at who's behind me, and that's my grandchildren, our children's children. And that's a valuable asset that we're going to leave behind them is their way of life off the land and off the sea. Tlingit people are ocean people. We've lived on the sea, we've lived on the land. We've lived with the Tsimsian. We've lived with the Haida. And today we're living with others, and we can conduct ourselves in a good way. To this Council, Mr. Chairman, John Littlefield, and others behind me, the Forest Service and the Fish and Game, thank you for allowing us to be here, and thank you for letting us share how we feel as people. (In Tlingit)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, this proposal has passed, so I just want to move on to administrative stuff. In working on the resolution, I want to ask help from ADF&G Subsistence Division. I had asked Mike to stand guard and knowing that we're running late, I just want to make that sure I can work with you over the next couple days.

The data that ISER provided I think is outdated and doesn't demonstrate the dependence on these resources from the Ketchikan area.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mike, will you work with us on that, and try to get.....

MR. TITUS: (Nods affirmative)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very much.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I request and ask unanimous consent for a suspension of rules for about one minute?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there any objection from the Council? So ordered. Go ahead.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I never really took the time to formally welcome this body to Ketchikan. I'm really proud to see everybody here. And I'm real confident in the Council that I'm looking at. And I also want to express my appreciation for having the opportunity of working with each of you. You've all been very supportive in many, many ways, and as well as Staff, people in the back of me, the Department, OSM have been helpful personally and in a team effort on doing things. I can't have gone 10 years without learning, and learning for the positive, and hope to be a positive contributor in the future.

So your kind gestures of acknowledgement yesterday, I don't have words to express my thank you and appreciation for those. I've never experienced that before. And like I always tell people I work with, I'm generally more interested in results than I am rewards or awards. But you get as old as I am, you take anything any more, so I was really happy to get the awards.

So I want to wish you the best of luck to the Council, to the Federal Subsistence Board, to the Department, and to the people that are involved in this process and are beneficiaries of the process, that this go forward in a positive manner. And I think everybody I've mentioned have grown in this process. Some of it we like personally, some of it we have no control over what we have to do.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very much for your kind words. Do you have anything else? Do you have another presentation?

MR. STANLEY: Yes, we do, Mr. Chair. First of all, we'd like to say thank you for the coho eggs that you brought forward for us to give our elders in the community.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: (In Tlingit)

MR. STANLEY: And that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right now while we have all the Council here, I'd like to take care of something that I believe we can do real shortly is the time and date of one year out meeting. Our next meeting is in Craig, tentatively set for October 6th. We need to come up with a year meeting as well as finalize the Craig meeting, and I'm hoping that won't take too long.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, if Council members would look at the last page of their Council book, it gives us the meeting advisory window for our fall meeting, and we'll note that we're scheduled to meet in Craig at that time. There was also interest on the part of a number of Council members in taking some time prior to this meeting to see some of the areas on Prince of Wales that we've been talking about so intensely for a number of years, particularly to visit some steelhead sites and to see something of deer habit on the island, so we try to do that before the Craig meeting.

The winter 2004 meeting, the meeting window opens on February 18 and closes on February 21. We need a suggestion on where this meeting will tentatively be held, and some dates.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I recommend Scottsdale. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: I would like to suggest Sitka in March. Late March.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Sitka late March. Others? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, just because regions do try to snatch up weeks, if we could specifically say that last week and it will get as close -- it will get us as close to herring eggs as we can get, so it would be the week of March 17th in our window.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The week of March 17th. It's fishing season time. It may not be fish egg time.

MR. SCHROEDER: Does any Council member know if there's any conflict with anything else that

1 might be occurring at that time? I think is that after
2 Gold Metal, presumably?
3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. First Sitka
5 is going once. Any objection or changes from just Sitka.
6 Unit 4. Okay. Well, Unuk 4. And so we'll go with
7 Sitka, and what about the last week, any objection to
8 that? The week of the 17th in Sitka.
9
10 Do you want to revisit the Craig and firm
11 that up?
12
13 MR. SCHROEDER: I think we're set and
14 ready to go for Craig. I'd just like very quickly to see
15 if Council members are interested in a day or two prior
16 to our formal meeting beginning for both a joint purpose
17 of possibly a half day on Staff training and Council
18 training, and some time to do some field observation of
19 deer and steelhead sites.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I think that's a
22 wonderful opportunity. Other Staff, how long would you
23 want -- or other Council, how long do you think that
24 would be appropriate, a half day, a day?
25
26 MS. GARZA: I'd say a week.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: A week in
29 Scottsdale.
30
31 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I think it
32 would be good to see the Staney Creek area, the area that
33 Merle Schultz did talk about where there's the 25-year
34 old growth, and perhaps some of the steelhead creeks
35 where we either do or don't have issues with
36 conservation.
37
38 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd also like the Council
39 to note that the Federal Subsistence Board was discussing
40 where they would be going on their summer field trip, and
41 there was some interest on the part of some Council
42 members in going to Prince of Wales. That won't work out
43 at that time, but on behalf of the Council, with your
44 permission, I'd extend our invitation to any Federal
45 Board members who wish to see something of Prince of
46 Wales at that time. Chair Demientieff in particular was
47 very interested in getting some on-the-ground experience
48 on Prince of Wales.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Apparently I'm the secretary to more than one people on this side. We want to see caves, too.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Anything else on the time and date? I just wanted to make sure if we adjourned and ran out, that we weren't out of business.

Okay. I want to go to the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. We have lots of stuff to take care of. I don't know if we're going to take care of all of it. Fisheries resource requires millions of dollars that we pass through and acknowledge. Very important. We need to have that information at least presented to us. Doug McBride.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two minutes.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Doug, would you please give us a couple minutes? We'll be right back. WE'll take a stand-down for a couple minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're back on the record. Fisheries resource monitoring program.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council. My name is Doug McBride. I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management, and within the Office of Subsistence Management, there's a section in there called the Fishery Information Services, which is where I work. And my job and the job of the Fisheries Information Services is to administer and oversee what's called the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program. And as Mr. Littlefield referenced a couple of minutes ago, that's the investment on the part of the Federal Subsistence Program in assessment work for fisheries management of subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands.

What I'd like to do today is provide just a very, very brief overview of the performance of the programs that we've funded so far to date. And then following my brief overview, there are several investigators that are here that are going to be making while brief presentations, more detailed presentations on the projects that they are doing. And what we're trying

to do was make an opportunity for some of these investigators to report on their performance and on their progress on their projects, and particularly investigators which you're going to see in the future because they either are or will be we're sure submitting future proposals for consideration for funding.

The material I'm going to be covering today is in your book. It's under Tab D, and I'd specifically like to direct you right now to Page 214, which is a graph that we've seen before, but I thought this would be a good place to start. This is just a pictorial of the finances of the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program on a statewide basis. And so what you see across the bottom are the years. The program started in the year 2000. And then each bar is the amount of money that has been invested, or in the case of 2004, is available for investment for this program. And like I say, I don't want to spend a lot of time on this, but as you can see, the program started with about a two and a half million dollar investment in 2000.

Then the following year was our single biggest one, because we had year two of the 2000 program, plus what is envisioned and what has been the annual allocation for this program, which was seven and a quarter million dollars, so in that second bar, that top part, that's the full seven and a quarter million dollars. And you can see that we allow programs up to three years duration, so you can see that playing out over time.

And so as you move across the board, or across the horizontal axis, you come to 2004, and what I want to direct you to is that top part of the graph that says $5 million. In 204 we will have completed most, not all, but most of our prior obligations for funding, and so there will be $5 million available for programs in 2004.

Now, as we discussed at the last meeting in Hoonah, and actually we discussed it a year ago at the meeting, one of the things we've tried to do is go through what we all a strategic planning exercise, to try to help focus our attention on that $5 million and try to sort out the highest priority things that we might want to consider funding. And so if you look at the next page, on Page 215, what you see there are series of bulleted questions. And again I don't want to go through this in a lot of detail, this in fact what we did six

1 months ago in Hoonah, but what we've envisioned for
2 strategic planning is to ask a series of questions and
3 then work with you to provide answers to help direct what
4 we think might, or what we want as priorities for the
5 program. And like I say, you can read those questions.
6 We've gone through these before.
7
8 I would particularly point you to
9 question number 2, which is issues and information need
10 which likely require annual collection of long-term data
11 sets. What we tried to do there was provide some
12 direction for which programs we might want to consider
13 funding longer than three years, and the order in which
14 we'd want to consider those.
15
16 But the final question on there, the
17 results of the projects to date, that is the one piece of
18 this plan that we have not addressed. We really were not
19 in a position to do that back in Hoonah and that's what
20 we told you then was we'd come back with a report of
21 performance and progress at this meeting. So that's what
22 this presentation is about.
23
24 For the overview of progress, if you turn
25 the page to Page 217, you'll see a table, and this is
26 table of everything that we have funded in this program
27 so far. And the first column are just project numbers.
28
29 The next column of data type I think most
30 of you remember that we have two different classes or
31 types of programs. The first monitor, SST, stands for
32 stock status and trends. Those are programs that assess
33 fish populations by and large, so we're trying to assess
34 abundance, assess migration patterns, age composition,
35 those kinds of things. But then the other category of
36 project are what are called HMTK, which stands for
37 harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge.
38 And those are programs that are primarily focused on the
39 subsistence harvest itself. And looking at patterns of
40 harvest, levels of harvest, types of harvest, those kinds
41 of things.
42
43 The next column over is the project
44 title. Those are obviously the titles of the programs
45 that we've funded.
46
47 The next column over, the investigators,
48 those are all the different investigators associated with
49 each project. Most of our projects by design have
50 multiple investigators. One of the things we try to

encourage is collaboration and cooperation between Federal agency, State agency, and what we call NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, which are largely tribal groups or other rural organizations. But those are the investigators associated with each project.

And then on the far right is the money associated with those projects. And you can see how that money plays out over time.

The rest of what's in the report is a project-by-project summary of where we're at with that project. And I'm not going to go through each project, but I'm certainly open to questions on that. But what I will continue to focus on is this table as just a summary of overview.

And as you can see from the table, the top half of the table has to do with sockeye projects. That has clearly been the number 1 priority for the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program in Southeast Alaska. That was very much done by design. That was one of the top issues and information needs identified by the Council, and clearly having a time series of information, particularly for sockeye salmon escapements, is an incredibly important thing to do. And most of the program has been focused on sockeye salmon escapement.

And in terms of performance, I think with really very few exceptions, most of these projects have performed and delivered the information as they were planned out. Most of these projects are focused on trying to estimate the level of escapement, or, your know, spawning population in individual systems. That's done usually with either a weir or what's called a mark/recaptured or a tagging experiment. Those are the two most common methodologies that we have in these projects. Every one of these projects has a collaborative or cooperative nature to it. One of the -- let's say one of the things that we highly stress in this program is what we all capacity building, and as you can see from what looks like alphabet soup there, but what you can see from all the investigators there, is a very wide range of cooperators that includes a lot of rural organizations and tribal groups in Southeast Alaska.

I think the primary applications that this information has been put to, there really are a couple, most of these programs are designed to try to figure out an appropriate escapement goal if you will, or

a management target for those individual systems. A lot of that type of information takes a while to get, but I think there's been a much more immediate application. I would say that a lot of these programs have been very, very useful to both State and Federal managers to configuring subsistence opportunity appropriately with levels of salmon abundance, and I think there have been examples where this information has been used either to restrict opportunity on the part of either subsistence users or other users when there's been a conservation concern or problem, and I think there's been other examples where particularly subsistence opportunity has been liberalized when there's been fish abundance that has been either greater than expected or greater than known since a lot of these systems, there wasn't a lot of escapement information prior to that.

There are a couple of projects that you should think about in terms of, you know, what we might consider for the future that really have not performed as they were originally designed. Probably the most acute example of that is the Virginia Lake project, which is a small system over by Wrangell. And on that one there really were some very unanticipated, unexpected difficulties. To make a long story short, it is not clear whether all the fish that are getting into the mouth of the creek where our assessment program was designed are surviving to make it up to the lake. There's a series of very significant falls between the mouth of the lake and the -- or the mouth of the stream and the lake. And what we've done there is we've worked with the Forest Service, who is the investigator on that project, and in this final year, the third year coming up, we've completely redesigned that program and we're going to do a radio tagging study, and the whole idea is -- I know this sounds like a very, very basic question, but the whole idea of what we're going to do is to estimate what proportion of the fish that make it into the mouth of the stream actually survive to make it up to the lake. And if the answer to that is not very many, then I think the Forest Service outside of this program is probably going to be looking real seriously at doing some stream modification, steep passes, fish passes, those kinds of things. There's already one steep pass in the system, but there may be reason to -- some good reason to think that more are needed for that system.

I think the only other project that I'll mention in terms of not performing as planned from a technical standpoint is what we call the trilogy of

projects in the Kake area, particularly Gut Bay, which has been the subject of regulatory action. They had a very, very difficult time trying to estimate escapement in there. That was designed as a tagging study. It really hasn't worked. And we do want to try to look at that in the future, because from a strategic standpoint there's a really good reason to have some estimate of escapement in there, and I think in the future one of the things that we've got as a proposal right now is to look at a weir in there. But again, just in terms of technical difficulties that's probably the other example where a program hasn't performed as originally designed.

I think in general all the rest really have. It's really been I think a good thing. We're getting I think very credible estimates of escapement in the vast majority of these systems. In addition to that, we're sampling the lake to get limnology, trying to figure out what the carrying capacity of the lake. The escapements are being sampled for age, sex, size composition. In a lot of cases the harvest immediately in front of the stream is also being monitored. We're getting a lot of good information on that, and again you'll be hearing some presentations on that following mine.

On the second category of projects, the harvest monitoring and TEK projects, has been a little bit more of a mixed bag. I think in general again I think we're getting very good information. But these projects are a little more -- they're a little less kind of off the shelf type technology I think, and in some cases we've got projects that I think are performing, but a little behind schedule. And some examples of that would be like projects 104 and 105, and again we've got that investigator here. He'll be talking to you about that. But we're real confident that even though they're behind schedule, we're going to get good information on the subsistence harvest. That's what they're designed to do.

Some of the projects are very much performing as designed. And probably good examples of that -- in fact, some of them have been completed, like 00-015. And then, unfortunately, the folks from Yakutat didn't make it here, but 01-091, that project is proceeding as it was designed.

Really the only one that we're going to basically finish up work that's been completed, but not

complete the third year of work is project 00-045, and on that one we've had a change in investigator. We've just been unsuccessful in finding another investigator. We've been trying to do that for over year now. And so the work that was started in years one and years two, our social scientist on staff, Ms. Polly Wheeler, who you met in Hoonah, she's going to be working with them to finish that work up, and then we're going to take the third year of that funding and try to plow that back into new project starts.

I think with that, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to stop my presentation, ask if there's any questions about just the overview, and then like I say, we've got several presenters, investigators here. There ones that I know of are Mr. Jack Lorrigan with the Sitka Tribe, Bert Lewis from Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and Mike Turek from Alaska Department of Fish and Game. They're all here to give you more detailed presentations about their projects. And their projects really cover a wide gamut, you know, the whole range of what's on this table.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are there any questions at this time from Council for Mr. McBride? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I much appreciate the presentation as well as the summary and the packet. And it does look like things are rolling along quite well. The only question I had was I wasn't sure what TST was under 038, the GIS data base development.

MR. McBRIDE: 038?

MS. GARZA: Yeah.

MR. McBRIDE: Oh, other -- okay.

REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

MR. TUREK: Chair, Dr. Garza, that's a consulting group, a computer consulting group. I think that that may have been changed. They've had some -- they wanted to change the consulting group, and I'm not sure if this is referring to the original group or the new one. One of them was from Fairbanks. I think they've changed that to a group in Juneau. That's really all I can tell you right now. I can find out more from

Brian Davis for you on that.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other questions for Mr. McBride or Mr. Turek? Cal.

MR. CASIPIT: Just a point of clarification on Ms. Garza's question. The lion's share of the money is going to Fish and Game and the Tlingit-Haida Central Council. That small portion of the computer support is only a small subcontract that Tlingit-Haida Central Council is taking care of.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Follow up or other questions? Okay. Are you going to lead us through the presenters?

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Like I say, there are three investigators that are here. There's Mr. Jack Lorrigan with the Sitka Tribe. The Sitka Tribe's been involved in several of the sockeye assessment projects. There's also Mr. Bert Lewis from Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and Alaska Department of Fish and Game has clearly been a major player in sockeye investigators, and then also Mr. Mike Turek who's been the primary investigator for the harvest monitor/TEK projects. So, Mr. Chairman, it would be your pleasure as to the order in which you'd like.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Lorrigan.

MR. LORRIGAN: Can everybody see that? Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Counsel members, my name is Jack Lorrigan. I'm the biologist for the Sitka Tribe. And I'll be reporting on the three projects that the Tribe has been involved with since 2001.

This first project, Salmon Lake, involves three partners, actually four. The Tribe, the Fish and Game, the Forest Service and NSERAA, Northern Southeastern Regional Aquaculture Association. And one of the reasons why this project is so important to four groups is that the sockeye and coho returning -- well, there's two species we're looking at. There's quite a gauntlet of fisheries that the fish have to pass through as they're coming into town.

This is an ocean view of Sitka, and the fish coming back to Sitka would have to go to the right in order to hit Silver Bay. As silvers are coming home, they encounter this and this. So that run is both runs

of coho and sockeye experiencing quite a bit of exploitation. And that's actually a herring fishery, but when they're after the chums pretty heavy in Deep Inlet, that's what it looks like.

This hear the project, the weir goes in the 1st of June and it's pulled the 31st of October, because we're looking at two species, and that's pretty much when the coho run is over in there. This year with the mark/recapture estimations, there's about 1,051 sockeye into the lake. That doesn't make a subsistence opportunity to the tribe. That' fish that are needed in the lake, so as far as we're concerned, those fish and probably a couple thousand more are probably needed to seed the lake sufficiently.

Coho do real well at reseeding the lake at lower numbers, but this year we had about 1100 fish come back to the drainage. And I say drainage, because they don't all pass through the weir. There's a number of fish that stay below the weir and don't even bother coming through, because they either were in that lower stream estuary, or have no need to come in.

NSRAA is doing the tagging, the juvenile tagging, because they're going to start boarding boats here pretty soon to look for coho interception. So this year they've been trying to shoot for about 5,000 smolts per year to get a number of -- for statistical reasons in and to ensure that some of those fish are up and they find them -- hopefully find them or don't find them in the fishery, the chum salmon seining, the commercial chum troll, coho troll and the guided sport fleet.

You can turn it off.

The lake is about, from high water is about a half mile from tidewater, so we use a helicopter to get the gear in there. It's much better than hiking it in. We prebuilt the floating weir. The Tribe has developed or created a floating weir. It's the only one in Southeast other than the one at Yakutat, and we built it in the warehouse, and then we just floated it to the lake.

Local hire at work. Every summer so far I've been able to hire or keep employed at least seven to eight people.

A floating weir is designed to take heavy

flows. there's an angle iron beam imbedded in the stream bed. The panels are attached to the cable, which is attached to the angle iron, which is buried in the stream bed. It allows the weir to fly during different flows. There's -- let's see if we can get a picture of it. If you'd notice down in the lower right-hand corner there's baffles that are laying flat, almost parallel with the panels. Those are adjustable, so during heavy flows you can make kind of like an elevator on an airplane wing. It will bring the weir up and keep the tips out of water, and the water will pass through. Now, if a log were to break loose and come down to the weir, it would just go right over the top of it and on down the stream, and the weir would pop back up. With traditional weirs that wouldn't happen. You'd have to saw the log up or you risk losing your weir.

This is where the trap in the original weir were joined. There's a herring net web that kind of block that passage. It's been modified since this picture. There's a heavy duty seine bunt between the trap and the weir now, and it seems to be working a lot better.

The adults are worked up. They're anesthetized, measured and weighed. The sockeye in Salmon Lake are being floy tagged 100 percent for mark/recapture reasons. Scales are taken for aging. The fish are released. As I stated before, this year probably a little over 1,000 sockeye got into the lake and about 1100 coho.

I mentioned to the council earlier in this meeting that Redoubt sockeye management plan has been enacted by the Board of Fish. During times of low abundance at Redoubt, when Redoubt is not able to sustain a fishery, usually what happens is Redoubt gets closed and Salmon Lake gets closed, the next lake that gets used is Klag Bay which is north of Sitka about 45 miles by boat.

The weir's usually installed mid June and pulled around September 12th, 11th time period. We had 3700 coho coming through, and this year we had 17,000 sockeye go through the weir. Our mark/recapture estimates indicate that the weir is very tight. Almost identical numbers at the weir versus mark/recapture in the stream. This year we had about 4,000 more fish this year than last year, and it was very apparent that there was quite an effort on this stock out front. In fact a

little after the 4th of July they'd only had 39 fish through the weir, and they were getting hammered out front. And based on the evidence at the weir, Fish and Game decided to close Klag Bay until some rain came, and allow those fish to pass upstream.

We estimated via creel census that about 2600 sockeye were harvested, and maybe more. I haven't got the information back from Fish and Game on all the reporting that they're supposed to be doing.

Again these projects couldn't happen without Federal support. We had a little dog and pony show, and we had some of the higher-ups come out and see what we were up to. And I think a good time was had by all.

We weren't able to get three, four years of funding for Klag Bay, so 2003 will be mainly funded from the Sustainable Salmon Funds from the Governor's Office with some match from the Federal side, but it will be a much scaled-back operation out at Klag. We're going to have -- we're just basically going to count fish. There's not going to be any mark/recapture. There's just not the funds to finance a crew out there to do that. And based on this last year's data on the recaptures, we're fairly confident that site the weir is located, that the fish aren't getting through. They have to get by us, so nobody's sneaking by.

Redfish Bay. That's not turning out. This looks better on the screen.

In year 2000 there was an illegal seining event that happened during the year which some manager feel really impacted that run. Those responsible were prosecuted and they lost their boat and some fishing privileges and got some time in jail.

However, Tumakof Lake is one of the most productive lakes on the west coast for its size. It's a mile and a half long by about a half mile wide. It's 100 meter deep in some of the deeper areas, and it's very, very productive. And that's some of the reasons why we go down there.

Because of that event, Sitka Tribe of Alaska applied for monitoring funds for this stream, and we wish to apply again, because the life cycle of the sockeye is roughly four to five to six years, and the

bird year in question of whether or not that seining event impacted it wouldn't happen until 2004 and 2005. So we'll have to figure out some way to get some money to fund a crew down there.

Our interest in Redfish Bay stems back thousands of years. These are ancient weir stakes in the estuary. Archaeologists estimate they're several thousand years old.

Mr. McBride and Terry Suminski and I looked for a weir site back 2001, and we put the weir in for the first time in 2002. The cabin looks right down on the weir.

There's roughly 24,000 sockeye that got by the weir. About 1300 were harvested. And our mark/recapture estimates were within the 10 percent error range. There were so many fish coming through, we were trying to tag 15 percent, but there's just -- we just couldn't keep up with it, so it went down to 14.5 or something like that, or 13.2 we think. And our recapture rate was about 12.4 I think.

These projects have provided a lot of employment for the Tribe. That's just a handful of people that are involved with the process of handling this money and getting the projects done. The partnerships we've developed out of this with Fish and Game and the Forest Service have been very valuable. And I would like to thank them.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is that it then? Are there any questions for Mr. Lorrigan or comments from Council? Very good presentation, Jack. Thank you. Mr. Bert Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity this afternoon to give this short presentation on sockeye salmon subsistence projects. My presentation is going to consist of some repetition with a brief overview of the stock assessment, some of the results that we're seeing, some of the benefits and what I think are some of the future options for us.

I'll start with what have we done. As you know, a series of lakes have been selected according to sockeye stocks that are important subsistence resources on them, and they cover pretty much the whole

range of Southeast Alaska. The sockeye salmon stock assessment projects are designed to assess the health of the sockeye population in each lake. These stock assessments are based around the life cycle of a sockeye salmon, looking at all the different life stages that we can get our hands on pretty much.

An important one is escapement, and we are monitoring that as you've heard through mark/recapture methods or using a weir.

We're also collecting biological data as Jack mentioned a minute ago, including scale sampling to determine the age of returning adult salmon.

One component that's pretty valuable is the hydro-acoustics estimates to look at juvenile sockeye salmon. This figure you see here is basically a fish finder printout. Each of the red dots represent a fish, and this is Kanalku Lake. Kanalku Lake had the lowest fry density of any lake that we looked at in 2001, and you can compare that to Hetta Lake which had the highest density of fry of any lake that we looked at. And these become important as you'll see later.

We're also monitoring the limnology as Doug McBride mentioned, looking at the food resources available in the lakes to support the juvenile sockeye.

Well, what have we learned from this project? I'm not going to go into too much detail. The reports are out. Last year's annual reports are out and you can look at those. But we feel that we've identified some healthy stocks. It's important to keep in mind that this is only two years of sampling, but during that time these six lakes have all had good escapement, and have supported some level of subsistence harvest.

We've also identified potentially depressed stocks. Again, the same caution that it's only two years of data, but Falls Lake and Kanalku have had very little escapement. It's not clear what's going on there. And we feel that more data is required before any management decisions are made.

Kook Lake also had low escapement, and it appeared that there was a debris jam at the outlet. And that's being removed on an annual basis now. It seems to be allowing more fish to escape into the lake. Hopefully we'll see a response in that population.

And we also have some uncertainty with results of the project. Hetta Lake. Prior to the project implementation, people of Hydaburg and the people on the project told us about tremendous escapement the year before, which is supported by the high density of fry that you saw the next year in the lake. But the two years that we've been operating the project, escapement has been pretty low. So low in fact that it's been difficult to operate our mark/ recapture. So it's not clear what's going on there. It could be a cyclic population. Again we need to track it through the entire life cycle of the sockeye salmon to see what's going on.

Hoktaheen Lake has been a little bit difficult. The fish came in, spawned, and died in such rapid succession that it limited our project function.

And Klawock Lake, there's a lot going on at Klawock Lake. Pretty complicated. And it's uncertain what the status of that stock is, but I think we're starting to get a handle on it.

A couple of unsuccessful projects that Doug McBride also mentioned. Hasselborg River. We attempted implement our standard stock assessment on the Hasselborg River, but because of river flows and current issues, not very conducive to the project, so that project was abandoned. I believe Kook Lake was added as this one was dropped.

And then Gut Bay, Doug talked about that. Difficult to work in Gut Bay. And weather made it hard to get in there in a timely manner, so for two years now we've been unable to get a good escapement estimate. As Doug mentioned, in a proposal that's up for review I believe, we're proposing to put a weir in there.

So there's another round of funding available right now, and we've submitted seven proposals which are basically a continuation of these projects, with some modifications, including a reduction in costs hopefully, and a shift of responsibilities to the tribal agencies.

We feel it's important, because sockeye salmon continue to be the most important subsistence fish resource.

Why continue this research? As I said, when you look at the stocks that are potentially healthy

or depressed, we only have two years of data, and you could potentially be sampling during a peak or a low point of it, and two years might be misleading. We feel that five to six years minimum data collection is required to get through an entire generation of sockeye salmon. We also feel that identifying long-term projects based on some of these criteria, including importance to subsistence users, important management issues, supportive tribal government cooperating on the project, and support from Federal and State agencies.

One of the benefits of continuing these sockeye salmon projects is increased responsibilities, participation and funds for the cooperators. As Doug McBride said, capacity building has been an important component of these projects, and we're working with seven tribal governments, employing 20 tribal technicians, providing staff support for the cooperatives, and building infrastructure at all levels of the projects.

Capacity building is really about the people. And over the past two years we've been able to bring people together to work on these projects. A great example is Jack Lorrigan, the fish biologist for the Sitka Tribal Association, and as he continues to learn and work with the State about data analysis, his capacity for the Sitka Tribal Association should really expand I believe.

Another example is Anthony Christianson of the Hydaburg Cooperative Association who has been instrumental in having the Hetta Lake project run smoothly. He hired Robert Sanderson and Lee Charles who have been a great crew. Lee Charles is being trained as the crew leader this year. Tony also recognized the need for additional subsistence monitoring and co-authored a proposal for a stock assessment project on Eek Lake which has been funded, and we're kicking that off this year. So that project, and working with Hydaburg has really been rewarding.

Similarly, John Feller is coming back for his third year as field crew leader of the Wrangell Cooperative Association, and we are giving the staff at their office more and more responsibility in running the projects.

LeRoy Martin of the Angoon project, pictured in the center is crew leader and has field operations oversight.

The Klawock project has also been working with capacity, with increased capacity. Henry Kennedy has been with the project for three years and should be coming on as crew leader in the future. Pete Brown, very enthusiastic, coming back for his second year.

So that kid of is a look at what some of the people involved with the project are, and that's what the capacity building seems to be really all about in my mind. And it's been a pleasure to work with these people.

Looking at the historic relationship of government agencies and some of these communities, it hasn't been that productive, and I think this is an opportunity to start off on a good footing. And there's been a range of acceptance of these projects, but in general they've been well received and meeting with a fair amount of success. A good example of that is Robert Sanderson out of the Hydaburg Cooperative, and his public relation skills are really outstanding. Anyone that knows Bob knows that he's perfectly willing to sit there and tell you the -- about the fish of Prince of Wales Island and what the benefits are of these project. And he's been ar real asset to the program, too. Learned a lot from Bob.

Sockeye subsistence projects allow management flexibility because of adequate information that is provided by these projects. Residents and Alaska Department of Fish and Game have worked together with project information to modify permits and manage fisheries. Some examples of that you've already heard. Klat, Sitkoh and Falls Lakes permits have been changed to trip limit rather than annual limits -- no, I'm sorry, that's backwards, from trip limits to annual limits. If someone takes the effort to go all the way out to Falls Lake and catches a big mess of fish, they're only allowed 20 fish on that day, so this was a reasonable management decision.

Klag Lake as you heard was re-opened after closure when escapement came up.

Another good example is the Angoon internal regulation of Kanalku fishing. When the project presented data of low escapement, and the hydro-acoustic estimate that you saw before, people recognized that Kanalku fishery was suffering, and they voluntarily imposed a moratorium on subsistence harvest at Kanalku,

and hopefully we'll see a response from that. And as we monitor it through time as it rebounds, no reason why we shouldn't start the subsistence harvest back up. They'll be in charge of that.

So in summary, these projects as they continue into the future will determine and monitor the health of these stocks, continued capacity building, assure long-term sustainability of these important subsistence resources, and guide management decisions.

That's all I have for you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Any Council questions for Mr. Lewis. Great job. Thank you. Dr. Garza, did you have.

MS. GARZA: Just one quick one. One quick question, Mr. Chairman. So I guess both to you and Jack, has the information that you've gleaned from these projects been shared with the communities closest to them?

MR. LEWIS: We have tried to have community meetings through ANBs and the corporations, and they have met with I would say limited success, mostly because of very low attendance. And I don't know if it's timing or because potentially of the historic relationship between the community, and we're going to try again with more of a cooperative approach rather than just having a billing of Fish and Game sockeye presentation, and doing something more cooperative this year. But, no, I don't know how well it's reached the community.

MR. LORRIGAN: I haven't presented this to Council yet, but tomorrow I'm giving this basically same talk to, a cabin fever talk there in Sitka. That's one of the reasons why I have to go back today.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: I would like to recommend that you give a presentation in the high schools. This capacity building is just really encouraging to me. It's great to see our native people being involved in this resource monitoring projects, and if we could get our youth interested and steered in career directions, that they can help capacity build, that would be great.

MR. LEWIS: Yeah, last year I did give presentations to grade school and high school in Hydaburg and Klawock, and hope to do that again. It was well received and it was either through a science class or to a general assembly.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Great idea. Any other Council comments. Good job guys. Mr. Mike Turek.

MR. TUREK: Chair and Council members, I'm Mike Turek with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence. I know it's getting late and I'll try to be brief, and I'll just briefly go over the projects, the FIS projects. I'd also like to discuss a couple of Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund projects that we've been funded for, and also the future projects we've applied for from the FIS.

We're presently working on several subsistence fishery projects, partially funded by the Federal Office of Subsistence Management. Nearing completion are our reports on subsistence sockeye salmon fisheries on the Klawock River, Falls Lake, Gut Bay and Bay of Pillars.

And our staff, Brian Davis, recently completed work on a geographical information system data base. This data base includes the 2000 subsistence and personal use harvest permit data, and maps of the Federal and the State customary and traditional use area. I'm hoping I can get Brian to attend the meeting in the fall, in October in Craig. We an demonstrate the work he's been doing on these data bases.

Last winter Staff conducted subsistence salmon harvest surveys in Kake, Angoon, and Hoonah. This work is part of the Division's statewide subsistence harvest assessment projection, also funded by the Federal Office of Subsistence Management. And that's a statewide project. And we're working right now on the report for the yearly subsistence fisheries report that that project produces. And we're doing quite a bit of work on that to rewrite the chapter on Southeast, so we're using the harvest data we collected last year in Kake, Angoon and Hoonah. It will be included in that report. And that report will be done I believe in April we should have that done.

Our projects are also -- capacity building is a large part of that, and the Klawock project

in particular has been real successful in that way. We've have had three people work for us in Klawock on these projects, one of this is Pete Brown who was mentioned working on a Commercial Fishery Division project. So he's getting a very rounded experience. And we hope to have he and/or James Rowen work with us in the future. And that's been very successful. Staff, Nancy Ratner has been working on that project. And the original projected included work on the Sarcar River, and we do have that in the project, but we ended up emphasizing the Klawock River. And that's going to be a very extensive report. Nancy is just finishing up the draft, and I'll start working on the draft this winter to get it prepared to share with the Klawock and Craig tribes.

The Kake project is also a project we've got going with the Organized Village of Kake, and that also has capacity building potential. That went fairly well. The Tribe ended up doing a lot more work on the report than really was in the original plan, but that's fine. They can handle some of the writing. I've gotten all the material from them, and we're starting to work on that draft.

So those are the two projects we've been working on the longest.

Last summer we also started working on a project in the Wrangell areas, which includes the Stikine River. We took a field trip with some Federal Staff and Mr. Richard Stokes up the Stikine River, and he told us about the traditional use of the Stikine River. The Wrangell report funding was broken up over two years, and the majority of that funding will be spent this coming year, and we'll be completing that report. A big part of that report will be the Stikine River, history of the use of the Stikine River. I'll be working on that a little bit this spring, arranging a meeting probably in April with the Wrangell Cooperative Association to try to start getting that off the ground for this coming year.

We'll also be working this summer with Professor Steve Langdon and the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska on an FIS project, the Hoonah and Klawock salmon survey. The Division of Subsistence will be working on preparing a descriptive analysis of Hoonah's historic and contemporary subsistence salmon harvest, and this work will be accomplished using previously published reports,

technical papers, documents, and some key respondent interviews in Hoonah. And we'll also be doing some observation of the contemporary fishery and documenting that.

I can't tell you too much about Professor Langdon or Tlingit/Haida's aspects of that report. Tomorrow afternoon I'll be meeting with Professor Langdon and Tlingit/Haida to prepare for this coming season, and I'm hoping that someone for either Professor Langdon or Tlingit and Haida, a representative from Tlingit and Haida will be able to attend the October meeting to be able to discuss the work that they've been doing in Hoonah and Klawock on this project.

Also a project that -- is the Prince of Wales Island steelhead project, which if funding is approved, we would probably start working on that in August 2003. This is the project that you recommended for us to work on. And partly due to staff limitations, and also due to the situation where we're running into Federal receipt authority, a problem with the State. We have -- there's a certain amount of money, they call it Federal receipt authority, that the Legislature allows us to receive per year, and we've come up against that, so we couldn't get any more money from the Federal Government until after the fiscal year in July, and so that's one of the reasons why we'll be starting on that this fall, and then working into it into next spring.

Let's see. From 1997 to 2000, the Division conducted comprehensive community subsistence harvest surveys in 24 Southeast Alaska communities. All that data, I believe even the 2000 communities, are now available on our community profile data base. And we're working on a -- we've got a draft report we've started working on. Close to finishing the first draft. And we'll be working with -- Jessie Bisard will be working with us on that report for the 24 communities. And that probably will be another year before we have that done. That's quite a bit of work there, and due to not having a research director for over a year, we were really slowed down on that project. But now that Jessie's on board, this is going to be a good opportunity for him to really learn about Southeast Alaska subsistence harvest patterns by working on this report with us. So I think that will work out quite well.

Now I'll talk briefly about the Southeast Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fund Project we're working

presently. And that's a subsistence salmon survey in Haines. Right now we're finishing up doing the survey this year in Haines of subsistence salmon fishers. During the summer we also worked with the Chilkoot and Chilkat tribes documenting the fishery and doing some key respondent interviews. And we're hoping that next year we can do a harvest survey, salmon harvest survey in Klukwan. We've talked with them about developing a proposal to the State Board of Fisheries for a community harvest permit, and also going to some kind of a harvest calendar for the community. And so we're hoping we'll be able to work with them through this summer and then this coming year do a harvest survey in Klukwan.

We've also applied and received funding from the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund starting this next fiscal year and going for four years to develop a Southeast Alaska traditional knowledge data base. Southeast Alaska salmon traditional knowledge data base. And that's going to be a project we'll be working with -- in our office, we're reviewing material we've collected of the years, and putting that into ASAM data base. And since this is Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund, we can only work on material from salmon, with traditional salmon knowledge. But I'm hoping -- what we applied for for the '04 for FIS is a Southeast Alaska traditional fisheries database through the Federal system, and I would like to be able to use that funding to complement the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund project, but also use that money to document and put into a data base information on other fisheries besides salmon. Steelhead, hooligan, and trout that are managed by Federal fisheries.

Let's see, I think that's probably all I have. If you have any questions, I can answer questions, but that's about it.

Also, what I've spoken to you is in the report that I gave to you on the last three pages. That would be Page 7, 8 and 9 I believe it is. So that's in your report that I handed out earlier. But I'm also available for any questions. Jessie and I are getting on the flight this evening, so we'll be here until six anyway. And then if you want to speak to me, you can always give me a call in the office. But that's all I have right now.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Turek. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mike, I guess I just want to put a bug in your ear that possibly with the Southeast Sustainable Salmon money or the additional TEK work, if there's any way that we can work Ketchikan into any of the projects so we start getting some type of data. And if there are opportunities separate from this round of funding that ADF&G could find to find data on Ketchikan, I would be filling to help work with you and support it however I can.

Thank you.

MR. TUREK: Chair, Dolly, yeah, actually I've been speaking with Dr. Priscilla Schulty who was here yesterday with ANB/ANS during the lunch, and she's an anthropology professor who's lived here for over 20 years. And I've talked with her in particular on the Unuk River hooligan. She is very close to both Tongass people and Metlakatla people that have connections with that fishery. And I've talked with her. And that's what I was thinking with the Federal data base would be, a part of that would be working with her, perhaps collecting traditional knowledge and contemporary use of that fishery for that data base. So I was thinking along the same lines, and so I'm glad you brought that up.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other Council questions for Mr. Turk? Thank you, Mike. Good report.

Would the Council like to take a break or finish up this Alsek? I think we can do it real quick.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's keep going.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Let's go. Okay. We're on the Alsek, Rachel Mason and Judy Ramos are not here. Dr. Schroeder.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I did get a call from Judy Ramos. She was very disappointed she could not come down, but there was, of course, a death in her family.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. Okay. Dr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And really this is Judy's report, and I'm not going to give it. I'd like to encourage her to come down in the fall and meet with the Council directly.

But I would just like to let the Council know that some very good work is going on in Yakutat. Judy's been working on subsistence projects and TEK projects now for a number of years, we've been able to put things together. And her current funding is through the FIS system. FIS was able to fund a project dealing with the Alsek River, and funding for that was joined with other TEK funding.

What's going on in Yakutat has been a major subsistence household harvest surveys which were conducted a few years ago. Judy's current project has to do with mapping the traditional subsistence territories of Yakutat Forelands and other areas in the Yakutat Kwans traditional use area. And she's particularly focused on traditional knowledge of salmon management and utilization.

These projects are pretty much on track, and hopefully we'll have Judy and/or Rachel with us in our Craig meeting to give us a full report.

So I just did want the Council to be aware that we have some really fine work going on in Yakutat.

Ms. Ramos may also be involved in some coming FIS projects that are under discussion for funding in this current cycle. I believe she may be doing some work with the Sitka Tribe and with Division of Subsistence. This is under discussion at this time. That's all I've got on that one, so I promised to be quick.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Dr. Schroeder. Any questions for him? That was a very good report. Okay.

Did Doug take off already? Okay. I just wanted to maybe for Mr. Turek, these capacity building as well as cooperation with the Department, seeking other money and stuff like that, TEK projects. I see this thing as complying with what the Council has been asking, and I really think this program's working real well, and I want to compliment all of you, and we'll just make sure

for the record that Doug McBride knows that we appreciate all of your work as well as well as the presenters. And, Cal?

MR. CASIPIT: I just wanted to mention something about the Southeast Sustainable Salmon Fund, the Governor's fund. Apparently the stakeholder panel that was put together originally under the previous administration apparently was disbanded, is that correct? And to me, especially me, I'm unclear as to how decisions on how that money is going to be appropriated in the future, and perhaps the Council may want to make their feelings known about disposition of those funds, and perhaps a letter to the Governor or something like that might be in order.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I think we should add that under habitat. Anyway, I do appreciate that, and I think it's complying with the Council. Are there any other Council who would like to comment on that? We appreciate your work. Mr. Turek.

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, Council, I'd just like to add something. In the short eight years that I've been with the Department, I've seen a real significant change in particularly the Commercial Fisheries Division since the funding for these projects, and these projects were developed. It's really been an education for people in the Commercial Fish Division in Southeast. They're much more aware of subsistence fisheries now, they're much more interested in them. There are staff that are subsistence biologists now. And I really saw that at this last Board of Fisheries meeting in January, how it affected the leadership in Southeast for Commercial Fish Division. Very sensitive to subsistence and really very supportive. I heard things from some of the Staff that I was really happy to hear comments from them during the committee meeting report writing, things that we've been saying for years, and it's really good to hear them saying that now. So I think one of the benefits of it is sort of capacity building for the Department of Fish and Game, because they're being educated about subsistence fisheries and how to work with local people, and how to work in rural Alaska. So I think that the capacity development is going both ways. And I think that it's going into the rural communities, and it's also going into the Department of Fish and Game. So I think it's been very successful, and it's happened very rapidly, so it's been something really nice to see. So I just wanted to add

that today.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very much. Let's take a real quick break. We've got some business. We've got a couple extra guests here. Take five minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're on item 11, agency reports, under Tab E. Dr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Casipit, I'd like you to give the call for proposals.

MR. CASIPIT: All right.

MR. SCHROEDER: And I'd like to hear what it sounds like.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Schroeder, Mr. Chairman. As you all know, the period for proposals for the 2004 cycle for fisheries regulations is now open and will be open until the end of March. There is a proposal form for members who are interested. That is in your book at Tab E, Page 223 and 224.

I'd like to mention as well that although some of our fisheries Staff from the districts have had to leave to go back home, all four of our subsistence fisheries biologists are more than willing to work with Council members and members of the public to formulate proposals for consideration.

I know of several proposals that members are interested in submitting. I know Ms. Garza and Mr. Stokes would like to, number 1, resubmit the Stikine River subsistence fisheries proposals, as well as a companion c&t proposal as well to go with it. Like I said to Mr. Stokes and Ms. Garza, I'd be more than willing to either sit down in person or over the phone to create those proposals to submit. We have some time, so, you know, it will be at their convenience if they so wish me to help them.

Other than that, that's all I had.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. For the

record, it's March 31, is that correct?

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any members of the Council have any questions for Mr. Casipit? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, just a point of order I guess. So this is a report. Is this the time when we would submit Regional Advisory Council proposals, or will we do that later in the agenda?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I believe we'll do that under item 12. I think there might be some that come forward. Any other questions.

Okay. We'll go on to reviewing material for the 2002 annual report. Dr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I did also want to bring to the Council's attention particularly to two seated members of the Council, that the membership application and nomination packet for anyone who wishes to reapply for the Council or to apply de novo is tomorrow, February 28th. So I would encourage anyone who needs to turn in an application to do so ASAP, and if you know someone who is interested and on the edge and who you think would be a good Council member, to encourage them between now and close of business tomorrow to do so.

The next item on the agenda is review of annual report material. What I have for the annual report are a number of concerns that Council members have given me individually, plus concerns that have been raised as Council members went around the room at the beginning of our meeting here. What I'd like to do is put those together and circulate basically your concerns back to you to see if I've got them correct, and this would take place over the next few weeks. So that's what I intend to do with the annual report item.

We could also spend a few moments right at this -- right now if there were other items that a Council member wanted to bring up. Alternatively those could be added to my rough draft that I'd circulate to you. Whatever your wishes might be.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Council members, is there anything that you would like to, for instance, take out of 12 and make sure it's in the annual report,

1 or any other items that you feel that we need to get
2 added? Okay. We'll revise that as we move along.
3
4 Draft regulatory coordination protocol.
5
6 MR. SCHROEDER: We do not have any staff
7 person present here to give a presentation on the
8 protocol. I will alert -- will point you to Page 225 in
9 your Council book, and there are brief write ups of the
10 status of what's been going on with regulatory
11 coordination protocols. And I'd beg your indulgence. I
12 really am not tracking the protocol coordination process.
13 If you have any questions, please bring them up with me,
14 and I'll get answers back to you.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Casipit.
17
18 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 If you flip through that section, you will notice that I
20 am one of the members on that protocol work group, as
21 well as -- well, Bill Thomas was on that work group. I
22 guess OSM will have to make a decision on who's going to
23 replace him. But I encourage the Council to closely
24 review the protocol, which actually starts on Page 228,
25 and give us your thoughts and feedback so that we can
26 take that back for incorporation into the draft.
27
28 I wanted to mention as well that there's
29 some outstanding concerns that are in here I think that
30 we all share. And some of the commitments that are made
31 in this protocol are going to require funding commitments
32 that at this time some of us at least in the Federal
33 program, and some in the State, are unclear how some of
34 that work is going to be funded and taken care of. So
35 those are some of -- like anything, the devil's in the
36 details. And to the extent that we can get input from
37 the Council on the details is at least where I'm coming
38 from, is where I would really like some input from the
39 Council on.
40
41 Thank you.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Council
44 input. First on Page 227, Bill Thomas was listed there,
45 no longer a member. What's the Council's wish? Dr.
46 Garza.
47
48 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, so on that
49 panel, do we have the authority to change that person,
50 and if so should it be the Chairman?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Could you answer that, Cal, please?

MR. CASIPIT: I think OSM would be looking for the Council to suggest a name to replace former Chairman Thomas. I don't think it has to be a chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you.

MR. DOUVILLE: I think it does.

MR. CASIPIT: What's that?

MR. DOUVILLE: I think it does.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion appointing our acting chair to that position.

MR. ADAMS: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved and seconded, but on procedure, is this what you need?

MR. CASIPIT: I think a name has to be suggested to OSM to replace Mr. Thomas.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: so it would be the -- make.....

MR. DOUVILLE: Our acting chair being Mr. Littlefield.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I hear the train coming in. Is there any discussion?

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Casipit, what is the length of duty in this position?

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Kookesh. If you will look at the timeline that's on Page 226, the assignment would wind up -- well, actually probably the last meeting that the representative would have to attend

1 would be somewhere at the end of this calendar year to
2 finalize the protocol.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council
5 members, discussion on the motion.
6
7 (No discussion)
8
9 MS. GARZA: Call for the question.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those in favor
12 of the train to put me in to put replace Bill Thomas,
13 please signify by saying aye.
14
15 IN UNISON: Aye.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed,
18 same sign.
19
20 (No opposing votes.)
21
22 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We will recommend
23 the Chair's name to OSM. The next is Page 228, the draft
24 protocol. Council comments. Mr. Casipit, could you
25 explain if any action is needed at this time, or maybe
26 give us some guidance here, please?
27
28 MR. CASIPIT: No action is needed at this
29 time. I realize this is probably the -- you know, since
30 you got these books a couple weeks ago, this is really
31 the first time that you've had the opportunity to review
32 this, and I realize that you may need more time to
33 review, and it would be perfectly acceptable to make your
34 feelings known either through Bob or me at a later date
35 that can be carried through to OSM and the protocol work
36 group.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Dr. Garza.
39
40 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I agree with
41 Mr. Casipit. I think that this is an incredibly
42 important area, but I have not looked at this document.
43 That's my fault. And perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we could
44 through Mr. Schroeder set an audioconference for the
45 Council specifically to the subject matter in a week or
46 two, so that we do have a response. A week? Two weeks?
47 Two? In two weeks.
48
49 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. This would
50 be an informal discussion, because of FACA requirements,

1 it would just be information. Is that correct?
2
3 MS. GARZA: However we can properly do
4 it.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Because it
7 will not be a noticed meeting and it's not in public, so
8 everything that we do, I think it should take place in a
9 couple weeks like you say, but for the record, it will be
10 informational to pass on informal recommendations.
11
12 MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, could we recess
13 until that audioconference and make it part of this
14 meeting?
15
16 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Kookesh?
17
18 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman, it is listed
19 as part of our agenda, so I'd like to see it continue in
20 that capacity. That way it will carry the -- it has that
21 weight going in.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree it's super
24 important. We've already seen some of that happen at
25 this meeting. Do you have any comments on that, Dr.
26 Schroeder, how that could be accomplished, and whether
27 specifically we could recess to that meeting to be held
28 as soon as possible and conclude the business on draft
29 regulatory coordination protocol by perhaps having an
30 open line to the public or something?
31
32 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think
33 that we could do that. Probably the OSM would accept
34 comments from the Council in any case as long as they
35 were our usual well thought out and reasoned comments.
36 Cal, is the timing on this such that the Council would --
37 that important decisions would not be made before our
38 fall meeting?
39
40 MR. CASIPIT: Yes. Again looking at the
41 timeline, and knowing the press of business for some of
42 the other work group members through the summer, I
43 anticipate that the next draft probably wouldn't be done
44 until after the next meeting. But it would be important
45 for the Council to send the input in as soon as they can
46 so that it is available for us to consider, you know, as
47 we meet.
48
49 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think the
50 Council in its transcript from this meeting has expressed

a number of concerns about exactly this topic. We might see that what we're doing over the next couple of weeks is putting better voice on those concerns that are already there, fleshing them out and getting them in to OSM. And we could act by more formally at our next noticed meeting. The suggestion would be that we turn in our comments and concerns and then bring this up as an item at our Craig meeting.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes, I see October 2003 is when the second draft protocol will be reviewed, so we need to make sure we have comments by the next meeting.

MR. SCHROEDER: We would then, if we're clear with that, we wouldn't hold our meeting open for two weeks. I would schedule an audio conference, and then we'd work from there on getting something in expeditiously to OSM. Whatever we turn in, we could then act on officially when we're at a noticed meeting in the fall.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. That would be within a month say so that we don't get into summertime activities, and we can take care of this here rather quickly in the next weeks or month. And that meets the best schedule of the Council members. Perhaps e-mail if you have it, or whatever will set this up where the most participation date.

Okay. The Forest Service was next, but I believe Ken addressed that. Was there any other members of the Forest service like to comment? Please state your official name for the record.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Council, David R.K. Johnson, subsistence coordinator for the Tongass. I just want to make a couple comments briefly.

First of all, I hadn't made any comments with respect to Chairman Thomas. I believe Mr. Thomas is to the Federal Subsistence Program as to what Mr. Michael Jordan is to basketball. And just as Michael Jordan is going to step down from the Wizards as a player, Mr. Thomas has stepped down from the chairmanship. He will still be involved in the Federal Subsistence Program, and will still continue to be a force that will be important to this body and to the people of Southeast Alaska as well as to the people of the rest of the State.

Lastly, I appreciate having the opportunity to still work with the Council. I appreciate the good work that was done this time, and I look forward to our next meeting.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you very much. Just a second. Any Council comments for the Forest Service?

I have one comment. I was very pleased to note the Forest Service willingness to be involved more actively in the subsistence as it pertains to the Tongass National Forest because of its land. And I encourage that to the Forest Service that they continue that. Thank you very much.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game made a presentation earlier, but, Mr. Turek and others, we will give you the chance.

MR. TUREK: Chair and Council, I'd just like to thank you again for inviting us to your meeting, and I always enjoy seeing you. I'm looking forward to the October meeting on Prince of Wales Island and Craig. And I hope to be there early so if you're having a field trip, if I could come along, that would be great. A number of things, of course, POW deer, but we've got the salmon projects on Prince of Wales Island and the steelhead, so it would be a real opportunity. And I hope I can bring some of my other staff, Nancy Ratner in particular, and Brian Davis down from Anchorage for that meeting. So looking forward to that.

And just good luck and keep up the good work, and if I don't see you before then, I'll see you in October.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any Council comments. Mike, again -- excuse me, Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: I just wanted to thank Mike, you know, for the fine work that he is doing, you know, on behalf of the State and for the people of the State of Alaska. It's always been, you know, working with him. I worked with him on a tribal level on occasion, and I just wanted to show you my appreciation, Mike.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any other council? Mike, again I'd like to thank you. I did not mention specifically the work that you did on the proposals that were supported by the RAC in the Hoonah meetings. Your work as well as that of Terry Suminski and Pete Probasco surely convinced the Board of Fish to act favorably on all of those motions except for the ones that we have the Stikine issue, and I think that's going to be resolved. And thank you very much for your help on those issues.

Any other State wish to make comments.

National Park Service, Mr. Summers.

MR. SUMMERS: Mr. Chairman, Council members, my name is Clarence Summers, National Park Service subsistence coordinator, Anchorage Office.

I just want to thank you for giving me this opportunity for a short comment. I just want to remind you that Bert Adams was recently reappointed as a member on the Wrangell/St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. And for the new members I've got a handout on the role and function of the subsistence resource commission program for the Park Service and I'll share this with you. This appointment is for three years, so Bert's officially on until November of 2005.

On another note, I forwarded a letter to I think Bob Schroeder, which is an example of a letter of notice. We're trying to do this now to notify Commission members when an appointment has occurred, and this will hopefully be signed by Mr. Littlefield and sent to both the Park Service to acknowledge the appointment and to Bert so that Bert has an official record. We're trying to do this with the appointing sources. Currently the Secretary of Interior, the Regional Councils in the appropriate area and the Governor make appointments to Park Service Subsistence Resource Commissions.

That's all I have for now on commission matters. Any questions before I close with a final comment?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Well, it's always good to see you, Clarence. I'm sorry we missed you last week when we had our meeting, but, you know, I serve at the pleasure of this Council here, and I just want to, you know, thank

the Council members for having the confidence in my to serve on the Commission. And like I said, you know, it's always good to see you, so, thanks, Council.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Adams. Did you wish to make any report on the Commission's last meeting.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have my notes in front of me, but, you know, we met last week, and I'll just tell you that many issues came up that we were talking about here today, like the designated hunt, and some of the other issues that, you know, I can't recall right now.

But one of the things that I enjoy about going up there was being able to try to see how different it is in the Interior as it is down here. And in many ways it is. But we all, you know, have the same concerns, and we've seen -- I've seen proposals come through this body during this meeting that were very much the same as the ones we addressed during the Council.

And, you know, the designated hunt thing was in great discussion up there, because of the -- and, you know, we concentrated mostly on the goat and deer, you know, designated hunt. And moose. But there was a big concern up there with the caribou. It seems to me like there was an opening and everyone went out there and they started shooting, you know, and sometimes they shot a lot of females, because it was done during a time when it was very hard to tell the difference between a male and a female. And that was a concern that we, you know, were addressing. And one of the ways that we settled that was because there was a potential for abuse, that we accepted that proposal, but we aligned it with the State regulations, eliminating that part in there where it said something like 70 percent, you know, handicapped, and 65 years and older, and inserted in there instead that they had to demonstrate a need of some sort.

I wish I had my notes in front of me. I didn't expect you to call on me, Mr. Chairman, to give a report. But to me that was about the most important thing that we discussed and, I don't know, Clarence, if you can fill in the blanks for me, I'd sure appreciate it.

Thank you.

MR. SUMMERS: Thank you, Bert. I think there's one other item. The Commission at their last meeting, which was in Tok, modelled a proposal after I think the designated provisions that are currently on the books in Units 1 through 5, and that's currently a proposal that's going to go before the Board sponsored by I believe the Subsistence Resource Commission. And so that's one item of note.

Another one has to do with a recommendation from the Commission to establish an eligibility requirement in resident zone communities. The National Park Service for subsistence eligibility has identified certain communities as subsistence resident zone communities. Yakutat happens to be one. Currently there's no requirement on the length of time that an individual has to reside in that community before becoming eligible. And there's currently a recommendation from the Commission to establish a one-year requirement, which would -- and Bert may want to address that. That seems to be at least the second at least high point of the meeting that I can recall.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Well, thank you, Clarence, for bringing that up. That was a big issue, and, you know, I appreciate that. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Oh, another thing while I do this. I wish I had more time to prepare my notes and everything for that meeting, but this one followed a week afterwards, you know, and I think it's a good idea the RACs meet after our Subsistence Resource Commission meeting. That way I'd have a better opportunity, you know, to give reports, and I promise I'll be better prepared next time.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Well, thank you summarizing that.

Mr. Summers, I would like to thank you for sticking with us. I know it's a late thing and we look -- my wife particularly enjoyed your handouts, and we look forward to those as well as the information. Thank you for your report.

MR. SUMMERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We're on Item 12, other new business. And others may have something else on the list, but I'll go through what I had. Under A I had the designated hunter program. Under B I had State subsistence concerns. Under C I had habitat, the State habitat discussion. Under D I had rural determination. Under E I had Council proposals. Under F the annual report items, specifically needs. And under item G we had the Unit 8 aerial controlled use area as discussion items. Were there any others that I missed under item 12?

With that, we'll go to item A, which is the designated hunter program. Council comments on that. My only comment on that was I think we made it clear that we were supporting these things to come from the bottom up. I think that was pretty much a reaction, that we wanted unit specific designated hunter programs, specifically then number of two, four, six, eight or whatever it might be.

And is there anybody else that can add something to that? This should be an item that's probably included in the annual report. Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this is one of the items that should be taken back to the communities so that they can talk about it and bring it back again.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's right. Any community that wanted something different would be expected to submit a proposal and bring that before the Council at its next wildlife or fisheries, either one, because there is a designated -- a similar thing in fisheries. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was one thing -- well, I'll just make a comment here. I do appreciate the designated hunter. It is really a fine thing, and it works for us, as a person that uses the system.

Yesterday or the day before I made a comment about the form that was used and the Forest Services inability to fill out the form, which is really uncalled for, because that person was not trained in doing that. So I wasn't really bashing the Forest Service, but what I did appreciate was a simpler form.

I do have one concern. If we're able to use a designated hunter system for say goat, and it was brought to my attention that the ADF&G is the person you go to, or the people you go to for that first permit or registration, I know that they do not have a designated hunter program. It is a proxy. And that to me is a big confusing. So would a person have to go to the Feds and get the second permit before the first one. Just a point that I wanted to bring out.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You're right on, Mr Douville. Maybe that's one that needs to be meshed in with B as well as the protocol. It would be in the best interest of everybody I believe that under our protocol that these differing programs be as close as possible. The designated hunter program was under quite a bit of attack in Hoonah on different proposals. We did not see any this time. I think the Council's been clear that they do support the designated hunter program as something that works. So perhaps we could make that an item of State concern included under the next one, too.

With that we will go to State concerns. I believe you added that, Dr. Garza. Okay. Again I just would like to see here, I think we talked about a couple times is differing regulations, dual management does no one any good, and it doesn't do the fish any good, it doesn't do the game any good, so the closer we can get with our -- to meshing these regulations, the better off the resource is going to be, as well as the users.

Habitat. Any action on habitat. There were several comments that were made by Council members under local concerns. This is before you got here, Ms. Phillips. And at least two or three Council persons mentioned that in their area discharge of water by boats. What else did they have? I don't know. Clean water had been mentioned. The Governor's switching Habitat from Department of Fish and Game to Department of Natural Resources. Any comments on those. You can go back, that's fine.

MS. GARZA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Under the subsistence concerns to share with ADF&G concerning State resources, what I had in mind were things like commercial development of black seaweed and commercial development of asparagus, the Salacornia species. In my position as marine advisory agent, I have been approached by ADF&G when residents have approached them to develop commercial fisheries and they don't know what -- or

commercial harvest of those resources and they don't know what to do. They don't have -- it's my opinion that they don't have an easy process of getting information from subsistence users whether or not it's an important resource. It's not within our jurisdiction, but I think if we could develop policies of important resources outside of our reach, then that may help Fish and Game in responding to those type of commercial requests. And so it's too late in the day to do that now, but if we could put that on the agenda for next meeting.

And then the other thing where, you know, in terms of this correspondence, I mean, the other issue is the aerial, the use of planes to go in and spot for moose in Unuk. There's nothing that we can do about it, but if we can pass that type of concern on to Board of Game that it is affecting subsistence users, and that they should more seriously consider those proposals when they come to them.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I agree. We'll make note of that. The next one, rural determination. Excuse me, Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Littlefield. Before you move on, I was wondering if I could just go back to the habitat issue.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: For the record, I'm going to say unless someone wants to make a motion on one of these, I would say that any of them can be discussed. Please go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Concerning the removal of the Habitat Division from the Department of Fish and Game to the Department of Natural Resources, I thought that was a bad move. I don't know. I'm not familiar enough with all of the villages that are represented by the Council, but I know in my village we have an area of state land that surrounds us. It's always been set aside for community use, and we would be somewhat worried with the changes in administration and changes in policy that there could be some more development take place on those lands, and the Department of -- the Habitat Division with the Forest -- or with the Department of Fish and Game I think was a good agency for review of all State regulations involving the State lands around our village, and I think we're going to lose a lot

of oversight on those decisions by moving that department to those responsibilities of permitting to the Department of Natural Resources, so we were disappointed in that decision, and I'd just like to make that known.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Would you like to make a resolution, a motion to adopt that as a Council resolution to.....

MR. KOOKESH: I'd like to comment, too. I'd like to comment.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. First Mr. Kookesh.

MR. KOOKESH: My comment to that, at this point in time with the Governor's decision to move Habitat, I think there's quite a bit of speculation going on, and I'd like to see what he does first, because I think we're trying to read too much into this. I'd like to see what the Governor does before we as a body react. Because all he's trying to do is streamline and everybody's, from my understanding, there's quite a bit of speculation out there. I think there's always room for improvement in any organization, and we need to sit back and take a look see before we start jumping too fast.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Other Council. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with, you know, the comments that Mr. Kookesh just made. It might be a good idea just to sit back and watch this for a while.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Littlefield, my comments aren't about the Habitat Division, but they are about habitat. May I proceed?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Please do.

MS. PHILLIPS: Logging-related habitat changes is causing a potential depletion of deer population, and it is imperative that this Council be watchful that the U.S. Forest Service utilize best forest management practices in all forest management strategies.

And I just want us to be watchful of those plans as they come forward.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Thank you. Also on habitat, I received a letter from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service that listed habitat as the number 1 concern in reduction of species of fish and wildlife. So we have a federal agency on one hand -- we just want to make sure that there is some oversight here, oversight remains. We don't have to do anything at this time, but the Fish and Wildlife Service does have oversight of those Federal lands that are affected, and we want to make sure that we keep our eye on this at future meetings.

Anything else? Any Council proposals. Ms. Garza?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I think that the Regional Advisory -- I'm requesting the Regional Advisory Council support several proposals, and they may be in part house cleaning or things that we thought we had, but we don't.

One is that we need to support a proposal for a customary and traditional use determination for king, coho, sockeye, chum and pink salmon on the Stikine River for Wrangell residents. The fact that we do not have that c&t determination implies that any rural resident could go into that area should we get a -- or when we get a subsistence fishery in there. So -- and that has caused ADF&G concerns. So this would help to close a loophole. So I would so move, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: It's been moved to add king, coho, sockeye and chum salmon on the Stikine River as a Council-generated -- c&t designation as a Council proposal. Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Stokes, do we need to add steelhead

MR. SCHROEDER: Dick, for this one that we've got up there, talking about c&t for Stikine, is it okay if it's king, coho, sockeye and chum, or do we need

to add other fish?

MR. STOKES: No, I think that's.....

REPORTER: Microphone, please.

MR. STOKES: No, I think that's sufficient. Stikine River fish.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We have a motion before us for a c&t -- a SERAC-generated proposal to support c&t for Wrangell for king, coho, sockeye, and chum salmon. Any further discussion.

(No discussion)

MS. GARZA: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's been called on the motion to submit a SERAC-generated proposal to establish a c&t designation on king, coho, sockeye and chum salmon for the Wrangell community. All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That will be submitted as a SERAC proposal. Any other proposals?

MS. GARZA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would move that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council submit a proposal to create c&t for use of hooligans on the Unuk by Metlakatla residents. That is not currently in the books.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. It's been moved and seconded that SERAC generate a proposal to allow c&t designation for the Community of Metlakatla for hooligan on the Unuk River. Is there any discussion on this.

(No discussion)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Are you ready for the question?

MR. KOOKESH: Question.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: The question's been called. All those in favor of generating a SERAC proposal to establish a c&t designation for the Community of Metlakatla for hooligan on the Unuk River, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Staff will prepare that one, too. Any other proposals?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, this is just an area of perhaps clarification for c&t determination for residents of northern Prince of Wales. If you look at the Southeast Alaska summary of districts for fish and the species and then the determination, in District 1, 2, 3, there is no list of the northern Prince of Wales Island residents. It just says Craig, Klawock, Hydaburg, Kasaan. And were they are listed is under the remainder of Southeast. I'm assuming salmon, all rural residents. While that may cover it, that can also cause concerns, and I think it's a wiser move to, and I would suggest to Mr. Hernandez that you may want to submit a proposal for your communities specific to streams. And I can't do that for you, because I don't know what you use. But I think it should be done.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You do not want to move to that c&t designation? Okay. Okay. Mr. Hernandez, do you understand the process there?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I believe I do. Would this be the time to make that or do I have until the end of March?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We have time to

get with Mr. Casipit, if you can respond and clarify that, please?

MR. CASIPIT: Yes, we have until the end of March to submit proposals. Again, Jeff Reeves I'm sure would be more than willing to assist you in crafting the proposals. I would be willing as well, so, you know, we're more than willing to help.

The north Prince of Wales Island area has been a concern for me personally as far as the steelhead fishery. It has been -- you know, in coordination with the State, that's one of the things that the State biologist bring to me is that, you know, basically the north Prince of Wales steelhead fishery that's on the books now would be open to virtually any rural resident of Southeast. And, you know, to the extent that we can clean that up and, you know, that we'd be more than willing to help.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Cal. We'll get together. That should be easy enough to do.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. You'll get with Mr. Reeves, and he will help you with that. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, the last one may just be a point of clarification. The issue of Wrangell came up because of the transboundary and Stikine issue with Pacific Salmon Commission. It also made me realize that we don't have any thing on the Taku. And I know that residents from Juneau as well as from Douglas have submitted requests to be recognized in that area. However, Douglas is not a rural community, so I'm not sure what to do. But we should do something.

And then my final point, realizing maybe we can't do anything, my final point is that I think that each of us in our communities should look over this thing on Page 51 and 52 of the Fishery Reg Book, and just make sure that their communities are covered and their streams are covered, because it's amazing what kind of little errors can cause, or little omissions can cause major issues with resource management.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Your words are well taken. We will -- I will certainly urge do that. I

urge all other Council members to do the same. Review those c&t designations for communities you're most familiar with.

Mr. Casipit, do you have any recommendations on how we could establish a positive c&t for Taku River, and who that would include?

MR. CASIPIT: I'm somewhat perplexed by that issue as well. Since the most -- since the closest communities currently are nonrural communities, by creating a c&t on them, I'm not sure which communities we would put in the request as to having c&t. You know, if you look back at the enthographic history, it's clear that the people of Douglas and perhaps Juneau did -- or do use, did use that area and do use that area, but since under the Federal program those are nonrural areas, I'm not sure what we do until those designations -- until or if those designations change. So I'm somewhat perplexed as to what to do there as well.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. This is one that may -- we could ask you to look into State coordination on this similar to what happened on Proposal 8, that, you know, there are users that may be from nonrural areas right now that are definitely exhibiting those c&t type uses, and we would like to figure out how to do that. Any other? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. The final point is that when dick and I met with ADF&G and Trans Boundary Panel members, I think we crossed some of the concerns we had in terms of the c&t for Wrangell as well as some of the upriver stocks that they were concerned about. We were able to look at the proposed regulation dates and harvest levels, and we will be submitting a proposal to amend our last proposal, or to create a new one to address those issues, but still provide opportunities for rural residents, and I think we will be working with Cal on that. So I'm not asking for Council approval, since we don't have the wording in front of us, but just to let you know it's coming.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. Dave, Mike and I both have to get to the bank. How much time do we have?

MR. JOHNSON: The bank lobby closes at 5:30, and I'd suggest you leave here no later than 5:15.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. We're just about one. One question for Mr. Turek. I think I'd asked earlier for the letter that was sent to Mr. Duffy be made available on the Stikine and Taku, trans boundary rivers. Is that available?

MR. TUREK: Mr. Chair, I do have an electronic version of that, it wouldn't have the signature, that I could leave with Bob Schroeder. But I can get one with the signature back in the office.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. If you could get that to Mr. Schroeder, and he can make sure that that gets out to Council, because it does address some of the concerns that we had on those rivers. Thank you very much.

Annual report. Needs. The aerial determination controlled use area. Council's wish. What is the Council's wish on Unit 8 aerial controlled use area? Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I would move for unanimous consent that we have someone in -- I mean, either Schroeder or Cal or habitat people send a letter to the Board of Game and the Division of Wildlife with the State of Alaska stating that we heard almost a day of testimony about concern in the Unuk and moose hunting, and using planes to spot, and the advantage it provides for this small group of hunters, and that they take these concerns into heart, because it is affecting hunters.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: You've ask for unanimous consent to have Staff compose a letter on this Unit 8 aerial designation. Is there any objection to that.

MS. PHILLIPS: Is there a second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Douville, did you want the mike? Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, just clarification, isn't that Unit 1(A)?

MR. SCHROEDER: Proposal 8.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yeah, Proposal 8,

Unit 1. Yes, Proposal 8. I don't know if we actually even need a motion. We can just direct Staff to do this if there's no one who objects. Mr. Douville?

MR. DOUVILLE: I agree, but, you know, one thing I would like to say is that conservation was not a problem, and the State doesn't get involved in these things, or doesn't seem to like to unless there is a conservation issue. However, fair chase was I believe what the real problem was, and this violates it, so in my opinion and everybody else that testified. So that is what the concern is.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Right. The letter will include comments about fair chase, as well as reasonable opportunity, recognizing the difference in these programs, we did not expect to, nor did we need to spend one day on this. That's our feeling. Anything else. We're going to run through this real quick here, make sure that everybody agrees that this is the council's intent. Dr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think we've only passed two resolutions. One resolution has to do with Ketchikan rural classification. A second resolution suggests replacing Mr. Thomas on the regional coordinating protocol with our acting chairman. Those are the only resolutions we have.

We're talking about an audioconference to talk about regulation coordination, and that this will take place within one month.

Issues concerning designated hunter moved to an annual report item.

Let's see, Dolly, this was -- the issue concerning possible commercialization of black seaweed and other marine plants were moved -- go ahead.

MS. GARZA: Okay. It's opposing development, not encouraging there.

MR. SCHROEDER: Did I say encouraging?

MS. GARZA: Well, you have in mind development.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Have in mind development. Have in mind no development.

MR. ADAMS: Black market seaweed.

MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. We didn't talk about antlers as evidence of sex. That was something someone brought up.

We talked a little bit about Habitat Division support. We don't have any action on that.

We have Council-generated proposals concerning Stikine River c&t for Wrangell for four salmon species, and c&t for hooligan for Metlakatla residents, and presumably we're talking about the Unuk/Chickamon River area, is that right, Dolly?

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Yes.

MS. GARZA: Yeah.

MR. SCHROEDER: I spelled it wrong. Let's see, I've got -- we know how we're dealing with the annual report. We want a letter drafted by Forest Service to Board of Game, Division of Wildlife Concerning aerial spotting on the Unuk River.

And did we talk about something about Sustainable Salmon Funds, or am I drifting off? What did we want to do about that? We were -- there was discussion there, and I'm not sure exactly what we're doing. Help me.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I know that many of the tribes do apply for those funds.

MR. SCHROEDER: So did we want to direct something to whom if we were going to say something about this.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Schroeder, I think we did to Mr. Turek, encourage them to continue seeking out those funds for these programs as they were quite successful and that. And I would encourage that. I don't believe it was a Council action.

MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. So that's not a Council action item. That's all I was -- that's what I've got then.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any errors or omissions, additions, corrections? Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I found a letter that Mr. Clarence Summers turned over to me when he came today. And it involves all of the things that Subsistence Resource Commission, you know, did. There's all of the proposal that were passed, and I'd just like to turn it over to our Coordinator for implementation in the minutes or somewhere.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Okay. A copy of that will be sent to all Council members. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I understand there was some interest in the Regional Advisory Council supporting Bert Adams for the Board of Fish.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: That's correct. Your wishes?

MS. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Regional Advisory Council support Bert Adams for a seat with the Board of Fisheries.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Is there a second?

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: There's a second. The motion before you is for the Southeast Alaska Regional Advisory Council to support the appointment of Bert Adams to the State Board of Fish. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. It completely slipped my mind. I did submit an application to the State for a seat on the Board of Fish. And it's my understanding that they're going to make an appointment sometime early this spring. I think it's in May. They've got one more appointment to make. And I applied for that seat, and I appreciate your support.

I'm kind of having second thoughts right now, because I heard that, like for instance, they're having a meeting right now, the Board of Fish, or this week, and it's the same time as we are having. And I hope that, you know, if I do get appointed that it won't conflict with the meetings that we are having, because I'd rather be here for the next few years.

But thank you for your support. I

appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: I support you, but you will find that it conflicts with everything.

Is there any other discussion on the motion. Is there any other discussion on the motion?

(No discussion)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: All those in favor of the motion to support the appointment of Bert Adams to the Board of Fish please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes.)

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: We support you, Bert.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Good luck. Any other business other than Mike and I have to get to the bank, and we have to leave in eight minutes. Is there any -- would the Council like to have last comments. Dr. Garza.

MS. GARZA: I don't know that we all need to, and I will be brief. As the Ketchikan host, I just want to thank you so much for coming. It was very important to Ketchikan residents to have you there. And we surely are happy with the support for our efforts to go rural.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council. Mr. Adams.

MR. ADAMS: Just a thank you and appreciation, you know, for the find welcoming dinner we had on our first night here, Dolly. We really appreciated that and goonachesh.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Other Council.

I'm going to echo that. Thank you very much. You're very hospitable. Some of the best meals I've had. I thought this was great. Ketchikan put on a good show. Could you pass that on to everyone? We appreciate that. Staff, you did a good job as normal. We appreciate your help. Thank you very much. Is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. ADAMS: So move.

CHAIRMAN LITTLEFIELD: Any objection? Thank you very much.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 306 through 460 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the VOLUME III, SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 26th day of February 2003, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Ketchikan Indian Corporation, Ketchikan, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 13th day of March, 2003.

_____
Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04