```
0363
 1
                   SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE
 2
                    REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
 3
 4
                         PUBLIC MEETING
 5
 6
                           VOLUME III
 7
 8
 9
10
                 Prince of Wales Vocational and
11
                    Technical Education Center
12
                        Klawock, Alaska
13
                         October 26, 2023
                            8:30 a.m.
14
15
16
17
18
    COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
19
20
   Donald Hernandez, Chairman
21
    Larry Bemis
22
    Calvin Casipit
23
   Michael Douville
24
   Albert Howard
25
    Harvey Kitka
26 Cathy Needham
27 Patricia Phillips
28
   Robert Schroeder
29
    Jim Slater
30
    John Smith
31
    Louie Wagner
32
33
34
35
36
    Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
    Recorded and transcribed by:
44
45
    Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
46
    329 F Street, Suite 222
47
    Anchorage, AK 99501
48
    907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net
49
50
```

0364	
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	(Klawock, Alaska - 10/26/2023)
4 5	(On record)
6	
7	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. In order to
8 9	get started this morning we'll first do a roll call and establish a quorum.
10	•
11 12	DeAnna.
13	MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14	
15 16	Cal Casipit.
17	MR. CASIPIT: Here.
18	
19 20	MS. PERRY: Mike Douville.
21	MR. DOUVILLE: Here.
22 23	MS. PERRY: Robert Schroeder.
23	MS. FERRI: RODELL SCHIOEGEL.
25	MR. SCHROEDER: Here.
26 27	MS. PERRY: Albert Howard.
28	no. Illini. Miscle nowald.
29	MR. HOWARD: Here.
30 31	MS. PERRY: Patricia Phillips.
32	
33 34	MS. PHILLIPS: Here.
35	MS. PERRY: Louie Wagner, Jr.
36	
37 38	MR. WAGNER: Here.
39	MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
40	MD IZTEIZĀ . II a u a
41 42	MR. KITKA: Here.
43	MS. PERRY: Thank you, Harvey.
44 45	John Smith, III.
46	JOHN SHILLI, III.
47	MR. SMITH: Here.
48 49	MS. PERRY: Cathy Needham.
50	ro. IERRI. Cacity Needitant.

```
0365
 1
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Here.
 2
 3
                     MS. PERRY: Larry Bemis.
 4
 5
                     MR. BEMIS: Here.
 6
 7
                     MS. PERRY: And we'll go to the phones
 8
     for Member Frank Wright. Member Wright, are you with
 9
     us on the phone?
10
11
                     (No comments)
12
13
                     MS. PERRY: Member Wright, you might
14
     just have to check, star, six, you might be muted, so
15
    if you could just check that for us.
16
17
                     (No comments)
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. And how about Member
20
     Jim Slater.
21
22
                     (No comments)
23
24
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. I know Member Slater
25
     had a meeting for a couple hours this morning, Mr.
26
     Chair, but will be joining us a little later. It looks
27
     like you have 11 members participating, you have a
28
     quorum.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: You didn't call my
31
     name.
32
33
                     MS. PERRY: I did not. I always save
34
     the best for last, the Chair always have to go last.
35
     Sorry about that. Don, are you here?
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm here. Yes,
38
     I'm here.
39
40
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you. Still 11 out of
41
     the 13.
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So as usual
44
     the first thing we start our meeting in the morning we
     allow public testimony on non-agenda items. If there's
45
     folks on the telephone that want to testify please let
46
47
     us know. I'd remind you that some -- there might
48
     people that want to testify on proposals, we're going
49
     to be doing proposals right after a couple items of
50
```

business this morning. If you want to testify on a proposal please wait until we get to that proposal to give your testimony. This is an opportunity for people to testify on any issue related to subsistence uses that may not necessarily be on our agenda. And then we do have -- like DeAnna said, we have a time certain commitment to hear a report at 9:00 a.m. So let's get started with testimony, I have -- if you did want to do a public testimony, like I say indicate over the telephone or hand in a blue card and I have one blue card here in front of me, and it's from Elijah Winrod.

Elijah.

I might mention that Elijah is a former Council member, he sat on the Council for a few years so good morning, Elijah.

MR. WINROD: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

REPORTER: Elijah.

MR. WINROD: This is Elijah Winrod.

REPORTER: Elijah, can you turn the mic around to you and then down a little bit. Thank you.

MR. WINROD: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chair and Council. Thank you for having me here. My name is Elijah Winrod, I'm from Klawock. I just had a few thoughts, probably it's already been thought of but just in case it hasn't.

I was recently up in Kotzebue and they've had a lot of controversy through the years of transporters and stuff, especially in the '80s and '90s and some even more recently where they'd have pallets of rotting caribou meat in the airport just because there was so many people up there that wanted to go get caribou and they didn't really care enough to be respectful. And we visited some of the transporters that are there now, they seem like they're really clean, they really do things right. But even fairly recently there was a transporter that was doing stuff like that, he would take meat and he was caught dumping meat in the lakes just to get rid of it, whatever, just mayhem kind of stuff. But anyway, in 2008 they implemented a working group to get the various interests all in the same room and see what could be

done so they weren't like -- like where transporters wouldn't be taking their clients into where local people were hunting caribou just to avoid conflict. And I just wondered if something like that could be done here to get the interests that are involved with the 05 and 06 proposals, kind of all at the same table and just -- to me it seems like it's mostly about etiquette and respect, it's like I don't think the people from Angoon don't want anybody hunting on their island but it is rude, I'd say, to just go hunt right around where those people -- or where the majority of those people hunt the most.

So -- and we've seen the same kind of thing around here, it's legal but when you have thousands of people coming and sometimes they come from Wrangell or Metlakatla, they bring a seiner around and go home with 50 deer from around here, it's all legal but it really kind of leaves people with a bad taste in their mouth. And I just wondered if some kind of a working group to get people on the same page might be a better lever to use than changing the regulations, especially since there doesn't seem to be a major conservation concern in Unit 4 for the deer.

So that's just something I felt like might be helpful and just wondered what you thought about that.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Elijah, we'll keep that in mind; two thoughts there, respect for the resources and cooperation amongst users would be very helpful, I agree.

Thank you.

MR. WINROD: I have one question. I heard that maybe there was a working group up there that was for this, is that so or could it be more developed?

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Somebody might know the answer to that, I think there was some kind of a group put together.

Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Hoonah Indian Association has a project going where

6

they are running a Unit 4 working group for advising 1 how to collect additional data, like social science based data, they met a couple times. And you might have been here when Ian Johnson came in and gave us a presentation regarding some of the data that they have collected and that working group is basically advisory 7 to Hoonah Indian Association's project. It's not quite the same of what you're talking about but there is a group of biologists and people from the community that 10 are meeting and kind of trying to work on addressing 11 the issue and finding ways to get meaningful 12 information to inform regulations.

13 14

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy. Anybody else.

15 16

(No comments)

17 18 19

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thanks for your thoughts this morning, Elijah, appreciate it.

20 21 22

MR. WINROD: Thank you.

23 24

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I also have a card here from Heather Bauscher. Heather.

25 26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

MS. BAUSCHER: Good morning, Council members. Everyone. I'll try and keep this brief. just have a few updates for you. You all know me pretty well. I've been coming to the meetings for years in various different capacities. My role has shifted slightly in the past year or so. I'm still working for Sitka Conservation Society in some capacities but more operating under the Salmon State Team and still working on all the same issues that I've been working on before.

36 37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44 45

46

47 48

The transboundary issue came up earlier this week and my colleagues wanted to have me remind you, or let you know if you hadn't seen it yet that Senator Murkowski has recently penned a pretty strong letter on the transboundary issue. I told -- I sent DeAnna copies of that so you'll have that. But direct quote in there, it said, that the United States should be fighting, not funding the destruction of our wild salmon rivers and she asked not to allocate any U.S. funding to Canadian projects in transboundary waters and to withhold any U.S. support from mining projects within Canada until conditions are met. So I think

6 7 that's pretty strong and it's cool to see that there's some movement there and that's really the result of the hard work here and all the tribes and municipalities across the region that have weighed in in various ways, and resolutions so I think if we keep standing strong on this issue we can continue to see forward movement. So that's an update there. I'll make sure that you have the copies of those letters and that's been a lot of work by the Salmon Beyond Borders folks also in collaboration with ALFA and ATA as well.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

9

Other projects I'm working on. Skipper Science Partnership is a new thing through the Alaska Conservation Foundation and it's an app on your phone that's used with fishermen so when you're out on the water you can record your observations. That's now being generated into a report and we're working with NOAA scientists and these reports are now being delivered as part of the information at the North Pacific Council meetings. So this is like another way to influence policy. I feel like when we have moments of feeling as though it's hard to impact things on the decisionmaking level, another way to impact the decisions that are made is through the data that is collected and the things that are highlighted. So I just wanted to let people know that this was happening and more people could get involved and now we're starting to have specific studies and matchmaking fishery groups with NOAA scientists to get -- one example is to get a full ecosystem analysis of the Gulf of Alaska.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

Another project is also the fish map app which is also through the Alaska Conservation -all of these started with the Aleut Community of St. Paul but have been working with Alaska Conservation Foundation, other partners like myself through Salmon State. The fish map app is about the anadromous waters catalog. So it's an app on your phone, but all of these things are for community monitoring and citizen science and the fish map app helps a person out in the field nominate a new stream for the anadromous waters catalog. This kind of goes back full circle to that thing a couple years ago when we were trying to change the language in the legislation around fish habitat permitting and for a stream -- or for fish habitat permits to be triggered for projects the stream needs to be in the anadromous waters catalog listing but you have to have a fish in hand for that stream to be on

2

5

6

the list so a lot of the streams in Alaska are not actually on that list and don't trigger the permitting so this is just a new way for people out on the land to collect that information and it becomes an automatic nomination of a stream. So if anybody wants to talk about that or we could do trainings or collaborate in the future to help document more streams let me know.

7 8 9

And then -- oh, different hat. Taking that hat off. Putting my Sitka Advisory Committee hat on.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

10

I will be stepping down from the Sitka Advisory Committee next week because I'm no longer living in Sitka full-time but I wanted to give a couple updates and follow up with Cal. We've been working hard on trying to move forward the unguided rental boat issue and I feel like we've been started to get some progress. We've spoken up enough times at the Council meetings now during Staff tasking, it's really a comp -- people think this process is complicated but I think that process is even more complicated and you have to bring something up over and over again at Staff tasking before you can even get it to be an agenda item. So we haven't fully gotten it as an agenda item to the Council, but we did get it on the halibut committee last week so last Friday -- and Patty called in, she listened, she was part of that as well and Cal's been giving testimony to the Council. We do have a person on the Council that's willing to help take up this issue but we are up against some barriers that Cal and I have talked about and we can figure that out more, but I also wanted to say that this issue is like all over the region and there's at least a number of Advisory Committee Chairs that are also concerned about this and I think in the future, on any of these issues, more collaboration between Advisory Committee Chairs and the RAC would help us all be able to move the issue forward. But I just wanted to give a couple updates on that. And, yeah, hope to continue to try and move all those things forward.

41 42 43

44

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Heather. There might be some questions on that. Anybody on the Council, questions.

45 46 47

(No comments)

48 49

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

0371 1 MS. BAUSCHER: Thank you. 2 3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, you bring us 4 some -- oh, Cal, go ahead. 5 MR. CASIPIT: I just wanted to --6 7 sorry. No question. I just wanted to thank you for all your help and keeping me straight and answering my 9 calls and texts and when I have a question so I just 10 want to thank you for helping me out and keeping me 11 straight and we'll be working together more. 12 13 MS. BAUSCHER: I look forward to it, 14 you help keep me straight, too, Cal, and we're all 15 learning together as we go through all of these things. 16 17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, 18 Heather. You brought us some -- oh, excuse me, Harvey, 19 go ahead. 20 21 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 22 Thank you for all your work, Heather. I realize this 23 -- getting this to work is going to be slow and tedious 24 because fishermen have a tendency to not tell the whole 25 truth sometimes. 26 27 (Laughter) 28 29 I understand that basically MR. KITKA: 30 the science you want it's basically conditions that are 31 happening out there in the ocean and things like that, 32 and not really so much the fish but -- but maybe a 33 closer eye on the climate change and what you find in 34 the food out there. Thank you so much for all your 35 help. 36 37 MS. BAUSCHER: Thanks, Harvey. 38 for being a mentor and a guide all these years as well. 39 40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody else. 41 42 MS. BAUSCHER: Thanks. 43 44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thanks for the 45 news about some signs of progress, it's good to hear, 46 it's a little bit of progress. 47 48 MS. BAUSCHER: Yeah. Yeah. 49

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, DeAnna, check on the phone lines.

MS. PERRY: Just a reminder for folks joining us on the phone if you'd like to give a public comment on non-agenda items at this time you can press star, five on your phone and that shows on our system that you'd like to make a comment. It's the asterisk button and the number 5 on your phone. We'll give that just a moment to see if anyone would like to make a comment on non-agenda items. As the Chair mentioned just a moment ago, for the remaining proposals that we have coming up we would ask that you hold those comments until such time as the Council hears that information.

Mr. Chair, we do have someone on the phone who would like to comment. That caller's number ends in number 7-7. The commenter whose number ends in 7-7 if you could please press star, six now to unmute your phone and it looks like your line is now unmuted. Please go ahead with your comment. Thank you.

### (No comments)

MS. PERRY: It looks like you're now muted again, if you could do star, six -- all right, it looks like you're set. Thank you.

MS. STEVENS: Hi, good morning, I'm Susan Stevens and my Tlingit name is (In Tlingit). Stikine Kwaan. And as the President of -- am I....

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: We're hearing you, go ahead.

MS. STEVENS: All right. I am the President of Wrangell Tlingit & Haida Community Council and also (In Tlingit) which typically protected the Stikine River from invaders or threats so I would like to speak on behalf of the Stikine River Watershed being threatened by the British Columbia Mine and I would like to see you involved with the U.S. State Department to stop the Canadian government from ruining our salmon for commercial as well as subsistence fisheries.

 $\label{eq:please} \mbox{ Please help us with this because we will not be able to exist without the salmon.}$ 

0373 1 Gunalcheesh. 2 3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. 4 Any questions, comments from the Council. 5 6 (No comments) 7 8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you 9 for talking to us this morning, appreciate it. 10 11 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, there are no 12 more callers at this time. 13 14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So we're still 15 waiting, let's see we have an appointment with somebody 16 at 9:00 a.m., they're not available yet, is there 17 anything short announcements we need to make, DeAnna, 18 or? 19 20 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. I believe there 21 was a group that met last night regarding aquaculture. 22 23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. 24 25 MS. PERRY: Perhaps Mr. Schroeder could 26 give us a quick report out on that. That is one of our 27 items that we brought over from yesterday. 28 29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure. 30 31 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, DeAnna, 32 through the Chair. We met for an hour or two last 33 night and it seemed like we had a good time talking 34 about all kinds of hunting and fishing stories but we 35 actually did pay attention to aquaculture but I'll need 36 a few minutes before I can put the stuff on the record 37 but I think we're pretty close to what you want -- to 38 what you need, in that, we identified perhaps six or 39 seven points of things that should be in a letter. 40 So that's what we got and I'd like to 41 42 thank everybody for showing up on that and paying 43 attention and also, as usual, Council Member -- other 44 Council members bring in really great background because of their experience in their communities with 45 46 -- in this case with aquaculture and just what's 47 happening out there. So if I can come back on a little

bit later it'd be great and I'll be prepared.

48

0374 1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, 2 Bob. 3 4 REPORTER: Don. Don. 5 6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Then we can -- oh, 7 excuse me. Just a brief report on the working group that met on the continuation of subsistence uses and 8 9 meaningful priority. We had a meeting at lunch 10 yesterday and the goal was to just kind of reformat, I 11 guess was the term Cathy used, and we just moved things 12 around a little bit, prioritized some of the statements 13 but we didn't make any changes to the wording, just 14 reorganized and maybe make it a little more effective, 15 and a couple citations, so I think we can -- it sounds 16 like the Council members were pretty satisfied with the 17 original draft product so I think we could probably 18 move through that quickly as well when we get a chance 19 to do that. 20 Anybody on the line yet? 21 22 23 MS. PERRY: No. 24 25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Nope. 26 27 MS. PERRY: Office of Subsistence 28 Management could go ahead and give their report if 29 they'd like, also Mr. Gallegos is here with his report. 30 I don't know if you want to get to those. 31 32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, maybe we 33 could do an agency report while we're waiting. How 34 about OSM's report, they're usually not too lengthy. 35 36 MR. VICKERS: Good morning, Mr. Chair 37 and members of the Council. It's nice to do this 38 report nice and early in the meeting. 39 40 I want to thank you all, Council 41 members, for your exceptional volunteer work on behalf 42 of your communities and user groups. We value your 43 expertise, contribution of your knowledge and 44 experience to the regulatory process. 45 46 For the record this is Brent Vickers, Office of Subsistence Management. Sorry about that, 47

48

49 50 it's still early.

1 The Federal Subsistence Board is 2 committed to providing Federally-recognized tribes and ANCSA Corporations with opportunities to be meaningfully involved in the subsistence regulatory 5 process. To that end the Board plans to hold tribal and ANCSA consultations on regulatory proposals after 6 7 the fall Council meeting cycle. Holding consultations after the Council meetings provides tribes the 9 opportunity to participate in meetings and hear 10 presentations after they hear presentations of proposal 11 analysis. We also hope that holding consultations 12 later in the year will be less of a conflict with 13 subsistence activities. Currently we have identified 14 the weeks between November 13th and December 15th to 15 schedule consultations. In fact, I think I just saw 16 yesterday we're tentatively planning for either 17 November 14th or 16th. Additionally, the Federal 18 Subsistence Board will again host tribal and ANCSA 19 consultations at the start of the wildlife regulatory 20 meeting which is April 2nd through 5th, 2024. The 21 Board will also schedule consultations with tribal 22 governments and ANCSA Corporations on any subsistence 23 issues or concerns throughout the year as requested by 24 the tribes. If you would like more information on 25 scheduling tribal or ANCSA Corporation consultation 26 consultations please call -- contact the Office of 27 Subsistence Management, Native Liaison, Orville Lind at 28 907-786-3953.

29 30

# Upcoming Board meetings.

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

Upcoming Board meetings scheduled for next year include the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program work session, scheduled for Wednesday February 7th, 2024, and the wildlife regulatory meeting which will be held April 2nd through 5th, 2024 in Anchorage. The Council Chairs or representatives who are liaisons to the Board are invited to participate in the Board's April regulatory meeting to share their region's subsistence report and discuss their Council's recommendations on wildlife proposals and closure reviews with the Board.

42 43 44

#### Student Art Contest.

45 46

47

48

OSM is inviting all Alaskan student artists, kindergarten through high school to submit original art work for the subsistence student art contest. The deadline for submissions is February 2nd,

Groundhog Day, 2024. We are specifically looking for art work that illustrates wildlife that are harvested for subsistence use or subsistence hunting activities. The winner's art work will be featured on the front cover of the 2024 through 2026 wildlife regulatory handbook and at least 16 other entries will be selected for display inside. The art contest offers an opportunity for students to express their talent and creativity while sharing their knowledge of subsistence resources. For more information, please contact Office of Subsistence Management and ask for outreach coordinator, Kayla McKinney.

#### RealID.

We keep reminding about this, please get your RealIDs because beginning May 7th, 2025 every traveler will need to present RealID to fly within the U.S., even when you fly on small commercial Bush carrier. For our program you will need to have your RealID in time for your fall 2025 Council meeting. That's two years from now. Get your RealIDs, State of Alaska, Division of Motor Vehicle website for information on that.

## Changes in OSM Staffing.

OSM -- we unfortunately had to say goodbye to our Southcentral and North Slope Council Coordinator Jessica Bill -- Gill. She's greatly missed and a few of other Coordinators had to shift over and pick up her responsibilities and they did a great job with that.

We also had to say goodbye to our administrative support assistant, Michelle Andrews, who moved on to new opportunities.

But while saying goodbye to some, we are pleased to welcome two new members, Becky Brown and Janel Day. Becky joins us as an administrative support assistant. She has a background in defense payroll and lived overseas in the UK for many years. She will primarily be handling invitational travel and property for OSM. Janel is our new cartographer/GIS specialist, which we have not had in awhile, so you will have fun new maps in all your analysis. She has worked as a cartographer for National Park Service, Arizona Geological Survey, Kodiak Island Borough and the

```
0377
 1
     Anchorage Municipality, and private contracting
 2
     company.
 3
 4
                     Additionally, OSM is welcoming back our
 5
     wonderful Anthropology Pathways Intern Kristen Morrow,
 6
    who is here at the meeting. Christine was with us
 7
     last summer but then had to take a year to complete her
    dissertation research in the jungles of Borneo.
 9
    Christine will be working with us fulltime in Anchorage
10
    until she graduates and completes the Pathways Program.
11
12
                     Thank you all. Council members, OSM
13
     Staff, multi-agency colleagues in subsistence,
14
     especially the Forest Service here for being wonderful
15
     hosts and thank you for all the public for attending
16
     and working towards our goal of inform subsistence
17
     management and implementation of Title VIII ANILCA.
18
19
                     I'd be happy to answer any of your
20
     questions.
21
22
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the
23
     Council.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
26
    Brent. Any questions.
27
28
                     (No comments)
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I guess not,
31
     thank you very much.
32
33
                     And I'll go to the phone again, it's a
34
     little after 9:00 o'clock, do we have somebody from the
35
     Department of Interior on the line ready to give us a
36
    presentation?
37
38
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I did just
39
    receive a note that it looks like the person from DOI
40
     is not available at this time and maybe a little bit
41
     later, maybe significantly later, so I would suggest
42
     that this Council go ahead and start tackling its
43
    business items. I believe we left off with Wildlife
     Proposal 24-04. For those on the phone just joining
44
     us, this Council got through the presentation procedure
45
46
     on Page 116 meeting book up to the time of Council
47
     action.
48
49
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
```

```
0378
 1
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
     DeAnna. Okay, time to get back to it. Now, we are at
 2
     the point in the process where we need a motion from
 4
     the Council to proceed with Wildlife Proposal 24-04.
 5
 6
                     (Off record comments regarding DOI
 7
     phone number)
 8
 9
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, maybe we're
10
    going back to Department of Interior so hold off on
11
     your motions. Do we have somebody on the phone from
12
     the Department of Interior?
13
14
                     (No comments)
15
16
                     MS. PERRY: If so we'd just like to
17
     remind you that your line is probably muted, you'll
18
     need to press star, six to unmute your line.
19
20
                     MR. VICKERS: It ends in 1-0-7-2.
21
22
                     MS. PERRY: It looks as though we do
23
     have a Washington number showing up, it ends 1-0-7-2,
24
     if that's your number and you're from the Department of
25
     Interior wanting to speak to our agenda item, please
26
     press star, six to unmute your phone.
27
28
                     MR. RHODES: Good morning, or
29
     afternoon. This is Justice Rhodes, Ecosystem
30
     Restoration Coordinator for the Assistant Secretary of
31
     Indian Affairs in the Department of Interior. I have
32
     nothing to report at this time.
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Good
35
     morning or good afternoon in Washington, D.C., we hear
36
     you, go ahead.
37
38
                     (No comments)
39
40
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, sorry, you
41
     said you have nothing to report?
42
43
                     MR. RHODES: Yes, sir, that's correct.
44
     There has been some transition in the office this week
45
     and I will be listening in and will report back with
46
     any questions that may arise.
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, okay. Well,
49
     thanks for that information, we'll standby for later.
```

```
0379
 1
     So thank you, appreciate you letting us know that.
 2
 3
                     Okay. I guess that removes that from
 4
     the agenda for awhile.
 5
 6
                     Back to a motion on Wildlife Proposal
 7
     24-04. Are we ready.
 8
 9
                     Mike.
10
11
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I move to
12
     adopt.
13
14
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Second.
15
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, we have a
16
17
    motion and a second. So the proposal is now open for
18
     discussion.
19
20
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair.
21
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: What are the
22
23
    Council's feelings on this.
24
25
                     Mike.
26
27
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I'd like to offer.....
28
29
                     REPORTER: Mike, your mic. Mike.
30
31
                     MR. DOUVILLE: ....an amendment.
32
33
                     REPORTER: Mike.
34
35
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Oh, excuse me.
36
37
                     REPORTER: Thank you.
38
39
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I would like
     to offer an amendment to this proposal.
40
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.
43
44
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. For -- I don't
45
     have the correct wording but first I would like to
     change the dates from 1 through 15 to 1 through 10 and
46
47
     I would like to remove the WAA 4041 from the proposal.
48
     And that would be the amendment.
49
```

```
0380
 1
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just checking
 2
    here, Mike, did you say the Wildlife Analysis Area 4041
     removed, is that the one.
 4
 5
                     MR. DOUVILLE: That is correct, Mr.
 6
     Chair.
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. We have an
 9
     amendment proposed, did we get a second?
10
11
                     MS. PERRY: Cathy seconded it.
12
13
                     REPORTER: No, she seconded the
14
     original motion.
15
16
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy seconded it,
17
     I thought she....
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, not the
20
     amendment, sorry.
21
22
                     MS. NEEDHAM: No, I didn't.
23
24
                     REPORTER: The original motion.
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No, Cathy seconded
27
     the original motion. How about on the amendment, do we
28
     have a second.
29
30
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Second.
31
32
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, there's a
33
     second.
34
35
                     Okay, discussion, Mike, what's your
36
     feelings on that.
37
38
                     MR. DOUVILLE: The rationale is there
39
     is healthy deer populations, however, I grew up in a
     really poor economy village, which was Craig, back in
40
41
     the early '50s and I fully understand what it's like to
42
     live that way and here we have Angoon with a similar
43
     economy. If you did not plan ahead, preserve food,
44
    things were very dire. With an 80 percent unemployment
    rate I can fully understand what it's like to live in
45
46
    that village. You have to plan ahead to survive and
47
    there are no frills. But in any case, this would
48
     lessen the impact on non-rural users by a considerable
49
     amount, it would still give Angoon a rural priority,
50
```

which is, in my opinion, that they need.

It shouldn't be harmful to anybody and it minimizes the impact on non-rural users.

In any case I believe that this would be beneficial to Angoon and the non-rural users that typically come from Juneau, in my opinion, if they can afford to run that far down there to go hunting they are not in the same situation as Angoon residents. Overall, I think the impact would be very minimal on non-rural users.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike. Other Council members with thoughts on the amended motion.

Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: It's not on the amended motion. The proposal is on Page 145 and Mr. Wagner was trying to find it in the booklet where we're at, so if we could identify where we're at in our booklet to assist the Council members that'd be helpful, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you for that, Patty, yes. The analysis starts on Page 145 and on Page 145 has the language for the original proposed amendment and I might point out that the map which shows the Wildlife Analysis Area units that we're talking about is on Page 150 and the one that Mike proposed in the amendment to have removed from the original proposal is the one furthest to the south on that map, 4041. So for that, is everybody literally on the same page here?

(Council nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thanks for that suggestion Patty. It's kind of hard to get restarted in the morning after leaving off in the afternoon and know where everybody is. Okay, any other comments from the Council on the amended proposal -- amended motion.

Patty, you have something, go ahead.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman Hernandez. Given the questions directed at Federal

```
0382
 1
     Staff and State representatives that the amount of
    harvest at that area that is being proposed to take out
     of the proposal, 4041, there isn't much non-Federally-
 4
     qualified effort in that zone or WAA and so it's less
 5
     than two percent of the overall harvest so I don't see
 6
     the point to remove it.
 7
 8
                     Mr. Chair, thank you.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
11
     Patty. Any other thoughts.
12
13
                     MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman.
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Albert, go ahead.
16
17
                     MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18
     This is just a -- I guess I'm going to show my
19
     appreciation to this Council, Mr. Chair, you guys have
20
     worked really hard on this.
21
22
                     This type of proposal has an impact on
23
                   This process was put in place to address
     generations.
24
     issues in our community and that's all I'm trying to
25
     do. One of my favorites is William Paul's speech to AFN
26
     in 1973. And I started this with the whole west side
27
     of Admiralty and now you've got -- and I agree, Mr.
28
     Douville, was courteous enough to sit and talk with me
29
     about it before he decided to make an amendment and I
30
     agreed with the amendment he made. But I don't want to
31
     turkey buzz it anymore. That's the history of our
32
     people, is, and you have to read the speech to
33
    understand what I'm talking about. I appreciate the
34
     effort you guys have put into this and it means a lot
35
     to Angoon and whether this makes it past the Federal
36
     Subsistence Board after a second try we'll see, but you
37
     guys have to leave here knowing you've done the best
38
     you could for Angoon and I'm always going to remember
39
     that.
40
41
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So thank you
44
     Albert, I just want to be clear in my mind because I
45
     think it's pretty important, you did say that you would
```

support the amendment?

MR. HOWARD: (Nods affirmatively)

```
0383
 1
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, appreciate
 2
    that. Thank you. That's very significant to me.
 4
                     John, go ahead.
 5
 6
                     MR. SMITH: In respect to Albert's
 7
     words, maybe he can share William Paul's words with us
     so that we can pass it around and people can read it
 8
 9
     and then sense what he's sharing, his feelings. That'd
10
    be really cool.
11
12
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: At some point
13
     during the meeting, you say, not right now?
14
15
                     MR. SMITH: Yes.
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Okay,
18
    yeah, that'd be helpful. Any other Council members
19
    with thoughts on the amended proposal.
20
21
                     Bob.
22
23
                     MR. SCHROEDER: I can't speak directly,
24
     I don't have any additional information on whether 4041
25
     should be in or out of this closure but I respect the
26
     opinions of Mr. Douville and the concurrence of that
     amendment by Albert. I will note that, you know, in
27
28
     reviewing other Council actions over the years that the
29
    Council has really made a strong effort to have the
30
    least adverse effect on non-subsistence users that was
31
    possible while protecting subsistence uses. So with
32
    that in mind that would be the change of cutting down
33
     the potential closed area, would be consistent with
34
    that, with things we've done in other parts of our
35
    region. So we have some track record of not having
36
     kneejerk responses and calling for major, major
37
     closures but really refined in our approach on that so
38
     this would be consistent and it would show that the
39
    Council really is not in the business of trying to
     restrict non-Federally-qualified users without the
40
    necessity of doing so.
41
42
43
                     Thank you.
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Thank you
46
     for that Bob. Anybody else.
47
48
                     (No comments)
```

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Just my thoughts on the amendment to the proposal are similar to what Mr. Schroeder stated. You know I was prepared to support the original proposal. This amendment, in my mind, would probably be about the minimum that the folks in Angoon would expect. It kind of limits the area to their immediate vicinity of Angoon and in my view makes a very short period of time with the subsistence priority in place, 10 days. That, in my view, would be about the minimum that folks in Angoon would expect from this process. I would be prepared to give them more but I'm perfectly willing to see through the efficacy of this amendment if it would lessen the impacts and give it a better chance of passing the Board. So I would support the amendment.

## Harvey.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will support this amendment. I really believe that it will have minimum effect on the hunters that come out of Juneau, it just won't affect them so much but it will help the community of Angoon, which is -- which has not been able to achieve their subsistence needs as needed. I know I really stand by the fact that if their subsistence needs are not being met, and this is where I'll stand, I'll stand behind them all the way. I really know that hunting period is very important because usually the bucks are at the healthiest stage of their life right then.

So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Harvey. Any other Council members.

(No comments)

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, are we ready} % \begin{subarray}{ll} \textbf{CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:} & \textbf{Okay, are we ready} \\ \textbf{For the question.} \end{subarray}$ 

MR. CASIPIT: Call for the question.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Question's been called for -- this is just for the amendment to the proposal, we still have to come back and vote on the main proposal, but this is just for the amendment. The amendment to the main proposal would implement a closure to non-Federally-qualified users from November

```
0385
     1st through November 10th in two Wildlife Analysis
 2
     Areas, lower Admiralty Island, those areas that would
     be closed would be 4042 and 4055.
 4
 5
                     Okay, all in favor of the amendment to
 6
     the proposal, we'll do a roll call vote -- DeAnna.
 7
 8
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
9
     is on the motion to amend.
10
11
                     Larry Bemis.
12
13
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes.
14
15
                     MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
16
17
                     MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: Mike Douville.
20
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
21
22
23
                     MS. PERRY: Robert Schroeder.
24
25
                     MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
26
27
                     MS. PERRY: Albert Howard.
28
29
                     MR. HOWARD: Yes.
30
31
                     MS. PERRY: Patricia Phillips.
32
33
                     MS. PHILLIPS: On the amendment, no.
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: Louie Wagner, Jr.
36
37
                     MR. WAGNER: Yes.
38
39
                     MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
40
41
                     MR. KITKA:
                                Yes.
42
43
                     MS. PERRY: John Smith, III.
44
45
                     MR. SMITH:
                                Yes.
46
47
                     MS. PERRY: Cathy Needham.
48
49
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
```

0386 1 MS. PERRY: And Don Hernandez. 2 3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes. 4 5 MS. PERRY: And I'll go quickly to the 6 phones, I don't believe these two Council members are 7 on but want to make sure I call them. Frank Wright, 8 are you on the line? 9 10 (No comments) 11 12 MS. PERRY: And, Jim Slater, are you on 13 the line to vote? 14 15 (No comments) 16 17 MS. PERRY: Okay. Mr. Chair, the 18 motion to amend passes 10 yea, 1 nay. 19 20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, 21 very much. And now we have an amended -- a new motion for discussion. So now we need to maybe expand our 22 23 discussion a little bit and make sure we cover our 24 rationale for the new amended motion and what our 25 thoughts are on the amended motion. So Council 26 members, other thoughts on what is now the main motion. 27 28 Cal. 29 30 MR. CASIPIT: I really don't -- I'm not 31 ready to put my rationale on yet but I did want to 32 mention something from yesterday. The State's comments 33 mentioned, in all these proposals, the requested 34 closure, the State mentions this Alaska v Federal 35 Subsistence Board and I talked to Mr. -- I asked Mr. 36 Churchwell about the citation and all and I apologize 37 in advance, I don't mean to come down hard on any Staff 38 or anything, I know that probably that passage and the 39 position was probably written by somebody way above Mr. Churchwell, but I just want to make sure and I want 40 41 Staff to know it's going to be really important to have 42 legal Council there when this comes up in front of the Board because the particular case that's mentioned here 43 44 in the State's comments has to do with a customary and traditional determination for moose in Chistochina in 45 46 Unit 12. The State challenged that C&T determination 47 through the Board's administrative procedures, took it

to District court, they lost in District Court, they

took it to the Ninth Circuit, they also lost that case

48

49

in the Ninth Circuit and it has to do with customary and traditional use determinations, it has nothing to do with whether or not the Board has -- has authority to restrict non-subsistence uses.

So I just want to make sure that we know that and that legal Council is available for the Board to talk about that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Cal, for that information. So like I said, this is an opportunity for Council members to, you know, deliberate on any aspects of this proposal. I'm not asking you to make our justifications, but what are your thoughts on this proposal and glad to hear those.

Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This proposal from the very beginning of the last regulatory cycle, which I didn't support at the table, but did attend the Federal Board meeting and carried the wishes of this Council forward to the best of my ability, I still am on the fence about it. The hard part for me, it's -- I feel like it's pitting, you know, benefit to subsistence users versus unnecessary restrictions of other users. So those are the two issues at hand. They go head to head.

Previously, I didn't feel there was overwhelming evidence that the benefit to subsistence users, there wasn't much on the record, there wasn't much in the analysis that really supported it other than having one person representing an entire community. And now here we are two years later, we have very much more detailed analysis that starts to make an argument that there is good information out there about the benefit to subsistence users and their needs in Angoon. I appreciate our Council Member Howard's continuation of speaking on the behalf of the people that he represents in Angoon, I think he represents them well. I really would like to see -personally I'd really like to see other people testifying. We've seen this on other proposals where -- in support, I guess I should say, we just see so much opposition from outside of it, but I'd like to see more support, diverse support and I would really have

liked to have seen what tribal consultation would have brought out about this. I hope that Mr. Howard pursues that between whatever our decision at this table is now and before the Federal Board meeting, that he can get tribal consultation and maybe rally some additional folks to put additional information on the record from other people. I know he represents a lot of people, but just a little extra would go a long way. I really feel that way about another proposal that we're going to see.

So I'm still really undecided about this but I would say that I'm much more supportive than I was the last round and I'd like to hear other Council member's opinions on whether this benefit to meeting subsistence uses and needs within the community of Angoon really does outweigh restricting other users.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy. Other Council members.

Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I speak in favor of the motion. I do know what -- we're not talking about -- this is not a conservation concern, however, it's our job to improve access to the resources and give a rural priority. But we had a situation here in the '90s where there was -- there wasn't -- we were okay with deer but we had a competition factor. We were having cars block the roads before the August 1 season opened and local people would go out there, well, they couldn't even -you know, the clear-cuts were desirable, everybody likes driveby hunting, don't get me wrong, even rural people do, I mean particularly, probably non-rural. So that was a problem. And we went through a quite long process to correct this problem. It was partially resolved because this Council failed -- perhaps more than once to take a week in the front end of that season for rural users, the problem was solved somewhat by opening the season early because there was so much resistance to taking that little window out. But it took more than one meeting, it took two or three, and a lot of that -- a deer planning committee was formed and it addressed other problems as well.

I think this is an okay thing. It's a small area. It may be unpopular with non-rural hunters, but I do think it would be very beneficial to those users that depend on this resource. They have to have it. And there is a competition issue.

So in my mind this will not solve the problem totally, but it would help in that direction.

The other thing that I would say is for Hoonah, Angoon and Pelican and other stakeholders, I would encourage the committee be formed to address some of these and perhaps find some common ground down the road.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike. Did you have something to add Cathy?

 $\,$  MS. NEEDHAM: Yes, I have a question for him if that's fine.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,

Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just had a quick question for Mr. Douville. In Unit 2 when regulations were changed to provide an additional season for subsistence users at the forefront of the deer hunt, that wasn't necessarily to close or restrict — I mean it was restricting non-Federally-qualified subsistence users but it wasn't closing a season for them, it was adding a benefit, what I really wanted to know is, is that — do you feel like that was a beneficial thing for Prince of Wales residents, do they utilize that hunt and is it a meaningful priority having the two weeks at the beginning of the season for just residents, and maybe Don can answer that question as well.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, I know you directed it to Mike but I also wanted to point out there was also a closure involved. They added time at the beginning of the season but they also delayed the opening of the non-subsistence hunters 10 days, so there was actually a 20 day window, which is kind of interesting the way that worked out. We asked for an early opening and the Board kind of took it upon

2

themselves to add an additional closure as well. So there was a closure involved, it wasn't just an early season. But Mike want to answer the rest of the question, go ahead Mike.

4 5 6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

MR. DOUVILLE: Additionally, I think there was an adjustment made for the south end to -via the proposal process to open that portion earlier than it would have been under the regulation at the time. And to answer your question about the early hunt is not as important now because those clear-cuts have grown in and the driveby hunting is not as good as it was at that time so there's less competition for it, there's also less competition overall on the island because we have a declining deer population so we're not seeing a big influx of people from outside coming in here to hunt like they were in the '90s. We've had a decline and they don't want to work hard for their deer so there's other places they go or do something else, I don't know, but we're not seeing it. And certainly we're seeing less deer.

212223

### CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Patty, go ahead.

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman Hernandez. This Subsistence Regional Advisory Council is broad in regional representation because we all have our local knowledge for our areas that we live in. And each area has their dynamics that affect, you know, the type of recommendations that we would bring to the area. I would agree that POW issues took up a lot of time, money, Staff effort to come up with the solutions that they came up with. However, we are now dealing with Unit 4 and three community proposals and like, Albert, I thank the RAC for following through on the three proposals that failed previously and now based on the Staff analysis and community participation that recognized that we should reduce the amount of time for the -- to provide a subsistence meaningful priority for a deer hunt that would give 15 days in November.

40 41 42

## I support the proposal.

43 44 45

46

47

48

ANILCA, Title VIII subsistence management, under the findings, Congress finds that: this is Congress saying it, and this was back in the 1970s that Congress met before ANILCA was actually implemented: That the continuation of subsistence uses by rural residents, both Native and non-Native for

physical, economic, traditional, cultural existence, or physical, economic, traditional and social existence. So economic is specifically stated in ANILCA. So when we have people saying that while I got to pay 5.45 a 5 gallon to go get my deer and I want it -- I would like 6 to be able to go and get it in one trip, that is a 7 justifiable reason for a citizen -- for a rural resident to say, hey, I would like to meet my subsistence needs, they're not being met, and why are 10 they not being met they tell us, so we also have a 11 finding that says, increase accessibility of remote 12 areas containing subsistence resources and the 13 increasing population in Alaska with resultant pressure 14 on subsistence resources. This is in ANILCA, specific 15 wording.

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

So we have people who have come to us and testified or Council members, because we're a broad representation of the region saying my community needs are not being met and we have outside pressure who are non-Federally-qualified that are affecting our ability to harvest the resource that we need to meet our subsistence needs.

232425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

And so also there's been a lot of disenfranchisement of segments of the population of the region and it's not my place to say why aren't you coming forward and testifying because of some of this disenfranchisement that they experience. In the last round, of which I was only a member of the public for part of the time and then for which I came in as a renewed Council member is there was a lot of -- as OSM has stated, controversy, hard feelings, tensions with these proposals and so it's like they said it once, why do they have to say it again and it really did create these riffs within the community that are actually not being mended and it is -- the Hoonah Indian Association stepped up and said that we will do these studies within these three communities and we'll, you know, try to find some facts based on these specific issues and that forum was opened to non-Federally-qualified and there was very limited non-Federally-qualified other than State agencies stepping in with their information.

43 44 45

46

47

So you can't force someone to the table. But what we are here to do is represent the needs of the rural users of subsistence and so, Mr. Chair, that's my comment.

1 Thank you.
2
3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Patty.
4 Other Council members.
5
6 Bob.

MR. SCHROEDER: I'll be supporting this proposal. The reasoning kind of goes in two routes. One is that we've heard a fair amount of testimony related to this specific situation in Angoon. I'd also be thankful — oh, many, many years ago I actually hunted in this area with an Angoon friend in a really small boat when we could not possibly have gotten any place else, I'm not a Federally-qualified subsistence users but I do know the land there. So I'm convinced on the basis of testimony and Council Member Albert's representation of his community that there is a problem for Angoon residents meeting their subsistence needs and this has to do with — and so I believe that that's convincing evidence for me.

212223

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

I'd also refer back to our really lengthy statement that we worked on on looking at our meaningful priority position statement which we talked about a little bit on the first day of our meeting and which is being reformatted at this time. And this goes into a lot of detail on the need to protect subsistence uses even if there's not a conservation concern. our job is not simply to respond to conservation concerns and rachet down seasons and bag limits when those occur, but it's our job to protect subsistence uses. What that analysis showed and I'm bringing that up because I'd like it to be considered as part of our rationale for whatever actions we take on this and the other two proposals dealing with Unit 4 deer, is that, though we may not like the situation but this is what's happening. We have a larger population in Alaska, many more demands on natural resources, in this case deer, and we have huge technological change that can get people from Juneau to the southern end of Admiralty Island faster than anyone imagined could happen in 1980. And we have many other changes which have to do with the economic structures of communities that may make subsistence harvesting just really more difficult for subsistence users. This has to do with price of gas, the migration of commercial fishing permits away from small communities and many other factors, which are outlined in our meaningful priority position

statement.

So I guess the one thing that does concern me is that I think as our world gets smaller and smaller and there are more demands put on resources, we're going to be doing a lot more of this and I'd anticipate that in coming years we'll increasingly be required by the directions of ANILCA and our authority to put restrictions on non-Federally-qualified subsistence users, not because we particularly want to do so but because it's necessary to protect subsistence uses, which is what our job is.

I also really appreciate, I mean this has been frustrating to have these proposals come back again and again, but this has permitted refinement of what kind of restrictions may be put on non-Federally-qualified hunters and as Chairman Hernandez said this may be about the minimum, this is the least that could be done to protect subsistence uses for Angoon residents and minimizing the effect on non-Federally-qualified hunters.

So that's the rationale that I have and I will support this proposal and in our stated rationale on this we should refer to our position statement.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob. Other Council members with thoughts on this.

Larry.

 MR. BEMIS: As we're deliberating and I agree with the amendment, you know, for not being involved with much of the Board business and, you know, I'm listening and evaluating and I've been here before but not in the last couple years, a lot has changed.

The one thing that I found from the outside looking in is I see a lot of study and analysis, but I don't see enough area representation of everybody having a voice. It's like when we had our public comment the other day, I did not hear any individual coming up as a non-area hunter, I mean subsistence user coming up to complain on this own personal behalf other than groups of other

representation of other people in the sense of a business or a group or something like this. If this was such an issue there should have been some individuals that are just regular people having a say about it and I didn't see that and I don't think there was enough community input also to make an analysis based on what you think the other person's thinking or what the whole thought process is. If -- you know it just seems like to me there wasn't enough information on both sides for the pro and the con of this proposal.

And the other thing I would like to add, it really has nothing to do with exactly where we're at, but in Yakutat for our subsistence extension of the hunt, we had a two week early hunt for the youth, you had to be of age and they had to have somebody 21 years old to go hunt with and the youth had to have gone through a gun safety course. And, you know, not many deer were taken, there was quite a bit of family, you know, but what it did is it got the youth involved in their hunting and they got to go out and be first in the field and it was really good. I mean it -- it gave a little earlier hunt and gave the youth a chance to be with -- out there in the area and learn a little bit about it.

That's all I have at this time, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Larry. Is there anybody else.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I wanted to give my thoughts on this proposal which I am in favor of and I think Bob did a pretty good job of kind of outlining our justifications. I want to point out some issues here that, you know, I've identified in this proposal and the other proposals before us.

This is a proposal very much crafted to address a situation which Bob and Patty outlined for us where ANILCA foresaw that there would be competition for resources in the rural areas. And now it's time, we're going to be addressing that in Unit 4, we've addressed it in other areas and now it's become an issue in Unit 4, and I think our position statement that we're going to send to the Board on this I think pretty well outlines the Councils feelings on this

issue and I think it is a very valid issue to be addressing.

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

And in relation to that I want to address, you know, a lot of the public comments. You know we have pages and pages -- dozens of public comments here and I did read through them all, I got my highlights there and I really appreciate the public comments, they're almost all in opposition as we know, it really helps me to formulate what the issues are and I do really appreciate it but there's just some statements in there that are just flat wrong. I know people believe it but it's just wrong. They say explicitly, you know, I've got -- you know I have them highlighted but I'm not going to look through them all, that the only time you can restrict a non-subsistence user is if there's a conservation concern, we know that's not true. I know people believe that but it's just not true.

19 20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

Our mandate is to also protect the continuation of subsistence uses and that's a concept that maybe a lot of people just don't grasp. I'm sure in a non-subsistence community it's really hard to grasp. But subsistence uses are all the practices that subsistence users undertake to do their subsistence harvesting and it's where you harvest, it's when you harvest, it's how you harvest, all of those need to be protected. And if they're being interfered with in some way by -- I'll call it competition, or just the presence from other hunters -- we -- and a lot of people talked about that competition factor. I saw a testimony in there that said, you know, I've hunted there for years and I don't see the competition that the local people are seeing, well, of course you're not. I live on Prince of Wales Island and I've lived there for almost 40 years but I lived in Petersburg 10 years prior to that and every year I hunted on Admiralty Island and I did like the other people from Petersburg, I went on a boat with a group of people, usually four or five of us, we went to Pybus Bay, we always got our limits, the deer hunting was great but I can recall -- we always left around the 10th of November and when the deer were in the rut, the bears were in their dens, hopefully, and we could be home for Thanksgiving dinner, okay, that was our pattern. And I can recall being in Pybus Bay -- we always went to Pybus, that was our favorite spot, I can recall being there in a stormy stretch of weather and the best

anchorage in Pybus, everybody -- there were 14 boats 1 anchored in that one little anchorage. And every one 2 of those boats, you know, had four, five, six people on them. It was kind of a zoo. We all kind of hunt the 5 same, that's just the way it was. They were mostly boats from Petersburg and Juneau, I don't think I ever 6 7 saw anybody from Kake, I don't think I ever saw anybody from Angoon, they don't hunt that way. So you can say, 8 oh, we didn't see any competition, well of course we 9 10 didn't see any competition, they're not going to be 11 there, they're not -- they're not there because they 12 don't want to be there, they're not there because we're 13 there, and that's the way it works. You know now I 14 live on Prince of Wales Island, there's a lot of 15 competition on Prince of Wales Island, I don't hunt the roads, I've never had a vehicle on POW, I hunt with a 16 17 skiff and there's a lot of competition there too. That competition comes mostly from Wrangell and Petersburg, 18 19 and we're all hunting with boats. Now, I have my 20 favorite spots and they have their favorite spots and 21 if I'm going out for a hunt and I see somebody from, 22 not one of my neighbors, in a place where I want to go, 23 I absolutely will not go there because I'm going to a 24 specific spot and leave my skiff in a spot that I know 25 that's protected and I'm going to a specific spot and I 26 don't want anybody else to know where that is, if they 27 don't already know where it is I don't want them to see 28 where I am. You just don't do that. So to say you're 29 not seeing competition, of course you're not seeing 30 competition, that just -- you know, so that was one 31 thing.

32 33

34

The other thing is the misconception on why we can impose a restriction, not just for conservation concerns.

35 36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47 48

49

50

The other thing we've heard in testimony, mostly from the State. They talk about how they're seeing less use from the folks in Angoon. And I'm sure that's a really complicated issue and I don't know Angoon very well, I've never been to Angoon, it's one of the few places in Southeast Alaska I've never visited and that's just kind of the way it is with Angoon, we don't know what goes on there and we only hear from our Council members usually. I'm sure it's a complicated situation. And if there's a situation where for some demographic economic reason less people are hunting in Angoon and that's affecting the overall subsistence needs of the community, I kind of got the

1 impression from the State of Alaska that, you know, that might be happening, it's not the fault of the 2 people in Juneau [sic] that that's happening, so don't -- there's nothing you can do to fix it. Well, if 5 there's a situation like that where the needs are not being met, but we see a solution, if, you know, less 6 7 people are hunting, the economics of hunting are more difficult, there's all these factors involved, and we 8 9 actually see a solution that would make it more 10 efficient and economical for people in Angoon to be 11 able to meet their needs and it involves, you know, 12 some very minor restriction on other users, well, yes, 13 we should do that. Okay, it may not be their fault but 14 there is a solution, we can make it more efficient and 15 easier for the folks in Angoon to meet their needs and 16 we should do that.

17 18

19

20

21

22

And it's a very -- I believe it's a very small imposition on the non-subsistence users, there is a lot of area in Unit 4 they can still hunt. A lot of time. But like I say, this is probably the minimum that we would do to help the folks in Angoon, so, yes, I do support it.

232425

Yeah, those are my thoughts.

26 27

28

 $$\operatorname{So}\ I$$  think we also pretty well covered the rationale, so other Council members, any additional thoughts.

293031

Mr. Howard, go ahead.

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We keep hearing Mr. Howard is the only one sitting here speaking for Angoon. Mr. Chairman, there's people, you know, the 20 percent that want to speak are working at the school district this morning. They're cooking lunches, they're doing dishes at the lunch program because they fed the kids and a lot of my friends are out hunting today. So you're given a choice to come here and call in and give your position on this proposal or go hunting because the weather's nice. you're -- we live in different worlds. There's Angoon and how we do things and then there's this governing body and everyone in this room that expects more than Mr. Howard to explain the situation in Angoon. And in my mind that's not fair. I have a 12th grade education and thanks to Patty and the rest of this Council I've learned to read this document and comprehend what it

means and when I look at the comments opposing the proposal these people don't get this. Mr. Chairman, I -- what's on my mind now is when this goes to the Federal Board what do I --in my mind I'm trying to put a plan together so it gets passed this time. I listened in, I testified because I couldn't afford to fly to Anchorage, and they got it, they understood, but according to this there was no conservation concerns so they didn't pass the original document we sent them. So now I'm trying to wrap my head around how am I going to get them to pass this one. And I appreciate OSM and all the effort that was put into this and I'm hoping we can get it passed. I appreciate everybody's effort here. It means a lot to me and I'm -- this isn't something I'm going to forget any time soon. Thank you, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert. Anybody else. Patty. MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. Just for the record, this, that Mr. Howard was referring to is ANILCA. CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Thank you, Patty. Anybody else. (No comments) CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Mike. said this before, that Angoon lives in a depressed 

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I said this before, that Angoon lives in a depressed economy and subsistence is very important but we're not just talking about deer. I grew up the same way and we ate a lot of fish until I didn't even like fish anymore. But when the weather was good, five or six of us could get aboard a little troller and go out and handline anything we could catch, we were after red snapper, and anything we caught came aboard. When the tides were right we got the gas lamp out and we went and dug clams. Deer was hard to get in the '50s that's why the Federal Fish and Game posioned (ph) them. But

when we did get one it was just like a total treat. I had five brothers and two sisters, there was 10 of us living at home and we'd eat a deer a week, we didn't have a freezer or even a refrigerator. If we didn't get a deer the following week we had to eat fish again. But this is kind of a window into what it's like to be in a village that has a depressed economy, so you're always thinking about what you're going to get next to eat and you had to go do it yourself. But I don't know if everybody understands because we're only talking about deer but it involves a whole way of life.

So I know what it's like to grow up with a subsistence way of life, truly.

I think that this proposal would go a long way into helping Angoon residents continue their subsistence way of life.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike. Anybody else.

Patty.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the Congressional Record on ANILCA it also talked about in their deliberations trying to figure what they were going to do to address subsistence needs in Alaska. They talked about subsistence zones, where only subsistence uses would occur, and then in the end we ended up with what we have in ANILCA. But in my mind these communities of Angoon, Hoonah and Pelican are asking for a subsistence zone during this time period of two weeks when the deer are in the rut, when they can go and get a deer, they know they can get a deer during that two week time period.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Patty.

Anybody else.

43 (No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Question. Are we ready for the question.

MR. DOUVILLE: Call for the question.

0400 1 2 3 4	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, question's been called for. DeAnna, you want to go through a roll call vote.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is a vote on the main motion as amended. Do you want me to go over that, the amendment, is everyone clear on the amendment or I could put it in the record again.
	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sorry, we should restate the motion, as amended.
	So the motion is to adopt Wildlife Proposal 24-04. This proposal would institute a closure to non-Federally-qualified users from November 1st through November 10th in two Wildlife Analysis Area units that surround the community of Angoon. I think that states it.
19 20	MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Mike Douville.
	MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
	MS. PERRY: Bob Schroeder.
	MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
29 30	MS. PERRY: Patty Phillips.
31 32	MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
33 34	
35	MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
36 37	MR. KITKA: Yes.
38 39	MS. PERRY: John Smith, III.
40	MR. SMITH: Yes.
41 42	MS. PERRY: Cathy Needham.
43 44	MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
45 46	MS. PERRY: Larry Bemis.
47 48	
49	MR. BEMIS: Yes.
50	

0401	
1	MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
2	
3	MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
4 5	MS. PERRY: Albert Howard.
6	MJ. IBIMI. AIDEIC HOWAIG.
7	MR. HOWARD: Yes.
8	
9	MS. PERRY: Louie Wagner, Jr.
10 11	MR. WAGNER: Yes.
12	THE WIGHTEN TOS.
13	MS. PERRY: Don Hernandez.
14	
15 16	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
17	MS. PERRY: And checking the phones for
18	Council Member Frank Wright. Star, six, Frank, to
19	unmute your line and provide your vote.
20	
21 22	(No comments)
23	MS. PERRY: And Council Member Jim
24	Slater, are you on the phone to vote?
25	
26	(No comments)
27 28	MS. PERRY: Okay. Mr. Chair, 11 yeas,
29	no nays, two absent. The motion passes.
30	
31	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
32 33	DeAnna. Let's take a 10 minute break before we move on
33	to our next proposal and come back at 10:15.
35	(Off record)
35 36	(Off record)
36 37	(Off record)
36 37 38	(On record)
36 37 38 39	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get
36 37 38 39 40 41	(On record)
36 37 38 39 40 41 42	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on the phone if you'd like to follow on our meeting book
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on the phone if you'd like to follow on our meeting book can be found online, www.doi/subsistence/regions/se and
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on the phone if you'd like to follow on our meeting book
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on the phone if you'd like to follow on our meeting book can be found online, www.doi/subsistence/regions/se and you'll see a box there marked meeting books or meeting
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on the phone if you'd like to follow on our meeting book can be found online, www.doi/subsistence/regions/se and you'll see a box there marked meeting books or meeting materials and you'll be able to find our agenda and documents there.
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47	(On record)  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to get started on the next set of proposals.  MS. PERRY: And a reminder for those on the phone if you'd like to follow on our meeting book can be found online, www.doi/subsistence/regions/se and you'll see a box there marked meeting books or meeting materials and you'll be able to find our agenda and

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right we're going to go ahead and get started after the break. We are now on the point of our agenda where we're going to hear about Wildlife Proposal WP24-05 and it looks like we have Mr. Jason Roberts at the table to give the presentation on the proposal.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, thank you, Chair and members of the Council. Unfortunately, you get to hear from me a lot in this meeting. This is -- I'll be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP24-05. The analysis of this proposal begins on Page 183 of your meeting book and I'll try to keep this at least slightly shorter than the last one.

Proposal WP24-05 was submitted by the Southeast Council. The proponents are requesting to close the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area to deer hunting by non-Federally-qualified users from November 1st to the 15th. The Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area is located on Northeastern Chichagof Island and corresponds approximately to Wildlife Analysis Areas 3523, 3524, 3535, 3526, 3551, 4222, 4252 and 4253. Combined, this represents about 48 percent of Chichagof Island. And you can see this area illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 on Pages 187 and 188 of your meeting book.

The proponents state that they submitted WP24-05 to establish a meaningful preference for the continuation of subsistence uses of deer by Federally-qualified users in the Hoonah area. Hoonah residents depend on deer as a key component of their subsistence lifestyles, however, the proponents assert that residents in this area have been experiencing difficulty harvesting enough deer to meet their subsistence needs because of increasing competition and user conflicts with non-Federally-qualified users. The proponents note that large numbers of non-Federallyqualified users come to Hoonah via ferry during the deer hunting season. The proponents assert that the amount of non-Federally-qualified users utilizing the area in recent years has often clogged the roads with large campers, trailers and tents that remain in the area for long periods of time. Both Federallyqualified and non-Federally-qualified users prefer hunting the road system around Hoonah because it's safer than hunting by boat. This creates issues of over crowding and hunting safety concerns as well as

inhibits access to hunting areas by Federally-qualified users who cannot find a place to park or camp. influx of non-Federally-qualified users also substantially increases competition for deer, 5 Whitestone Harbor and Freshwater Bay are examples of 6 areas where these issues regularly occur. Non-7 Federally-qualified users may also decrease the success of Federally-qualified users if they shoot at deer and 9 miss causing deer to be more skittish and wary of 10 hunting presence. Subsistence livelihoods depend upon 11 effective and efficient harvest. The proponents 12 explained that the proposed two week closure window in 13 early November is the most efficient time for 14 subsistence deer hunting in Unit 4 for several reasons. 15 First, the deer are still fat providing the highest quality and amount of meat. Second, the deer are in 16 17 rut making them more susceptible to harvest. And, 18 third, weather conditions are typically favorable and 19 proper meat processing. The proponents assert that 20 this two week closure would allow for the continuation 21 of subsistence uses and provide a meaningful 22 subsistence priority enhancing opportunity for 23 subsistence users in helping them meet their needs by 24 reducing competition and improving access to hunting 25 areas during the most important time of year for 26 subsistence hunting. Additionally, the proponents note 27 that the proposed closure area is limited in scope but 28 represents the area most hunted by Hoonah residents.

29 30

31

32

33

The proponents believe this closure will have a relatively small impact on non-Federally-qualified users who would maintain significant time and space to hunt deer in Unit 4 but it would provide vital benefits to local subsistence users.

34 35 36

So just a brief bit on regulatory

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

history.

In 2022 four proposals concerning Unit 4 deer regulations were submitted during the Federal wildlife regulatory cycle. The stated intent of these proposals was to protect local deer populations from further depletion by reducing hunting pressure from non-Federally-qualified users. WP22-08 was submitted by the Southeast Council requesting the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area annual deer harvest limit for non-Federally-qualified users be reduced to two male deer. The current proposal is similar to this proposal in that it requests a change to deer hunting

regulations for non-Federally-qualified users in this area, however, the current proposal requests a 15 day deer closure by non-Federally-qualified users instead of a season long harvest limit reduction in this area.

4 5

6 As I noted in the previous analysis, 7 monitoring deer populations in Forested habitat is challenging as the total number of deer cannot be 8 9 directly counted through ground or aerial surveys. 10 Changes in deer populations in Unit 4 have historically 11 been monitored using three methods deer pellet surveys, 12 hunter harvest reporting and hunter surveys and more 13 recent aerial Alpine surveys. Winter body condition 14 and beach mortality surveys may also be conducted to 15 understand changes in the health and abundance of deer 16 populations. A deer pellet survey was conducted at 17 Pavlof Harbor in 2019 along the southern portion of the 18 proposal area near Tenakee Springs. The average of 19 2.47 pellet groups per plot counted for this survey is 20 considered to indicate a high density deer population. 21 However, I would note the study by Brinkman and 22 colleagues I talked about in the last presentation, 23 questions about the accuracy of deer pellet counts as 24 an index of deer population. This count was considered 25 to represent a 39 percent index in average pellet 26 groups counted during the last survey conducted at 27 Pavlof Harbor in 2010. There have been no recently 28 published data on deer pellet surveys conducted closer 29 to Hoonah. Before 2019 the most recent deer pellet 30 surveys conducted on Chichagof Island were taken at 31 Finger Mountain in 2011, 2015, 2017 and 2018. Only the 32 2015 survey at Finger Mountain did not indicate a high 33 density population. More information on the results of 34 the deer pellet surveys conducted on Chichagof, Baranof 35 and Admiralty Island can be found in Table 2 on Pages 36 195 and 196 of your meeting book. Aerial Alpine 37 surveys were conducted over two locations in Unit 4 38 between 2015 and 2018. Surveys were flown over 39 Southern Admiralty Island in 2015, '16 and '17 and Northeast Chichagof Island in 2017 and 2018. 40 41 Northeast Chichagof exhibited numbers of deer similar 42 to North Prince of Wales Island. And this information 43 is shown in more detail in Table 3 on Page 196 of your 44 meeting book.

45 46

47

48

49

50

Annual harvest data estimated from harvest reports and hunter surveys can also provide another indicator of deer population status and potential change over time. This information is

discussed in more detail in the harvest history section of the analysis.

2 3 4

Based on the combination of harvest data, pellet survey data, aerial surveys and related information managers in the area assert that the overall deer population in Unit 4 has recovered from the population decline suffered during the severe winters of 2006 to 2008 and may be reaching winter carrying capacity in some areas.

So turning a bit to community characteristics for the communities in the proposal area. There are four communities located within the proposed closure area, Hoonah, Game Creek, Tenakee Spring, and Whitestone Camp. Hoonah is a Tlingit community of longstanding. It's the largest and oldest community in this area. Whitestone Logging Camp and Game Creek are more recently developed communities located along the road system a few miles southwest of Hoonah. Tenakee Springs is an older community located on Tenakee Inlet about 20 miles south of Hoonah. Tenakee has a year-round population but also serves part-time residents and recreational tourists who arrive in the summer. The four communities in this area can only be accessed from the outside by plane or boat and Tenakee Springs is not road-connected to other communities. Gustavus is a community located outside the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area, however, it's also reliant on the proposed closure area for deer hunting as Glacier Bay National Park is closed to subsistence activities. Gustavus, likewise, can only be reached by ploom -- plane, ploom -- plane or boat. Gustavus, like Tenakee Springs has a population that increases substantially during the summer months with the arrival of part-time residents and tourists.

The populations of all five of the coastal communities located in and around the proposal area have regularly fluctuated, primarily in response to changing opportunities for employment through fishing, logging, tourism, and other industries. Their combined population, however, has nearly doubled since 1960 to an estimated roughly 1,700 people in 2020. Hoonah and Gustavus, in particular, have shown upward trends in population since the census first started collecting data for these communities. The population of Tenakee Springs has remained relatively stable for the past several decades while the populations of Game

Creek and Whitestone Camp have generally declined since the '90s.

2 3 4

Commercial salmon and halibut fishing have long been important industries in the area and tourism has also been growing as an economic driver with recent declines in commercial fisheries. These commercial activities have become important compliments to the more traditional subsistence hunting and fishing practices that have taken place in the area for generations.

The most recent period of logging took place in the area in the 1980s and an extensive network of logging roads were built around Hoonah to facilitate timber harvest. These roads changed how Hoonah residents access certain subsistence resources, as well as how non-local people hunt and use the land. Active logging has been greatly reduced in recent years but the effects of past timber harvest and road building continue to be felt in Hoonah today.

Deer have been a key subsistence resource utilized by Hoonah residents and residents of the other communities in or near the proposal area for many years and generally represent the most significant terrestrial source of meat for rural residents of Southeast Alaska. Hoonah residents participated in comprehensive household surveys documenting their harvest and use of deer and other wild resources in the '80s, '90s and 2010s. The other four reliant communities participated in surveys in the '80s or '90s. In all these studies the vast majority of households utilized deer and deer consistently ranked as a primary resource in terms of both contribution to subsistence diets at times only trailing salmon, non-salmon fish and/or berries.

Before logging roads were constructed Hoonah residents accessed deer hunting areas almost exclusively by foot or boat and hunting by non-locals was limited. After 1980 the newly constructed logging roads became the main means of accessing deer hunting locations and the Hoonah road system quickly gained the reputation of being a relatively inexpensive productive and easy place to hunt deer for both locals and non-locals. Reports of increasing hunter competition and localized depletions of deer have been common in the Hoonah area since the most recent period of logging.

As early as 1986, Schroeder and Kookesh observed Hoonah hunters having difficulty harvesting deer in some parts of Hoonah's core harvest area. Hoonah residents who were successfully harvesting deer at abandoned areas near roads as competition from other hunters had significantly increased these areas. Similar concerns were documented in 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2021. For example, ADF&G researchers noted in 2012 the issue of how many deer are taken by non-local hunters was a concern due to the affect it has on local hunters as was simply the number of deer hunters out hunting making local areas and roads too crowded to hunt.

Overall, approximately 80 percent of all recent deer harvest in Unit 4 have been made by boat based hunters. The proposed area may be a particular popular destination for non-local hunters because it's accessible by the ferry system and offers the opportunity to hunt along the road or by boat. At a Southeast Council meeting in 2021 an area resident explained that last season was particularly hard competition wise. There were days I'd go out and have to hop over three bays before seeing any sign of deer. Suggesting the deer population in these bays may have been hunted out. Another Council member explained that the extensive road network around Hoonah allows people to get to coastlines that you don't have to take a skiff to. The Council member continued Whitestone Harbor experience really really high pressure from skiffs and from what I presume is non-Federallyqualified users. The hunters from Hoonah who would drive out to Whitestone Harbor and basically not be able to hunt there because of having three boats parked up at Whitestone Harbor hunting the entire thing like every weekend and during the week too.

Other comments received during the fall 2021 Southeast Council meetings noted that reduced subsistence harvest of deer in the area could stem from localized depletions that ADF&G unit-wide data is too course to detect or from competition and crowding from non-Federally-qualified users who are displacing Federally-qualified users from preferred and traditional hunting areas. Some Federally-qualified users also noted that hunting -- hunter effort and harvest reporting data tend to underestimate the amount of hunting activity that actually takes place in an area. Hoonah residents have also explained that localized population declines and increased hunting

pressure may still be related to the legacy of logging and road construction in the area. Together these issues have exacerbated user conflicts around Hoonah. However, as a member of the public testified during the 5 same Council meeting there are a lot of cabin owners in 6 the Freshwater Bay who don't really compete with the 7 road system hunters from Hoonah who this proposal WP22-08 would adversely affect. I think this potential 9 regulation change is unnecessary for those folks. 10 There's a lot of deer there, you just have to get out 11 of your truck to go get them. Similarly some 12 Federally-qualified and non-Federally-qualified users 13 have suggested that deer hunting issues currently 14 being experienced in places like Hoonah stem from local 15 preferences for beach and road accessible hunting. An 16 aging population of hunters in communities like Hoonah 17 might be more reliant upon beach and low elevation 18 hunts in an otherwise steep and rugged landscape. As 19 one Juneau resident explained, the perception of 20 increased competition leading to localized declines in 21 the Unit 4 deer population may also be due to recent 22 mild winters which resulted in deer being spread out 23 through Forest rather than concentrated and observable 24 on beaches or near roads.

2526

27

28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Changing, less predictable weather patterns are also affecting local deer populations and associated hunting strategies. During periods of heavy snowfall deer typically move to the beaches and Forest fringe to seek food. However, in 2012 in an ADF&G subsistence study Hoonah residents reported changing weather patterns -- one resident noted, whereas 20 years ago winters used to reliably have snowfall, now there are years of high snow fall followed by years where it mainly rains. There is more rain during winters with less consistent snow fall. This issue was noted again at a Southeast Council meeting in 2021 when a resident explained, we'll get a dump of snow and a bunch of rain for six weeks and deer disappear until the snow comes back. In the future we're going to have more of this.

41 42 43

44

45 46

47

48

The rising cost for fuel for boats and vehicles has also impacting hunting strategies of Hoonah residents. In 2021 ADF&G researchers observed as the coast has risen since the mid-90s hunters and fishers may elect to search closer to town in order to conserve fuel and money. One Hoonah resident told the researchers with current economic conditions and high

fuel prices, it's very important to be efficient when going out to harvest, it's too expensive to not bring back a harvest. Some Hoonah community members and residents of other Unit 4 communities cannot afford to hunt outside of their local core subsistence area. As one Southeast Council member noted they can't afford to go anywhere else because it's just too expensive, that's not really subsistence you're spending everything that you have to try to get anywhere and it just doesn't make sense.

Consequently reductions in deer hunting efforts and harvest reported by Hoonah residents during the most recent five year reporting period could be related to the impacts of declining commercial opportunities combined with the rising price of gas and other consumer items. These issues have led some Hoonah residents to reiterate concerns over food security and the necessity of efficiently harvesting wild resources to offset the high cost associated with living in small rural Alaskan communities. Residents note that increasing hunter competition and user conflict over access to favored hunting locations close to home is impacting local people's ability to harvest sufficient subsistence resources.

Looking at harvest history.

Hunter harvest and effort reporting, as noted before, is another way that managers use to monitor deer populations in Unit 4. As Bafune notes, hunter harvest trends, particularly those observed at larger scales typically reflect current population levels, however, hunter self-reported harvest and effort data should be analyzed cautiously as reporting rates can be less than ideal. This is particularly the case in small rural communities where reporting rates are often lower than elsewhere, sometimes less than 30 percent and Hoonah and Angoon have been mentioned in the past as areas with low reporting rates. However, management Staff typically call hunters to ask about their hunting efforts to try to achieve a 60 percent reporting rate when response rates are low. However, to account for hunters who do not report data are proportionally expanded by community size, therefore in small communities with low reporting rates, expanding data may be based on the reports of only a handful of hunters resulting in a good deal of uncertainty about the accuracy of this expanded data. Additionally,

5

6

7

calculations of hunter effort and success may be misleading because some subsistence users only document their successful hunts. As one Unit 4 resident explained I question this harvest success information when I complete a deer hunter survey I only list actual deer harvested and it's always a one day hunt. I never list the times I hunt without success and it may be three, four, or five times before I shoot a deer.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

With that said, and looking at the available harvest data from 2000 to 2021 proximity to Hoonah and the Hoonah road system appears to be a key factor for residents when selecting deer hunting locations. According to this data approximately 80 percent of Hoonah residents reported deer harvest and 79 percent of their reported hunting days took place within the Wildlife Analysis Areas covered by the proposal area. The eastside Port Frederick Hoonah area, Whitestone Harbor, Freshwater Bay and Humpback Gallagher Creek area accounted for the vast majority of these harvest and hunting days. A relatively small amount of hunting and harvest took place in the remaining Wildlife Analysis Areas in the proposal area. Hoonah residents also reported minimal hunting and harvest occurring in areas located outside the proposal area. And this information is shown in more detail in Table 9 on Page 211 of your meeting book. Based on the reported data, an average of approximately 568 total users hunted for 2017 days harvesting a total of 693 deer within the proposal area each year from 2000 to 2021, however, the total number of hunters, hunter days and deer harvested in this area by both Federallyqualified and non-Federally-qualified users was variable between years. In most years Federallyqualified users harvested more deer from the proposal area due to the larger number of hunters present in this group. On average, roughly 55 percent of all reported hunters utilizing the proposal area each year were Federally-qualified users. About 77 percent of these users were Hoonah residents. Non-Federallyqualified users accounted for an average of about 45 percent of all hunters utilizing the proposal area. Most of these users came from Juneau. However, the proportion of non-Federally-qualified user hunter effort and harvest within the proposal area has increased fairly substantially over the two most recent reporting periods from 2011 to 2015 and 2016 to 2020. During the 2016 to 2020 reporting period non-Federallyqualified users accounted for an average of 54 percent

5

6

7

8

of all reported hunters, 67 percent of all reported hunter days and 50 percent of all reported harvest taken from the proposal area. And overall non-Federally-qualified users were the only user group reporting increases in average yearly hunter, hunter days and harvest in the proposal area between the 2001 to 2005 reporting period, and the most recent 2016 to 2020 reporting period. Hoonah hunters reported the most substantial declines and average hunters, hunter days and harvest per year.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

For all user groups and reporting periods years of declining harvest were generally correlated with declines land reported hunters and hunter days. This issue complicates the analysis, though there may be contextual factors such as those previously discussed that aren't discussed in this data. This information is displayed in more detail in Table 10 on Page 213 of your meeting book. proposal area accounted for a relatively substantial amount of non-Federally-qualified users overall hunting efforts and harvest within Unit 4 between 2000 and 2021. Wildlife Analysis Areas 3525, 3526 and 3524 were the portions of the proposal area most heavily utilized by non-Federally-qualified users accounting for over 58 percent of all non-Federally-qualified hunting effort and harvest in the proposal area during this period.

272829

Looking at the effects -- the potential effects of this proposal.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

If the Board adopts this proposal it will restrict non-Federally-qualified users from hunting deer within the proposal area on Northeast Chichagof Island from November 1 through the 15th. This could potentially provide Federally-qualified users in the area with an enhanced subsistence harvest opportunity by reducing user competition and conflict during a period of peak hunter effort and harvest. Adopting the proposed closure could lead to increased harvest effort by non-Federally-qualified users before and after the closure period. Adopting the proposal would also prevent non-Federally-qualified users with local ties to the area from directly participating in deer hunting during the period of closure but they would be able to still participate in other ways, such as with meat processing. While deliberating similar proposals during the previous wildlife cycle some Southeast Council members expressed concern over the

potential displacement of non-Federally-qualified users to other parts of Unit 4 if these types of proposals were to be adopted. These Council members were particularly concerned about potential displacement creating similar problems elsewhere if all three deer proposals under consideration at the time were to be adopted. These concerns may still be relevant as adopting the current proposal and similar proposal WP24-06 would close over half of Chichagof Island to non-Federally-qualified users during the same time period.

And, once again this is very difficult. I've gone back and forth and in consultation, this is not really the product of my own individual thought process, but a group effort, the preliminary conclusion for OSM at this time is to oppose WP24-05.

The justification is that deer have been and continue to be very important to local subsistence livelihoods for Federally-qualified users living in the Hoonah area. Many area residents have noted that they've had to change their deer hunting methods to focus their efforts closer to home as it's become too expensive and dangerous to travel further without the necessary fuel or equipment. Residents have noted that recently increasing numbers of non-Federally-qualified users utilizing the Hoonah road system are anchoring boats in narrow embayments to hunt for deer are increasing issues of competition and conflict in the area. Residents of Hoonah and similar communities have also noted that deer populations in Unit 4 may not be tracked at a fine enough scale to consistently capture localized depletions that exacerbate issues of competition and conflict. Residents have also explained that hunter effort and harvest reporting tend to under estimate the amount of hunting effort taking place and over estimate hunting success rates. There is data presented in this analysis that supports these arguments suggesting that rates of competition for deer in the recent years may be impacting the success and efficiency of residents of the Hoonah area who have had to focus their deer hunting efforts closer to home.

However, it's still not clear that -to OSM that the current levels of competition created
by non-Federally-qualified users in the proposal area
pose an imminent threat to the continuation of

subsistence at this time. There may be a better compromise available to address the proponents concerns without enacting a closure to non-Federally-qualified users or without enacting a closure of this size to non-Federally-qualified users.

Though, Hoonah residents deer harvest have generally declined over the past 22 years, analyzed for this proposal, these declining harvests have typically been associated with declines in reported hunter effort that cannot always be explained by associated declines in the community's population. Despite limitations in the hunter harvest and effort reporting framework this issue complicates the analysis. We think that more information is required to better understand local hunter effort -- or local hunter harvest reporting practices and the potential relationships between declining economies, rising fuel costs, local hunter effort, the residual impacts of logging and increasing rates of competition from non-Federally-qualified users in the proposal area.

OSM hopes to receive this type of information through additional meetings of the Southeast Council and the Unit 4 deer working group.

And that completes my long-winded

summary.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for that presentation of the proposal. Before we go into questions I just want to let everybody know that we do have a time certain for the Department of Interior at 11:10 and that my interrupt our proposal process a little bit. But we will only get them for 15 minutes so we really need to take that call. I just want to let everybody know that, I'll be watching the clock. And then I just want to remind Council this is a time to ask the Office of Subsistence Management that prepared this presentation of the proposal to us, questions, it's not necessarily a time for us to express our opinion or deliberations.

 $$\operatorname{So}$$  with that if there are any questions for Jason please let me know.

Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madame

1 Chair. A couple of questions. I may have missed it if I wasn't listening carefully enough, did you talk about posted land in this area? Yeah, Sealaska Corporation and Hoonah Totem Corporation have major land holdings, 5 those are basically reflected on Page 187, the white areas around Hoonah and I don't know the current status 6 7 perhaps someone on board here does know or perhaps Rob knows, but in some years Hoonah Totem and Sealaska have 9 posted their land, that's State land so under State 10 management so it wouldn't be affected by this proposal 11 but it would show that if it is posted that the 12 corporations have taken some action to limit hunting to 13 protect local subsistence users. So did you include 14 that or is that?

15 16

MR. ROBERTS: No, I will look into that, I haven't included that.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. And then a second question is, and this also applied to the last proposal but we didn't bring it up or discuss it, in the rationale and justification section, we're talking about an imminent threat to the continuation of subsistence uses at this time, that's the second paragraph from the bottom. And I can understand what those words mean but this almost suggests that there's a standard that an imminent threat, well, perhaps we need to take some action on that, but just if it's not an imminent threat we don't, and I'm wondering if you can tell me where the concept of imminent threat came from or if it's just something put in to say that we don't think it's a very serious threat; in other words does this concept imminent threat have any regulatory standing?

343536

37

38

39

MR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Mr. Schroeder. Dr. Schroeder. That's a good question. That's just poor wording on my part. We're not sure it rises to the level where we can justify a closure of this size.

40 41 42

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Follow up.

43 44

45

46

47

48

MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, my concern was mainly because much of our deliberations that we're talking about significant priority which does have legal standing and then we talk about restriction to non-Federally-qualified users and that has a legal standing and so that just sort of struck out to me

```
0415
    there. I think -- let's see I think possibly other
     things I have on my mind should wait for deliberations
    but we'll call you up for deliberations to clarify
 4
    things.
 5
 6
                     Thank you.
 7
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are
 8
     there any other questions regarding the OSM analysis.
 9
10
                     Harvey.
11
12
                     MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I
13
     just was -- maybe I didn't quite understand Bob
14
     Schroeder's comments but how much is private, how much
15
    belongs to Hoonah Totem and how much hunting effort is
16
     actually on Federal controlled lands?
17
18
                     MR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Mr.
19
    Kitka. That is information I could get for you later,
20
    I don't have that right now.
21
22
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
23
24
                     Patty.
25
26
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
27
     On Page 188 it shows, you know, the WAAs for the
28
    NECCUA, was there a look at the harvest from east Port
29
     Frederick versus west Port Frederick?
30
31
                     (Pause)
32
33
                     MS. PHILLIPS: 188.
34
35
                     MR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Ms.
36
     Phillips. If you'll turn to Page 211, Table 9, that
37
     shows a break down of reported harvests in the various
38
    Wildlife Analysis Areas in the proposal area and then
39
     outside of the proposal area, and that's for Hoonah
40
     residents though.
41
42
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Other questions
43
    regarding the analysis.
44
45
                     MR. CASIPIT: Not a question but I
46
    wanted to thank you for including some of this
47
    demographic and information for Gustavus because we do
48
     use significant portions of 4222.
```

0416 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Don, you have a 2 question. 3 4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, the 5 community of Tenakee Springs is also included in this 6 area, I didn't hear much information on Tenakee, have 7 you done much research on what their uses are? I don't recall seeing much public testimony from there as well. 8 9 Any information on Tenakee? 10 11 MR. ROBERTS: I have not done a ton on 12 that, I know that they do have some sort of a 13 recreational, tourism, guiding type operations that go 14 on there. But, yeah, I don't have a ton of information 15 on them. 16 17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Follow up. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, just follow 20 up. You also mentioned Whitestone Harbor, sounds like 21 there's some private land there, private cabins but I'm 22 not familiar with it. Is that extensive or a few 23 scattered folks, or what's Whitestone Harbor? 24 25 MR. ROBERTS: Forest Service Staff may 26 be able to correct me but I think it's more of a 27 scattered thing. 28 29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. 30 31 John. 32 33 MR. SMITH: Just a comment. I know 34 that some of the locations that you're sharing and even Tenakee is a landless community. I know that's on the 36 table. But Freshwater Bay and many of the locations 37 you were sharing are very traditional and we have a lot 38 of cultural stories that come right out of that area so 39 I think definitely looking at the tribal map -- and I 40 know that Hoonah Totem and them, over there, they 41 manage their land very well. They actually have a land 42 watcher, I don't know if that's still in place, but 43 when I lived there Louie White was managing and he 44 would -- and there was some other younger ones that he was mentoring to keep an eye on those properties but I 45 46 think that would be important to take a peak at that.

Hey, thank you for your report.

49 50

0417		
1		Thank you.
2		
3		ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are
4 5	there any other	questions regarding the OSM analysis.
6		Ms. Phillips and then Mr. Douville.
7		ms. Inititips and then mr. bouville.
8		MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
9	So I'm just goir	ng to call it the west side of the
10		t know how else to call it. But is that
11	_	ne road system from Hoonah proper? Like
12		4222, is that accessible by the road
13	system from Hoon	nah?
14 15		MD DODEDTC: Through the Chair Ma
16	Phillins If we	MR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Ms. ou'll look on the map on Page 188
17		on there that shows the road system,
18		es, it looks to me that it is not.
19		•
20		ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville.
21		
22		MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
23		accessible or are there landings other
24		ame that some of them are accessible
25 26		nd unless the corporation's block them,
27	like they reach	cessible in these areas where they look
28	Tike they reach	the beach:
29		MR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Mr.
30	Douville. I wou	ald call on Forest Service Staff who
31	might be more fa	amiliar with the road system there for
32	that question.	
33		
34		MR. DOUVILLE: Since Council Member
35		ere, he could answer a lot of our
36 37		e he's listening but I'm trying to get a
38		ch the road system is used as opposed to nunting is done, which is the most
39		active, you know, just general
40	information.	decive, you know, Jude general
41		
42		ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
43	Douville. Mr. 0	Casipit. And then Mr. Smith, if you
44	have questions.	
45		
46		MR. CASIPIT: Not a question but I had
47	an answer on roa	ad issues.
48		ACTURE CHAID MEEDIAM. Co shood
49 50		ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Go ahead.
50		

MR. CASIPIT: Actually I'm looking at 4252 and there are some -- I know there's roads in there because there's timber harvest there but it's not showing up on a map for 4252 and I don't know what layer was used for the road layer. But in 4222 you can see the little road going up into 4222, and that I believe -- well, it's called a Chicken Creek -- the Chicken Creek road system so I think that accesses the upper end of 4222. But you're right, for most of 4222 that is totally unroaded. There is some roading high up in the watershed that comes over the top but 4252 doesn't have the road system on there and I know that there's roads there because there's clear-cuts there, the 13 miles of disrespect.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you for that Mr. Casipit. And we'll also wait to see if -- I don't know that we'll wait but we'll check to see if Mr. Wright is going to be calling in and connecting with us.

John, do you have a question?

MR. SMITH: No, but I can answer the question about the beach hunting and the road hunting. I was just there and I wanted to go out to Freshwater Bay and see the new cabin so I took a friend out there and we left at about 4:00 o'clock and, of course, my buddy wanted to hunt but I don't road hunt and, of course, I seen lots of deer, it's just beautiful over there in the town, in the city, on the roads. We ran into quite a few bucks, quite a few does on the way but I don't road hunt so my buddy really wanted to stop but I kept going. On the way back we ran into many families, because we were out there, and just testimony that they were relatives of mine that lived there and they were road hunting and they were -- so when I ran into them I shared with them all the markers, where all those deer were. But I know that, you know, there's a good partnership between the State and the Forest Service and that to manage and take care of the roads so everybody's maintained but a lot of their -- there's a lot of cabins, Forest Service cabins all over the place in there, some of them are condemned but some of them are new and updated and they're being used but just to share that point of view.

And as far as the beach hunting, I grew up there since I was a young kid and I know our

```
0419
 1
     families beach hunt.
 2
 3
                     So just to share a perspective, thank
 4
     you.
 5
 6
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
 7
     Smith. Mr. Schroeder, did you have something -- okay,
 8
    Mr. Douville.
 9
10
                     (No comments)
11
12
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville,
13
     did you have a question?
14
15
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Oh, yeah, but you said
16
    Mr. Schroeder so I was -- I have a question on -- I
17
     know when the private land was logged, that started in
18
     the '80s but you have other looks like Forest Service
19
     logged in there, but I guess I'm looking for a general
20
    description of how those loggings, both private and
21
     Forest Service -- at what stage of second growth are
22
     they in, is it like here or does it stay more open, or
23
     just how does it compare to here?
24
25
                     MR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Mr.
26
    Douville. That is something I'll have to look into, I
27
    don't know -- rely on Forest Service Staff, we'll look
28
     into that.
29
30
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
31
     Douville. I see the Staff is kind of looking so
     they're probably just not ready yet and maybe they can
32
33
     come up after if they are able to answer that question.
34
     Did you have a follow up.
35
36
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
37
     The reason for asking is I'm trying to get a grasp if
38
    people are using these roads to access non-logging
39
     areas or they're road hunting on the road or just how
40
     -- or what the dynamics are.
41
42
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank
43
    you, Mr. Douville.
44
                     Ms. Phillips, you had a question.
45
46
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
47
48
     Just a question to local knowledge Member Casipit, do
49
     those roads on the west side connect directly to Hoonah
50
```

0420	
1	or do you have to access some road systems from Port
2	Frederick, do you know?
3	
4	MR. CASIPIT: I believe it's both.
5	There's some areas that are and some areas that aren't.
6	ACHTNO CHATD MEDDIAM - A
7	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there other
8	questions for OSM at this time regarding the analysis.
9 10	(No commonta)
11	(No comments)
12	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a
13	question?
14	question:
15	(No comments)
16	(NO Commerces)
17	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thanks.
18	Thank you for that, it sounds like we might have a
19	little bit of additional questions before we get into
20	that. I think we're going to pause in our proposal
21	process right now. I know it is about four minutes
22	before we have a time certain at 11:10 and I don't want
23	to ask the next presenter to come up and be interrupted
24	in the middle of it so if we can kind of hold tight for
25	four minutes.
26	
27	(Pause)
28	
29	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Musslewhite,
30	did you have a quick answer to the question that you'd
31	like to come up and give.
32	
33	MR. MUSSLEWHITE: (Not at a microphone)
34	give a quick summary of what I do have.
35	
36	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Will it take two
37	to three minutes?
38	
39	MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Sure.
40	(7
41	(Laughter)
42	MD MIGGI DEGITED. The all Me alone
43	MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Thank you, Madame
44 45	Chair. For the record my name is Jake Musslewhite, Biologist out of Juneau. I haven't spent a lot of time
46	
47	around Hoonah and the Hoonah road system but I can kind of tell you just my general understanding, the layout.
4 7	or terr you just my general understanding, the layout.
49	I believe we had a couple questions
50	i believe we had a couple questions

bout how developed the Forest is and another about kind of the use of the road system and such.

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

There is that road system that heads sort of south out of Hoonah proper, a lot of that crosses the, you know, private tribal lands. There is kind of another major access point all the way down at the far end of Port Frederick. There is Eight Fathombyte, Eight Fathom Cabin, there is a landing there that, you know, you can tie up a boat to and then that gives you a lot access and I don't know exactly how extensive or what connects anymore or what roads have been decommissioned but that gives you access to a lot of that west side of Port Frederick but it's also a pretty popular recreational spot since there is a public Forest Service cabin in that area. There's also sort of that northwest side of Port Frederick, a lot of that is tribal land, most of that has been clear-cut. I'm thinking most of that has been in the '70s/80s so most of that is definitely in the dog hair stage, you know, pretty thick sort of stuff so, you know, definitely difficult to access but it's just past that point where you'd want to hunt it; is my general impression.

242526

27

28 29

30

Yeah, so I think a lot of the folks, maybe they're riding on the ferry from Juneau end up on that east side of Port Frederick and going down into that road system over there with some folks arriving by private boat and either using ATVs or something like that for that entire west side of Port Frederick.

31 32 33

So that's my general impression, I'm not super familiar, just to give you some idea.

343536

Thanks.

37 38 39

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Musslewhite. I'm going to hold off on questions and ask our Council Coordinator if our Department of Interior folks are ready.

41 42 43

40

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  PERRY: Not yet, Madame Chair, but I am monitoring.

44 45 46

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: One question.

47

48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

49

0422 1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, one more question that Jake might be able to answer. That 2 Whitewater Bay, Whitestone Harbor area, that's the site of a previous logging camp as I understand, was there 5 some extensive private land turned over in that area? I see public testimony from people that have cabins 6 7 there that live in Juneau. I'm trying to get an idea 8 just how much..... 9 10 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes. That's correct. 11 There is -- I don't know the exact extent but I do know 12 that, in fact, Whitestone Harbor was essentially a 13 community. I don't think there's much there now in 14 terms of year-round residents but it was a logging camp 15 type situation there and I don't know if it's Juneau 16 folks that own places. I do know in Freshwater Bay 17 that is a place where people -- a lot of folks from 18 Juneau have recreational cabins that they use for 19 hunting and such, yeah. 20 21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: And they own --22 they own private property there? 23 24 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: And they own private 25 property there, there's quite a few private cabins in 26 the Freshwater Bay area. 27

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

28 29 30

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. no Department of Interior so Mr. Kitka, you have a question.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

31

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I personally would like to see a little better map than what is private property, what belongs to the city of Angoon [sic] and what is Federal property in relation to this. Right now we have a map with numbers on it but it doesn't really show us what is State and private lands.

40 41 42

Thank you.

43 44

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Musslewhite, is it possible at some point to maybe project that map, do you have that type of capability?

46 47 48

45

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: If you give us a few minutes I bet we could find something and put it up

0423 there, certainly. Perhaps after the DOI person. 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you. 4 5 MS. PERRY: Not yet. 6 7 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Or there might be one 8 -- look on Page 187, there might be a better map is 9 what I understand. 10 11 (Pause) 12 13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I 14 really don't want -- I mean the next step on the 15 proposal presentation process is the State and I really don't want to interrupt the State in the middle of 16 17 their presentation while we're waiting for this time 18 certain DOI presentation so if we can just hang tight, 19 I think that's how we're going to have to try to handle 20 this. We'll give it a couple more minutes and then see 21 where we're at. 22 23 (Pause) 24 25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So the Council 26 27 28 Roberts come back up and give us a summary of the 29

Coordinator has informed me that maybe we can do the proposal process a little bit out of order and can Mr. written comments -- the written public comments, which is normally at the end, but we'll go ahead and have him do that.

31 32 33

34

35

36

30

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. This is Jason Roberts, Anthropologist at OSM, Madame Vice Chair. Members of the Council. We received 37 total written public comments on this proposal. One in support, 36 in opposition.

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44

The commenter in support noted that subsistence hunting and fishing are subject to disproportionate levels of regulation and scrutiny. This commenter thought that this proposal was an innovative way to not only support but to prioritize subsistence users, household needs and invest in local food security.

45 46 47

The 36 in opposition noted that ADF&G data shows that there are no conservation concerns regarding deer populations in this area and the level

49 50

of competition for deer in the area does not warrant a closure. Many noted the primary issue impacting deer hunting recently has been the impact of warmer winter weather that has not produced as much snow particularly early in the season. This lack of snow means that deer are not being pushed down to beaches and other areas where they can be more easily harvested. They also state that this proposal would restrict the rights of long-term seasonal residents and others with local ties to the area. And the commenters also noted that the proposal does not consider the impact of other Federally-qualified users.

 $\label{eq:local_equation} \text{And that is the summary of written} \\ \text{public comments.}$ 

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for stepping up and doing that to help us fill the time. And now I'd like to call on Brian Newland with the Department of Interior who is waiting online to give a presentation, an update on the proposed move of OSM to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Newland, are you there, you have

MR. NEWLAND: You betcha, can you hear

29 me okay?

the floor.

31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, we can hear 32 you.

MR. NEWLAND: Okay, great. Thank you. Good morning, everyone, my name is Brian Newland. I serve as the Assistant Secretary for Bureau of Indian Affairs here at the Department of the Interior. And I wanted to take a few minutes with you today to just give you an overview of our proposal to move OSM out of the Fish and Wildlife Service as you just heard, and then answer a few questions that you might have about that.

But before I launch into that I just want to thank those of you who are serving on the RAC. Know that it's a labor of love and what you're doing is vitality important and also understand that many of you, you're bearing the cost of a lot of the work that you're doing. And, you know, I'm aware of that and I'm

very grateful for what you do. It's vitally important for subsistence management in Alaska.

Pardon my raspy voice today, I'm battling some seasonal allergies down here.

So you may have seen in the Presidents FY24 budget proposal to Congress we have proposed moving the Office of Subsistence Management out of the Fish and Wildlife Service and into the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, which is the job that I now hold.

A couple of things with that, this move would not take OSM and put it inside the Bureau of Indian Affairs. A lot of folks make that assumption. But my office is, if you were to take an org chart for the Department, my office is actually housed in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. So what we're proposing is elevating the Office of Subsistence Management from the Fish and Wildlife Service into the Department's Leadership structure. And under our current org chart we have a number of programs that report, or are directly overseen by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs that are outside the BIA and OSM would simply be another part of that.

Along with this move we are not proposing to eliminate Staff or cut Staff or change Staff at OSM, or to physically move their offices out of Anchorage and out of Alaska. Those things would remain the same. Anyone who would want to come over from OSM would be able to. And we have also proposed increasing the funding for OSM and subsistence activities including for wildlife monitoring under this proposal.

So this proposal is a request to Congress through the annual budget process and so this move would, as it's currently proposed, would not happen unless and until Congress has approved this proposal.

One, you know, I know folks have asked, well, what's the reasoning behind this move and why do this now, or why propose this now. All of you know, surely much better than I do, these conversations about subsistence management have been going on in Alaska for a very long time and back in the days of Secretary

Salazar we engaged in a review of the structure of subsistence management here at the Department of Interior and consulted with a number of tribes in that process. And back then and again now under the President Biden's Administration with Secretary Haaland we heard consistently from tribes across Alaska that they felt the current structure was not the best way to ensure that we fulfill our trust our responsibilities to tribes and Alaska Natives while also carrying out our mission and our responsibilities under ANILCA. So based on those consultations and I think a desire to elevate the importance of the work that OSM does and subsistence management generally we have put this proposal on the table and it is really aimed at better aligning our ANILCA responsibility with our trust responsibilities to Alaska Native peoples and tribes under our government to government relationships.

So the day to day operations of OSM would not change dramatically, you know, as a result of this move. But over a long period of time we think that restructuring the department in this way would allow us to better fit and align the trust responsibility with our ANILCA responsibility.

So I think that's the most succinct way I can explain this. I do want to leave some time over the next five or six minutes and to answer any questions you might have.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Newland. Are there any questions from Council.

Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes, thank you for your presentation Mr. Newland. I just had a quick question for you, here in Southeast, you know, the primary land manager is the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture and I'm wondering regarding this proposal has there been any coordination with USDA, USDA Secretary. You mentioned budget, changing -- you know increasing budget, has there been any conversations with USDA for increasing USDA's contribution of the Subsistence Program as far as budget goes because I know a big portion of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is funded by USDA, so I'm just wondering what level of coordination is going on with Secretary of

Agriculture and any question -- and also my question about budgets, increasing the budgets. I think it's important to increase it for OSM but we need to be looking at USDA too because they do fund significant 5 portions of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and the last -- I listened into a presentation to the 6 7 Eastern Interior Council the last cycle and they had mentioned 1.5 million dollars to begin a wildlife 9 information services program. And I just wanted to 10 state that for 1.5 million we're not going to be able 11 to do much for wildlife studies, we need significantly 12 more than that.

13 14

Anyway, that's all I had, thank you.

15 16

17

18

19

MR. NEWLAND: Sure. So let me try to answer your three questions in turn. We have had -- we have been coordinating with folks at USDA about this and their subsistence management regime and policy generally and we have regular conversations with them.

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

With respect to USDA's budget, I don't have an answer for you there. Not to be flippant, it's enough to manage our own budget here at the Department of the Interior, but we've certainly, you know, been emphasizing the importance of subsistence management as a priority of the Administration.

272829

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

Third. I hear you the need for budget and funding. Last Friday I was in Anchorage and met with the Federal Subsistence Board along with Secretary Haaland and we heard a lot about the budgetary needs of the Board but also the RACs and just generally for subsistence management. I don't want to say that I hear you that \$1.5 million doesn't go far but I also want to say it's not nothing and that we're trying to put our money where our mouth is here and get that trajectory moving in the right direction. Because this is important and I think as we see with all the management pressures, climate change and other things you guys have to deal with, your work only gets more complicated and as it does we've got to prioritize our response.

43 44 45

46

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Are there other questions from Council members for Mr. Newland.

47 48 49

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: If you have time I have one additional question myself then. This is —does this mean that the position — or the Office of Subsistence Management would be under a position that is overseen by a political appointee and how — what is the thought on how that would transition each time Administrations change in terms of the time it takes to kind of get up to speed on how subsistence is managed in the State of Alaska?

MR. NEWLAND: So that's 'a great question. So I am a political appointee. The person who came before me, Assistant Secretary Sweeney was a political appointee and whoever does this job next will be as well. So my position is a political appointment. I will say that Sue does a fantastic job at OSM and her position is not a political appointment, which I know you understand. And so, you know, I think there are obviously things that change with different Administrations and different officials but the day to day work doesn't change too much for our team and I would expect that to continue with OSM.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for that. Any last minute questions for Council members.

MR. NEWLAND: Can I have just one last The Department of the Interior is a piece on that. very large State agency, it's one of the largest in the Federal government, not only with it's reach from Alaska all the way down to the Territories but also the size of the number of employees and so it's easy for agencies and programs to get lost in the shuffle and not have visibility from the Secretary and from Senior Officials here at the Department and while there may be some benefits in the long-term of insulating agencies from turnover of Administration, raising the visibility of offices and giving them direct access to policymakers tends to -- is a reflection of priority and also tends to -- visibility tends to yield itself in the budgeting process as well. Not every year and not in all cases but overall this is aimed at elevating the importance of OSM here at the Department.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. It does not look like we have any other questions so I'd really like to thank you for your time today in calling in and giving us a little update on something

that we've known about but had not heard directly from the Department of Interior about yet so thank you for that Mr. Newland.

MR. NEWLAND: Thank you guys very much. Also, again, thank you for the work you do and for allowing me an opportunity to come and share what we're doing. Take care.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. All right, just to remind everybody we are currently going through the presentation of the Proposal Wildlife 24-05 regarding Hoonah area and it looks like our Federal Staff is going to be able to put up a map for us right now so we'll go ahead and continue. This is part of the proposal presentation and answers to the questions that the Council members have asked of OSM and the Forest Service.

## (Pause)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.

 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: All right, thank you, Madame Chair. Again, take everything I say here with a grain of salt because I'm not super familiar with this area but I'll try to give you a quick tour of what I do know.

So here is Hoonah and so accessible right out from town so imagine you just got off the ferry from Juneau, you know, with nothing but your pickup truck. This is sort of the main line road system leads, you know, southwest from here.

## Scroll.

And then head's down, you know, down into Freshwater Bay and that sort of -- in that area, and then out here, out into like Falls Bay and that sort of thing so that's -- I would imagine that that's probably one of the areas that a lot of, you know, folks from Juneau arriving are hunting in that area.

You can see the little blue blobs here, I believe that those are timber harvest units, it may be more extensive than that.

And then the other main areas that are

just -- where my pointer is here, is that Eight Fathom, where I mentioned earlier, so there's a Forest Service cabin near there then a road system goes up to Neka Hot Springs and that sort of thing. So I don't know -- I know that that area can be -- you know, is awfully accessible by folks who come in by boat and could bring ATVs and that sort of thing.

There is another road system access here at Salt Lake, I believe it's called, and then that also leads down into here, down along sort of Tenakee Inlet, almost all the way down there.

And, again, Whitestone Harbor, you know, is here, that's where we mentioned earlier.

Then I believe there's a fair bit amount of private land here, along this section of Freshwater Bay.

I also have it -- it may be also helpful, is the motor vehicle use map, which shows some of these things a little bit better labeled. What it doesn't show, though, is on any of these -- since this is a Forest Service map it doesn't show it doesn't show the road system from timber harvest on tribal and private lands. Just from my personal experience, I know that this whole area here, which I see every time I drive a boat into Hoonah, has been extensively clearcut and there's also extensive road system along there. I believe that a lot of folks maybe just, you know, take a skiff across Port Frederick and access, you know, that road system from there.

And it sounds like Mr. Smith may also have some other personal experience there so, you know, if you have anything to add, but, yeah, so that's sort of the quick synopsis of my limited knowledge of the Hoonah road system.

 $$\operatorname{ACTING}$  CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Question,Mr. Schroeder, and then Mr. Smith, if you have a question.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, while we have Jake up there, Wildlife Analysis Area 3526, which is the north side of Tenakee Inlet, Tenakee is a community, to my understanding is not connected by road to the Hoonah road system although I think you could get there if

you're an aggressive fourwheeler driver. Is that still the situation?

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, that's -- I think you would have to be awfully aggressive but, it sounds like Mr. Smith probably has some insight into that.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, when I -- when I saw the first map there's a lot of roads that I don't see that I know that are, and even looking at this map here there's roads missing just like you shared. And if you want to get to Tenakee, you can drive in your car all the way pretty darn close to that location and it only takes 20 minutes, maybe -- well, for me, take about 20 minutes, maybe others it might take longer, but you can walk right into Tenakee if you wanted to so it's not that -- but even on Westport you see Port Frederick on the -- the far side like you were saying there's actually a logging camp that was there. We called it Westport and I logged all that area and I logged a lot of the other areas that you see but there's a landing there that they can actually go on to and fourwheelers and brah, brah, brah and you can take off -- if you look at the road you can even -- I was sharing with Patricia earlier, too, you can almost get to Pelican from some of the roads. Even the -- the Forest Service road, a lot of people go down there, there's a dock that's down there and a lot of my family go down in there and they'll get their fourwheelers on there, they'll go up into the hot tub that the Forest Service -- it's beautiful, I love it up there, and I do appreciate the Forest Service and them maintaining a lot of those locations and a lot of our families use those locations, even some that they condemned, we still use those buildings that they don't maintain anymore.

So there's a lot of roads from the main road, you're seeing a straight line, but there's hundreds of roads that are going off of this here that, you know, they're not going to mark those apparently but most of those roads are barred off so -- and a lot of them are barred so nobody can get on to those roads, but as far as from Hoonah, when you leave Hoonah you can drive a long ways and all the side roads are all barred off so actually -- actually when they leave there and they're finished they'll rip the road out but you can still access them and drive up to the bar --

0432 and walk on to those properties and, of course, you have Hoonah Totem, you have -- I've logged for all these, Hoonah Totem, Forest Service, Sealaska has property all amongst the whole thing there so -- and 5 many access those. If you're not Alaska Native you go on Hoonah Totem there might be -- but they have Forest 7 Service access so they can go on there. So our families, you know, we hunt on your property, too, on 9 the Forest Service property, you know, following the 10 rules and the regulations. 11 12 Thank you. 13 14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 15 you. Mr. Howard has a question. 16 17 MR. HOWARD: Just an observation, 18 Madame Chair. In the '90s I went back and hunted Port 19 Frederick with my cousins and we tried to go there last 20 year and it's all overgrown. The road to Tenakee, if you don't like your vehicle, yeah, you can drive that 21 22 one but my truck just about fell apart on that road. A 23 lot of those roads, even if they're on the map you 24 can't drive them. They do go up to Eight Fathom with 25 their fourwheelers, I had some friends of mine do that 26 last year but as far as go to Pelican, I'd rather go on 27 a boat because that's a long walk from the end of that 28 road. So that's just my observation. 29 30 Thank you, Madame Chair. 31

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

Ms. Phillips.

32

33 34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46 47 48

49

50

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. So the private land, corporation land is under State management, correct?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  MUSSLEWHITE: Member Phillips, through the Chair. That's correct, the management there would be done under State regs.

MS. PHILLIPS: Follow up.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

 $\,$  MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So the 3526 would be included in this proposal and would be that

the criteria or, you know, what we're asking would keep non-Federally-qualified out of 3526 during the time period that the Council recommends, so it would be an added benefit for Tenakee.

Thank you.

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, Member
Phillips, through the Chair. Yes. It sounds like it
would be an added benefit for the community of Tenakee.
I would add, however, from my personal knowledge of
Tenakee there is a very strong Juneau/Tenakee tie so an
awful lot of folks with I'd say very strong ties to
Tenakee maybe spend all summer there but they maintain
a residence in Juneau and go there for the hunting
season so there would be some, you know, complicated
effects there. Just saying.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

Mr. Casipit, did you have a question.

MR. CASIPIT: (Shakes head negatively)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Oh, sorry, I thought I saw your hand. Are there any other questions from Council members for this. Mr. Douville, was this helpful?

MR. DOUVILLE: A little bit.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. All right, thank you guys for putting that together to answer some of the questions about access to these Wildlife Analysis Units. In our next part of this proposal agency -- we're under agency comments and are there comments from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MR. CHURCHWELL: Thank you, Madame Vice Chair. This is Roy Churchwell, Regional Management Coordinator for Alaska Department of Fish and Game for the Southeast region. Many of our comments are the same as what we presented to you guys last night so I'll try to focus more on the comments that are unique to this location so we don't need to go over them again and again.

Our position is similar to the proposal from last night, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes this proposal because there are no justifications under the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act for the Federal Subsistence Board to approve this closure. As Member Casipit pointed out, I am presented opinions and ideas from many Fish and Game employees and so I am aware of the court case that Member Casipit brought up but I don't know enough about it to defend whether it should be in our comments are not. That being said I did get a response and I'll just try and read that real quick.

And so the response was: Alaska [sic] contends that the instant C&T determination places restrictions on non-subsistence taking because granting Chistochina residents a Federal subsistence priority to take moose throughout GMU 12 increases moose taking and thus necessitates greater conservation efforts by the State.

I don't know if that satisfies Member Casipit, but I'll just say that that was the response that I got.

So moving on.

The stated purpose of the proposal is to establish a meaningful preference for the continuation of subsistence use of deer however the proponents provide no substantial evidence in support of claims that the non-Federally-qualified users hunting in this area inhibit harvest by Federallyqualified subsistence users and data provided by Federally-qualified users residing in Hoonah clearly indicate that the decline in harvest by the community results from declining participation and effort by Hoonah hunters. We note that Federally-qualified users in Hoonah already enjoy several meaning preferences including an extra month of hunting opportunity in January, a liberal designated hunter program where any Federally-qualified user can hunt on behalf of another Federally-qualified user and living close to the resource which allows Federally-qualified users to hunt whenever conditions are favorable.

We also note that Hoonah Totem and Sealaska shareholders already have exclusive hunting opportunity on the substantial Alaska Native Claims

Settlement Act corporation lands near Hoonah. In contrast, non-Federally-qualified users from Juneau are limited by the Alaska Marine Highway schedule and vehicle capacity of the small ferry that serves Hoonah. Non-Federally-qualified users accessing the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area by boat from Juneau need to travel a minimum of 40 miles to Whitestone Bay or 60 miles to Hoonah during the time of year when short days and often unfavorable weather. Non-Federally-qualified users have a more restrictive bag limit of three deer east of Port Frederick and non-resident hunters, non-Alaskan residents have a more restrictive bag limit of two bucks.

Further, we could find no reference in Title VIII of ANILCA to the term meaningful preference nor could we find justification for limiting non-Federally-qualified users based on safety concerns, economics of Federally-qualified users or potential -- or the potential of altering deer behavior due to poor non-Federally-qualified user marksmanship.

We conclude there is no law justification for adopting this proposal and it should be rejected under Section .805(c)(1).

We presented ADF&G's deer abundance survey data and deer hunting effort and harvest data provided to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game by GMU 4 hunters including Hoonah residents to gage changes in measures of hunter effort and harvest, we compared the decade prior to the severe winter of 2006/2007 with the decade since 2013 when the deer population was considered recovered. Those comparisons support the following conclusions.

Deer remain abundant in the proposal area. Deer pellet group transects, area Alpine surveys and late winter mortality surveys all indicate that GMU 4 deer occur at among the highest densities in the state. Consequently there is no need to restrict take by non-Federally-qualified users to either conserve the deer population or to ensure continued subsistence use of the deer population.

The total number of hunters and numbers

of hunters from each user group, Hoonah residents, other Federally-qualified users and non-Federallyqualified users hunting deer in the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area has declined and data from the last few years indicate that trend is likely to continue. In recent years Federally-qualified user hunters are 6 7 also expending considerably less effort so total hunting pressure in the proposal area is moderate and 9 declining. IT is also likely that some of the non-10 Federally-qualified users hunting in the proposal area 11 are former Hoonah residents who moved to Juneau for 12 employment or other opportunities but return to hunt 13 with and on behalf of relative and friends in Hoonah. 14 The average number of Hoonah residents participating in 15 deer hunting each year and the days of hunting effort 16 by those hunters have declined. Between the two 17 comparison periods the average number of Hoonah 18 residents who obtain deer harvest tickets declined by 19 19 percent. Reporting -- reported hunting declined by 20 23 percent. And the days of hunting effort reported by 21 Hoonah residents declined by 54 percent. That dramatic 22 decline in hunting effort is the reason deer harvest by 23 Hoonah residents has declined, not competition from 24 non-Federally-qualified hunters. The days of hunting 25 effort Hoonah hunters require to harvest one deer 26 remains very low at 2.1 days of hunting per deer 27 harvested. The proposal emphasizes that subsistence 28 hunters need to be efficient and this is among the most 29 efficient hunting anywhere in Alaska. 30

And that concludes my remarks.

31 32 33

34

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Churchwell.

35 36

Mr. Hernandez, you have a question.

37 38 39

40

41

42

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes. I believe you stated that the Department sees -- has no concerns with people of Hoonah being able to continue their subsistence uses, that they're not being affected by the non-subsistence users. How does the State assess whether or not subsistence uses are being affected?

43 44 45

46

47

48

MR. CHURCHWELL: Mr. Hernandez. I guess my first thought on that is that we're looking at the data that we're seeing, the first one that comes to mind to me is the number of days to harvest a deer have not changed over this period and so it seems like

they're very effective in harvesting deer and so that's our -- at least one of our indicators that they're not being impacted.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So you focus on harvest it sounds like?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  CHURCHWELL: I would say that that's the first thing that comes to mind. I'm sure there's many other factors.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, yeah, we consider many other factors and I'm not sure that the State. I know we've heard testimony before about your amount necessary for subsistence that you base some of the management on, you know, those are numbers, those are harvests and we've been trying to explain that, you know, we see -- we have a completely different vision of what it means to subsist and the uses include more than just the harvest numbers. So I'm just trying to get a grasp on how the State draws their conclusions compared to how we draw our conclusions.

So I think you've answered that, thank

you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are there other questions for Mr. -- yes, Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, Roy, thanks for sticking with us here. I think you have a somewhat difficult job but that's why you're the managing coordinator. But you can fill me in, I was trying to remember why NECCUA was formed, and I couldn't remember whether it was formed to -- with respect to brown bear management or marten and if you can fill me in on that -- that's a little bit of a sideline but I can't think of anything else for a few minutes so if you could help me that would be great.

MR. CHURCHWELL: Yeah, thanks, Member Schroeder for that question. My time here at the Department is a little sense then but I guess I'll just throw out my general impression and we might get a retort from my supervisor at some point saying I was not correct. But my understanding is that that may have been developed when they were coming up with the brown bear management plan, I think that's when that came about. I know that there are brown bear

regulations associated with using vehicles to harvest brown bears in that area so I think that that was probably the case. I don't know of any regulations about marten harvest so I do believe it's associated with brown bears.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Mr. Kitka, you have a question.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I was more curious as to corporation lands. If the corporation (excuse me) -- if the corporation decided (excuse me) that only their shareholders could hunt on their lands, what would the State's stand be?

MR. CHURCHWELL: Yeah, Member Kitka. Once again it's just my understanding answering the question and so we'll have to take that into account, but I do believe if the folks only wanted -- if they wanted to only allow shareholders to harvest animals on those lands, that the State would agree with that and not have any issues with that. I do believe there are other places in Alaska where corporation lands are only the shareholders on those lands can harvest animals, and so I don't think that's a new thing for the State.

 $\mbox{ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM:} \quad \mbox{All right, thank} \\ \mbox{you.} \quad \mbox{Are there any other questions.} \\$ 

Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. What percentage of hunters report harvest for this area?

MR. CHURCHWELL: Yeah, I do have some numbers on that. And I guess I'll say this is the reporting rate, it could be that they reported that they did harvest or didn't harvest but it's what they reported — or the percentage that did report. So for Hoonah 61 percent of hunters reported. We also talked about how Gustavus is associated with this hunt and they have the highest reporting rate of 88 percent. And we don't have Tenakee-specific numbers, but that's what I have.

 $\label{eq:acting chair needham: All right, Mr. Schroeder.} Acting chair needham: All right, Mr. Schroeder.$ 

MR. SCHROEDER: Just a follow up on that reporting, Roy. I know I keep getting reminders from Fish and Game if I forget to report, is -- what kind of follow through goes on with Hoonah hunters on that? I mean I get, you know, through my email account because that's usually the way I get deer tags or other things and Fish and Game reminds me enough until I get worried about it and then I make sure that a report goes in. Are you following up pretty closely with Hoonah hunters, not all of whom are as connected to the internet as I might be?

MR. CHURCHWELL: Yeah, through the Chair. Mr. Schroeder. The Hoonah hunters are getting the same reminders that you are to report. As the OSM analysis suggested, we do try to get at least 60 percent of folks reporting and if we don't get that we will make some phone calls and similar to what Mr. Howard had earlier this year, to try to boost that up to at least 60 percent. And so we do try to focus on that to get it up to a certain level, whether that's in Hoonah, Pelican, Angoon or any of our villages out in the area.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Are there any other questions from Council members for the State at this time.

Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you. Our Federal Staff testified that they see a tendency in the rural communities that they have a tendency to only report their successful hunts and we've talked about this before on your reporting method, you know, your essentially post card forms that have, in my opinion, pretty limited space to actually detail, you know, your hunting activities especially in a place like Hoonah where people are probably out, you know, doing a lot of other activities associated with their hunting and trying to capture all of that on a card is difficult, whereas if you're in Juneau, chances are you might be planning a hunting trip, you go out for a week and it's -- I think your cards have like six lines on it so it's pretty easy to detail your activities. Would you agree with the Federal Staff's assessment that accurate reporting from the rural communities is less accurate?

MR. CHURCHWELL: Through the Chair.

```
0440
     Mr. Hernandez. I would say that that does occur. It
     would be difficult to quantify it probably without like
     a personal survey. You know my take on it is that we
     use these data -- well, I guess you're familiar more
     with our wolf count data here on POW where we get a
    number but it may not be the actual number of wolves on
 6
 7
     the Island but if we follow those numbers from one year
     to the next, especially if we get 10 years of data we
     can see trends in that, and I think that that would be
10
     similar of how we should look at this reporting data.
11
     I feel like if a person is likely to only report the
     deer harvest that they get and not necessarily the
12
13
     number of days they're probably going to do that from
14
     one year to the next, and so I think the patterns are
15
     fairly similar and so we should be looking more at
16
     trends than the actual number is how I would suggest we
17
     look at those data.
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
20
21
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, last
22
     call, any other Council questions for the State Alaska
23
     Department of Fish and Game.
24
25
                     (No comments)
26
27
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
28
     you, Mr. Churchwell.
29
30
                     Next under agency comments, are there
31
     any comments from other Federal agencies.
32
33
                     (No comments)
34
35
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any
36
     comments on the proposal from tribal entities.
37
38
                     (No comments)
39
40
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any
41
     Advisory Group comments, other Regional Councils.
42
43
                     MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair.
44
45
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Fish and Game
46
     Advisory Committees.
47
48
                     MS. PERRY: Nope.
49
```

0441 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Or Subsistence 2 Resource Commissions. 3 4 MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair. 5 6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. 7 have already heard the summary of written public comments and so do we have any public testimony. Can 8 9 our Council Coordinator please check with folks online. 10 11 MS. PERRY: For those folks who are participating online, if you would like to give a 12 13 public comment please press star, five so that we can 14 see that you wish to make a comment. If there's anyone 15 in the room who would like to make a comment, if you'll fill out one of these blue cards and bring them to me 16 17 so that we know that you'd like to comment, that would 18 be great. Again, if you're on the phone, star, five. 19 I do have two commenters, Madame Chair. 20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, we 21 22 can take public testimony over the phone at this time. 23 24 MS. PERRY: For the person calling in 25 whose number ends in 3-2, if you would like to press 26 star, six to unmute your line and go ahead and give us 27 your comment. Again, make sure you press star, six, 28 and I see that your line is now muted [sic], please go 29 ahead. 30 31 MR. ORR: I'm unmuted, you mean? 32 33 REPORTER: Yes, that's what she meant. 34 35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, go ahead. 36 37 MR. ORR: Okay. All right, so my name 38 is Nicholas Orr. I'm on the Juneau/Douglas Advisory 39 Committee although I'm not the President and I'm 40 certainly not speaking for them in this capacity. 41 will note that the Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee 42 submitted written comments on all three of these 43 proposals so it's a little strange to hear that there 44 are no comments from the Committee. 45 46 But I will say that my main issue with 47 this proposal, just to be clear, there is no

conservation issue, is that there doesn't seem to be --

non-Federally-qualified users don't seem to be

48

49

inhibiting the continuation of subsistence uses by Federally-qualified users. And I think Roy kind of put the -- like pinpoint, the statistics we can look at, which is hunter efficacy which is, you know, days per deer and this is second in the state for large animals so it's kind of tough to make that call that there's an inhibiting of continuation of subsistence uses.

And I know that priority is important under ANILCA and the Federally-qualified users in this area have priority by the January season and by the Federally designated hunter program.

So for those reasons I would urge you guys not to pass this proposal and that's the end — that's all I got to say.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for calling in. Were they finished?

REPORTER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, okay. DeAnna, do you have the next public comment, please.

MS. PERRY: I do and I did want to let the last caller know that we did receive Advisory Committee comments and I believe they were put into a packet that the Council did get. I do not have them right in front of me but the Council is aware of those and I think maybe they were summarized with the written public comments that Dr. Roberts gave previously.

Okay, one more commenter on the phone, Madame Chair. This caller's number ends in 3-7, if that is your number, please, go ahead I can see that your microphone is open.

MR. BEASON: Thank you, very much. This is Ryan Beason, I'm with the Territorial Sportsmen. We, again, propose -- oppose this Proposal, 2405. I think the biggest thing is -- and I'll give a little bit of my personal experience. This is the unit I hunt almost exclusively. The last three years I've had the most successful hunting I've ever had, whether it's in the Alpine, in November, in the woods or on the beach. During the first two weeks of November, it's some of the best hunting I've ever had.

0443 1 REPORTER: Ryan, are you still there? 2 3 MR. BEASON: Hi, I apologize about 4 that, it somehow muted me again. 5 6 REPORTER: Okay, no problem, go ahead. 7 8 MR. BEASON: But where I left off is 9 I've had -- am I good to go? 10 11 REPORTER: Yes. 12 13 MR. BEASON: I apologize. But what I 14 was saying I've had some of the best hunting I've had 15 in the last three years in this unit. 16 17 And another thing I'll add is obviously 18 we know how the Federal Subsistence Board ruled earlier 19 this year on very similar proposals and I would ask the 20 Council, how are these proposals different and how are 21 they now allowed? I think we need to look at how the 22 Subsistence Boar, the FSB ruled, take that into 23 consideration and see if these comments -- or these 24 proposals are even allowed, that's the biggest thing, 25 is, how are these now allowed when they were voted down 26 earlier this year. 27 28 I will also say that, you know, this is 29 a huge area, Northern Chichagof Island, how -- or why 30 are some of these areas even included. Before today 31 there's been no mention of Tenakee whatsoever, why is 32 Tenakee included in this, why are some of the western 33 areas included in this that have very little or no 34

roads. This is a huge area being closed down.

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45 46

47 48

49

50

And I'd also like to mention, too, is I would like to look for options to improve access for Federally-qualified users while at the same time not limiting access to non-Federally-qualified users, whether that be an earlier season in July potentially like in Unit 2.

And kind of with that I would just hope that the Council opposes these proposals going forward and if you have any questions I'll do my best to answer those and thank you for your time.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for calling in and providing that testimony. Ms.

Perry, are there any other public comments on the phone at this time?

 MS. PERRY: Not at this time but just as a reminder if anyone on the phone would like to comment if you'll press star, five, that will indicate on our end that you'd like to speak and, Madame Chair, we do not have any blue cards for any testimony from anyone in the room.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. That gets us to a point where we've had the presentation of the proposal and all of the things in our process up until the point where the Council would go into deliberations. We are at a break point right now where we can handle other agenda item real quick and then break for lunch, and I'm told that Tony Christensen is in the building and would like to address the Council, he's in the other room if somebody could grab him and ask him if he wants to come in and address the Council before lunch please.

(Pause)

MR. GALLEGOS: You were looking for me, or Tony Christensen, I don't know?

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: My apologies, I thought I was told Mr. Christianson was here for the thing so I'm not exactly sure what's happening but do you need a few moments of our time before we break for lunch or did you have some kind of presentation.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  GALLEGOS: I have a short presentation, we did have a presentation recorded and I'm on the schedule for reports.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Will you be here just after lunch?

MR. GALLEGOS: I will.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Let's go ahead and break for lunch and have -- because we are in the middle of a proposal process so I was just going to allow the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board to say a few words.....

(Laughter)

0445 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....which is a 2 little bit different than interrupting it with a 3 presentation. 4 5 (Laughter) 6 7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So how does the Council feel about being back within 50 minutes or even 8 9 shorter, we're running kind of short on time. Can we 10 -- do you want a half an hour or do you want to be back 11 at 1:00 -- half hour or 1:00 o'clock. 12 13 (Off record comments regarding lunch) 14 15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, I'm hearing mixed signals so let's go for 1:00 o'clock, 16 17 we'll take the 50 minutes so that folks can get things 18 that they need to get done, done over lunch time so 19 we'll recess for lunch and be back at 1:00 o'clock. 20 21 (Off record) 22 23 (On record) 24 25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: If we can get 26 all Council members into the room so that we can begin 27 our afternoon session. 28 29 (Pause) 30 31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, we're 32 going to get started with this afternoon. If the last 33 few Council members in the hall could trickle in that'd 34 be great. As a reminder of where we are, we are --35 we've heard the presentation and comments for Wildlife 36 Proposal 24-05 for the Hoonah area and so we will now 37 potentially entertain a motion from the Council so we 38 can enter deliberations regarding this proposal. 39 40 Mr. Hernandez. 41 42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I move 43 to adopt Wildlife Proposal 24-05. 44 45 MR. SCHROEDER: Second. 46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. It's 47 48 been moved and seconded to adopt Proposal -- Wildlife 49 Proposal 24-05 and at this time if there are any

Council comments to put into the record that would address our justification.

Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame Chair, Well, it may be premature but I'm thinking about offering up an amendment to this proposal as well. We did make an amendment on the previous proposal affecting the folks at Angoon and I'm thinking that maybe we should be consistent, I don't want to have different areas necessarily have different time periods of closures that could be confusing to folks and then I'm also -- we have a fair amount of discussion about the area encompassing the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area and, you know, how extensively that may be used by folks in Angoon [sic] and folks elsewhere.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{So}}$$  maybe at this time I will offer up an amendment and see what the rest of the Council thinks.

I'm really hesitant to do this not having our Council representative from Hoonah available but hopefully there's enough local knowledge here on the Council to maybe discuss this and at least put it up for a motion.

So I'm going to move to amend Wildlife Proposal 24-05 so that it would change the closure date to November 1st to November 10th. And then I think I might also offer up the amendment to remove Wildlife Analysis Area 3526, that is the very southern end of the NECCUA and it's, as we found out in our presentation, it is not on that Hoonah road system and may not have as much conflict there, it also encompasses the community of Tenakee Springs which we really didn't have much information on in our analysis and I'm kind of hesitant to include the immediate area around that community without a lot of good information.

So I'll offer those up as amendments.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Was that a motion then?

```
0447
 1
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, that was a
 2
    motion to amend.
 3
 4
                     MS. PHILLIPS: So I'll second that, but
 5
     I was also wondering about wet NECCUA 4222, 4252, 4253,
     I mean 90 percent of the harvest is in the east NECCUA,
 6
 7
     so for Hoonah residents, according to the analysis.
     And that means like only 10 percent occurs in the west
     -- or possibly the west NECCUA. I don't know if that
10
    would be appropriate, you know, it's not connected to
11
    the road system either. Like you said our Hoonah
12
     representative isn't here to ask about it.
13
14
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. So for a
15
    lack of a second on Mr. Hernandez' motion then....
16
17
                     MS. PERRY: Well, Patty did second it.
18
19
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Oh, you did
20
    second it?
21
22
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
23
24
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Oh, okay. So we
25
    do have an amendment on the floor that doesn't include
26
    those so maybe we can handle the current amendment,
27
     after some discussion, and then determine whether or
28
    not we need to add the additional Wildlife Analysis
29
    Areas.
30
31
                     So the amendment on the floor includes
32
     -- Mr. Hernandez.
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a quick
35
    procedural question, if Patty were to withdraw her
36
     second could I restate the motion?
37
38
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair, I'll
39
    withdraw.
40
41
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr.
42
    Hernandez....
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that
45
     appropriate?
46
47
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: ..... believe
48
     you made the amended motion so you have to withdraw and
49
     she has to concur.
50
```

0448 1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. 2 Then I would like to withdraw my amended motion with the concurrence of the second. 4 5 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair. I concur 6 with withdrawing the motion. 7 8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. 9 10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, we 11 are back to the main motion. Mr. Hernandez, did you 12 want to offer a new amendment? 13 14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you, 15 Madame Chair. So I would like to offer up an altered 16 amendment and that amendment would be: 17 18 To change the time of the closure from 19 November 1st to November 10th, different from what is 20 stated in the existing proposal, which is November 1st 21 to the November 15th. So change that to November 1st to November 10th. And delete Wildlife Analysis Area 22 23 3526 and Wildlife Analysis Area 4222. 24 25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a 26 second. 27 28 MS. PHILLIPS: Second. 29 30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 31 amendment, is there discussion by the Council regarding 32 the amendment to remove Wildlife Analysis Areas 4222, 33 and 3526 and shorten the closure period from November 34 1st to the 15th and now November 1st through the 10th. 35 36 Discussion. 37 38 Mr. Hernandez. 39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame 40 41 Chair. Yes, I think, you know, we -- this is a 42 proposal from the Council and I think it's fairly 43 typical that the Council when it puts in a proposal, 44 you know, it would include as much time and area in the 45 speculative closure as, you know, we think might be 46 appropriate. Then we get the analysis, we get the 47 public comments, we get a lot more information, so I 48 think making an amendment to the original proposal

based on what we've heard I think is an appropriate

49

0449 thing to do and we have had a lot of good analysis and a lot of public comment on this so, yeah, that's my reasoning for making the amendment. 4 5 And like I said I think we also want to 6 be consistent in our closure dates with what we've done 7 previously in the Unit 4 recommendations on previous 8 proposals. 9 10 So that's my rationale for the 11 amendment. 12 13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 14 Hernandez. Is there any other discussion on the 15 amendment. 16 17 MS. PHILLIPS: Ouestion. 18 19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the 20 question's been called so we'll have a vote on the 21 amendment to reduce the closure time from November 1st 22 to the 10th and remove Wildlife Analysis 4222 and 3526. 23 Is there anybody on the phone? 24 25 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, I could 26 suggest if you wanted to do the motion to amend by 27 unanimous consent and then we could do a roll call on 28 the motion as amended. 29 30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms. 31 Perry. So if we can get this by unanimous consent, if 32 anybody opposes the amendment please speak at this 33 time. 34 35 (No opposition) 36 37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, back to the main motion which is now Wildlife Proposal 24-05 38 39 which will now include closing a portion of the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area from November 40 41 1st through the 10th, and it would include Wildlife 42 Analysis Areas 4252, 4253, 3526, 3524, 3525 and 3551. 43 44 MS. PHILLIPS: Not 3526.... 45 46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm sorry, which 47 one did I forget? 48

MS. PHILLIPS: You included 3526 and it

49

-- we're withdrawing that.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. the Wildlife Analysis Areas include 4252, 4253, 3524, 3523, 3525, 3551.

9 10

4

Is there any discussion from Council members regarding the proposal, and I will remind you that we do need to provide justification on the record that addresses the key points that we normally address when we deliberate proposals.

11 12 13

Mr. Bemis.

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BEMIS: I agree with the proposal and I think it's only right that we treat all the areas the same beings they're as close as they are, and if there was some kind of affect where there was a lack of animals or deer, that you might have a little different on this but beings that's not the case and the weather conditions are different and it wouldn't favor the subsistence user at this time to be able to have a fair hunt on it, it looks like we're kind of behind on the weather system unless it changes.

24 25 26

And I think that we've all made a good decision on this.

27 28

Thank you.

29 30 31

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Bemis. Any other comments regarding the proposal.

32 33 34

Mr. Hernandez.

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair. I'm going to support the proposal. I think we can acknowledge that we don't see an overall conservation concern, however, I think we do have a pretty good indication that in this area that we're talking about that there could be localized depletions. I think that was brought out in the analysis. There's a lot of heavily logged areas and stem inclusion zones that are probably not providing very much good deer habitat anymore, kind of lessens the available hunting opportunities. So for -- I'm not talking about an overall conservation concern, we are focused, once, again, on the continuation of subsistence uses as a rationale for restriction on non-Federally-qualified

1 users.

 And I think in the instance of the Hoonah area, I think we have a lot of good information about user conflicts and how the -- between subsistence and non-subsistence users, competition being a factor, a lot of easy access on the ferry, people come to Hoonah from other areas, you know, creates the situation so I think we're definitely looking at a situation where needs -- people are having a difficult time meeting their needs and continuing their subsistence uses in the area due to people from non-subsistence areas coming to utilize the area.

 $$\operatorname{So}\ I$$  think that's our main rationale for a restriction.

And I still point out that there's a very large area in Unit 4 that is still available to all hunters for the entire season. I think that's a pretty reasonable argument for our recommendation not unnecessarily restricting other users.

So I think that's my main considerations.

 $\label{eq:ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.} \\ \text{Hernandez.}$ 

Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just to highlight some things that came out in the Staff presentation on this proposal. Will note that the population of Hoonah has been rising somewhat, has risen quite a bit since that epic study was done by Schroeder and Kookesh in 1990, which is cited in the report, but population is up somewhat in Table 5, possibly 15 percent or so. If we look at Table 7 this indicates that in the 10 year time period for which data are available that non-Federally-qualified hunters accounted for the majority of harvest in November and, you know, so there shows that there's a significant amount of harvest by people from Juneau and other said communities.

I think we continue to be rather frustrated with the harvest ticket permit data. Every time this comes up we're frustrated with it because basically we have a system that is pretty good at

6 7

9

11

12

13

14

15

tracking big trends but isn't very accurate on a very fine scale level so it would be really great if we had better harvest data from Hoonah. In particular we did hear from the State representative that the response rate was something like 60 percent, which from a statistical point of view is somewhat iffy if you consider the general rubric for survey research, this isn't really survey research -- if you get -- you're happy if you have a 95 percent response, you're feeling okay if you have a 90 percent response and then you're kind of in the boy I'm not sure that's really right if you get below that, and there isn't any real magic there it's simply that if you have a large number of non-respondents they -- the true value may be very different from what you extrapolate from the 60 percent that you get.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

If we look at Table 10 this is kind of a little bit difficult to unpack but, you know, this Table 10 shows -- and this is, again, based on harvest ticket data so we'll take that with a grain of salt, or a grain of something else, but, overall harvest are down from what they were in kind of the end of the big logging era which was in the 2000 to 2005 period where there was a lot of activity in Hoonah, and you also had a lot of temporary logging residents who probably hunted but if we look at bottom line things there, the Hoonah harvest by this, again, qualified data source, give a five year average of 2016 to 2020 of 230 deer for Hoonah versus 347 deer for non-Federally-qualified users, so what we have is a shift over time. If you look higher up on the chart, Hoonah, in the much earlier period 2001 to 2005 had a proportion of harvest that was Hoonah versus the non-Federally-qualified users was really different, it was 526 versus 309. this is some numerical indication of just increased hunting in Hoonah mostly by people in Juneau.

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

Anecdotally, since I'm a Juneau resident I know of quite a few people who go over and hunt in Hoonah. It's -- Southeast is kind of stormy, not everyone has a boat that they're comfortable going out and staying on and putting your truck on the blue canoe of the Alaska Marine Highway System is a pretty good option, getting off, driving up the road in Hoonah, camping someplace and possibly getting a bunch of deer. I think I had -- I think one of my sons went up there with a real expert hunter that he was with and, you know, they just went up and expected to limit

out as long as they could chase the bears away because the bears in Hoonah apparently recognize shots as being like dinner bells.

So that's some of the stuff that's in there.

We also would see someplace in here the overall harvest level is presented in pounds per capita based on a number of years, nothing is really current, but without looking through to find that, what that table shows is that at least based on the data source cited, that the amount of deer taken on a per capita basis either in numbers of deer or pounds of meat per household has gone way down in the time period mentioned.

So we have these indications that there is some threat to subsistence uses and a pretty good justification for saying that action needs to be taken to protect subsistence uses, leaving aside the question of whether or not there's a real local conservation concerning, meaning a local depletion of deer, that may be the case but we don't have strong evidence for that.

As a general justification and which should be included by reference to this proposal is our larger statement as we mentioned for the previous proposal on what our obligation is to protect subsistence uses under our charge under ANILCA, and this may very well fit that situation. And just to say again since this is will go through as a separate item before the Federal Subsistence Board, basically these sorts of things are what ANILCA envisioned in 1980 when it was signed, that there just would be increased competition for resources and that the reason for there being ANILCA protections was to make sure that as Alaska's population grew, as technical changes took place that allowed people to get to -- allowed urban people to get to rural areas quicker and easier and maybe hunt more efficiently, that these things would occur. And so what we're doing is we're addressing what ANILCA writers thought we should be doing when they crafted this Legislation 43 years ago, is that right, Patty?

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

MR. SCHROEDER: 43 years ago.

So I think we're on pretty good grounds here. I'm frustrated that I haven't heard from our -- directly in this meeting from our Council member from Hoonah and that's the one thing that's kind of missing in my reasoning.

And one other thing, I think it's completely appropriate to reduce the proposal although we already voted on that particularly eliminating the Wildlife Analysis Area that is basically Tenakee Inlet. Tenakee kind of marches to a different drummer and people in Tenakee, from my personal knowledge, don't really go across into the other part of NECCUA very much and they definitely don't want people from Hoonah and other places to use the road system to access the areas really close to Tenakee Inlet.

So that's what I got, I think we're in pretty good shape on this proposal.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

Schroeder.

Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I'll be referencing the preliminary results of the SASSI Deer Work Force Southeast Subsistence RAC prepared by Ian Johnson, Hoonah Indian Association 10/24/23.

For Hoonah on Figure 3 is a graphical representation of primary concern rankings and in Hoonah competition was the primary reason and underneath that is Table 9, Table 7 it shows the primary -- if the respondent identified competition as a primary concern they were asked further to define what competition was doing to their hunt and it was impacting abundance, it was scaring deer making hunting more difficult, keeping them from hunting preferred areas and feeling unsafe while hunting.

I would also like to note that according to the Staff analysis that 90 percent of deer hunting effort and harvest by Hoonah residents occurs within the NECCUA and there's -- let's see the higher cost of -- they cannot afford to hunt outside the local

core subsistence areas, that's on Page 205, and so the core area is the NECCUA and it's important for meeting their subsistence needs. And the average for take for — the five year average for the years 2016 to 2020 for all Federally-qualified users was 347 harvest and the harvest for non-Federally-qualified users was 347 so it was a 50/50 take for Federally-qualified versus non-Federally-qualified so it is having a substantial — the non-Federally-qualified harvest is substantial.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms. Phillips. Mr. Smith, did you have comments.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, just a couple facts of it was about 1999 when we wrapped up Whitestone so back then there was a couple thousand people, you know, it was a very busy town but, you know, today I'm looking at probably between 800 and a thousand people, just to share kind of a population in that area.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Are there any other Council comments regarding the amended Wildlife Proposal 24-05.

Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: I'd simply add in one other thing concerning the change which took off -- I think it's Wildlife Analysis Area that ends in 22, is that right, no, I'm wrong. I got to find the Wildlife Analysis Area here.

 $\,$  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The two Wildlife Analysis Areas that we removed were 4222 and 3526.

MR. SCHROEDER: Okay, it's 4222. And that may include or if it doesn't include, it's right on the edge of Gull Cove and restricting hunting in that area would impact a lodge and business that's operated in that area for quite awhile and would probably unduly, unnecessarily reduce the lodge activity and the non-local hunters who come there without much benefit for subsistence users.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Schroeder. Any other Council comments on the proposal.

0456	
1	(No comments)
2 3	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: If there's no
4	other Council comments I'd entertain a question.
5 6	MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.
7	no. Initiatio. Call for the question.
8 9	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. The question's been called. We'll now have a roll call
10	vote on Wildlife Proposal 24-05 as amended, which
11	requests to close a portion of Northeast Chichagof
12 13	Controlled Use Area to deer hunting by non-Federally- qualified users from November 1st through November
14	10th. Ms. Perry, can you do the roll call vote.
15	MG DEDDY W W I GI
16 17	MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair.
18	Albert Howard.
19 20	MR. HOWARD: Yes.
21	PIK. HOWAKD. 165.
22	MS. PERRY: Don Hernandez.
23 24	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
25	
26 27	MS. PERRY: Patty Phillips.
28	MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
29 30	MS. PERRY: Louie Wagner, Jr.
31	no. Illiani. Boate wagner, or.
32 33	MR. WAGNER: Yes.
34	MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
35	ND WITTING
36 37	MR. KITKA: Yes.
38	MS. PERRY: John Smith.
39 40	MR. SMITH: Yes.
41	
42 43	MS. PERRY: Larry Bemis.
44	MR. BEMIS: Yes.
45	MC DEDDY. Cal Carinit
46 47	MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
48	MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
49 50	
50	

```
0457
 1
                     MS. PERRY: Mike Douville.
 2
 3
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
 4
 5
                     MS. PERRY: And on the phone checking
 6
     for our Council Member Frank Wright. Frank, if you're
 7
     on the line press star, six to unmute your phone.
 8
 9
                     (No comments)
10
11
                     MS. PERRY: And I'm not seeing Frank's
12
     phone number on my list here so I don't believe he was
13
     able to join us today.
14
15
                     Mr. Slater, had joined us just before
16
     lunch, Mr. Slater are you with us for a vote?
17
18
                     (No comments)
19
20
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Slater, if you are
21
     still online, star, six to unmute your phone.
22
23
                     (No comments)
24
25
                     MS. PERRY: I thought I just saw his or
26
    possibly Mr. -- okay, it looks like he just dropped
27
     off. All right. And Cathy Needham.
28
29
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
30
31
                     MS. PERRY: Robert Schroeder.
32
33
                     MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair.
36
     This motion passes 11 to zero and two absent.
37
38
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
39
     Perry. All right, next up on the agenda we have
     Wildlife Proposal 24-06, Pelican area closed to non-
40
41
     Federally-qualified users from November 1st through the
42
     15th, Unit 4. And I have Mr. Roberts from OSM.
43
44
                     MR. ROBERTS: All right, thank you, Ms.
45
     Vice Chair and members of the Council. This is Jason
46
    Roberts, Anthropologist at OSM. I'll be presenting a
     summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal 24-06.
47
48
     The analysis for this proposal begins on Page 222 of
49
     your meeting book.
50
```

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Proposal WP24-06 was submitted by the Southeast Council. The proponents are requesting to close a portion of Northeast Chichagof Island around Pelican to deer hunting by non-Federally-qualified users from November 1st through November 15th. specific closure area would include Federal public lands within drainages flowing into Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait and Stag Bay south of a line connecting Soapstone and Collum Points and north of a line connecting Point Theodore and Point Uray. This proposed closure area encompasses parts of Wildlife Analysis Areas 3417, 3418, 3419 and 3421. This area is approximately 218 square miles in size or roughly 11 percent of Chichagof Island. You can see this proposed closure area illustrated on Figures 1 and 2 on Pages 226 and 227 of your meeting book.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

The proponents state that they submitted WP24-06 to establish a meaningful preference for the continuation of subsistence uses of deer by Federally-qualified users in the Pelican area. Pelican residents depend on deer as a key component of their subsistence lifestyles, however, the proponents assert that residents in this area have been experiencing difficulty harvesting enough deer to meet their needs because of increasing competition and user conflict with non-Federally-qualified users. The proponents explained that high fuel costs, depressed economies, small boats and inclimate weather are all impacting the ability of Pelican residents to meet their needs. Pelican residents cannot afford to have unsuccessful deer hunts or travel far from the community to hunt deer. Non-Federally-qualified users exacerbate these concerns by obstructing access, competing for deer and potentially altering deer behavior all of which decrease the chances of successful subsistence hunts and hinder the continuation of subsistence uses. Subsistence livelihoods require effective and efficient harvest. The proponents note that the proposed two week closure window in early November is the most efficient time for subsistence deer hunting. The proponents assert that this two week closure would allow for the continuation of subsistence uses and provide for a meaningful subsistence preference enhancing opportunity for subsistence users in helping them meet their needs by reducing competition and improving access to hunting areas during the most important time of deer for subsistence deer hunting.

2

5

6

7

Additionally, the proponents note the proposed closure area is limited in scope but represents the area most hunted by Pelican residents. The proponents state that this closure will have a relatively small impact on non-Federally-qualified users who would maintain significant time and space to hunt deer in Unit 4 but that the closure would greatly benefit local subsistence users.

8 9 10

Getting into some population

information.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

There have been no recently reported deer pellet surveys conducted in the proposal area. The last deer pellet surveys conducted on Chichagof Island took place at Pavlof Bay in 2019 and Finger Mountain in 2018. The average pellet groups counted per plot for each of these surveys indicated a high density deer population. Recent pellet surveys conducted in other parts of Unit 4 have generally indicated increasing populations from prior years. However, as a long time Pelican resident cautioned, I've hunted in Game Management Unit 4 since 1993 and have been very aware of the deer population. I have always hunted the good time between October 20th and November 24th or so, around Thanksgiving and I can witness there's a significant decrease in the population in the Pelican area. In 1998 as I would walk through my three acres and the hillsides going up the hill to hunt you would frequently see multiple deer droppings, multiple areas of droppings, now as I walk through three to eight acres of the area near Sunnyside, it's hardly one dropping for every 10 feet. So there is a significant decrease in the population in the Lisianski Inlet. I am also familiar with areas outside the inlet and I've seen a larger population there before where we've seen herds of deer, seven or eight at times in the past, we're seeing two or three now. I think the deer population in Lisianski Inlet is in danger of not being able to reproduce and keep the herd up.

41 42 43

44

45 46

47

48

Aerial Alpine survey work began in 2013. These surveys are intended to be flown each summer before the hunting season with deer seen per hour considered the standard unit of measurement. I was not able to find any reports of aerial Alpine surveys having been conducted over the proposal area. Recent surveys were flown over Southern Admiralty

Island and Northeast Chichagof Island from 2015 to 2018.

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

Annual harvest data estimated from harvest reports and hunter surveys can also provide another indicator of deer population status and potential change over time. The estimated average yearly harvest in the Wildlife Analysis Areas encompassed by the proposal area decreased by approximately 16 percent or 42 deer between the 2011 to '15 and the 2016 to 2020 reporting periods. However, at least some of this reduction in harvest could be attributed to a similar reduction in the average number of reported hunters and average reported hunter days witnessed between these two reporting periods. Overall there's been a substantial decline in the average reported hunters per year, average reported hunter days per year and average reported harvest per year in the Wildlife Analysis Areas encompassed by the proposal area between 2011 to 2005 [sic] that reporting period and the 2016 to 2020 reporting period and that information is displayed in more detail on Table 12 on Page 237 and Table 8 on Page 248 of your meeting book.

232425

Just a bit of background about Pelican.

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

Pelican is located near the Northeast coast of Chichagof Island and Lisianski Inlet. Pelican began as a commercial fishing and processing town. The commercial fishing fleet was made up of mostly family boats and Pelican was a thriving fishing community until the 1990s. Unfortunately the fishing industry, like many in this area, began a significant decline in the 1990s which culminating with the closing of the fish processing plant in 2009. Though fishing is still a key aspect of the culture in this community, the commercial fishing industry is not as strong as it was previously. And the downturn in this industry has likely played a role in the decline in Pelican's population which also started in the '90s. A Pelican resident recently explained that commercial fishing opportunities such as longlining for halibut and black cod have been decreasing and that many people left the community when Pelican Seafoods shut down. This situation is similar to that being experienced in many smaller rural communities in Southeast Alaska. Deer have been a key subsistence resource utilized by Pelican residents for many years and as I've said before generally represent the most significant

6 7

1 terrestrial source of meat for rural residents of Southeast Alaska. Pelican residents participated in a baseline household subsistence survey documenting their harvest and use of deer and other wild resources in 1987. There have been no other comprehensive subsistence studies of Pelican that I could find, however, a new one is scheduled to be conducted during the winter this year. Still, the data provided in the 9 '87 baseline study compares favorably to subsistence 10 studies conducted in nearby Unit 4 communities around 11 the same time. 91 percent of Pelican households were 12 shown to use deer and deer ranked as the second most 13 important resource in terms of bulk contribution to subsistence, trailing only non-salmon fish at that 15 time.

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

14

Like other Unit 4 communities, Pelican residents typically utilize three general hunting strategies. These strategies are broadly described as the Alpine hunt, the muskeg and Forest hunt and the beach hunt. However, due to the generally steep and rugged landscape in Unit 4 beach hunting is often a preferred strategy. Alpine hunts often require overnight camping and considerable hiking and boats are used extensively to facilitate deer hunting trips to destinations that are reached along the marine passages from Pelican. The cost of living is high in Pelican like that of many other communities like Pelican in Unit 4 and many residents' incomes are limited. Successful subsistence hunting and fishing is key to local livelihoods. Though the deer population appears to be healthy on a game management-wide level and close to carrying capacity in some parts of Unit 4, the proponents and other residents of Unit 4 have noted localized declines in deer populations in recent years which have exacerbated issues of competition between different user groups in these areas. Residents have also suggested that deer populations in Unit 4 may not be tracked at a fine enough scale to consistently capture these depletions in these localized areas and that hunter effort and harvest reporting data tends to underestimate the amount of hunting effort taking place and over estimate hunting success rates. As one Pelican resident noted, I've lived in Pelican coming up on 30 years, last year 2020 I shot one deer and my wife, my daughter and I live on a fixed income, we depend on our fish and our deer to eat, we have one ferry a month if we're lucky. Alaska Seaplanes charges \$1 a pound for shipping food. We can't afford to go

and buy the expensive beef and expensive food. Lately we've been going without food. And the increased hunting pressure in this area along with the pressure of bears has just totally hindered our hunting. 5 Likewise another resident noted this is a low income 6 community, subsistence hunting and fishing is really 7 not optional for many folks here. Recent food scarcity has been exacerbated by the fact that our ferry service 8 9 has been intermittent and our food supply has been 10 undependable because of that. This is causing 11 increasing concern about getting food into the 12 community. It's also common for planes to Pelican to 13 be cancelled because of bad weather. One resident 14 explains you have to put up lots of food to sustain 15 yourself. However, residents have noted that increased 16 hunting pressure can lead to issues of crowding, safety 17 and reduced hunter success due to the generally steep 18 terrain and limited drainages in and around Lisianski 19 Inlet. As I noted before approximately 80 percent of 20 recent annual deer harvest in Unit 4 have been made by 21 boat-based hunters. Regarding the deer hunting 22 situation in and around Pelican, one long time resident 23 commented; the big problem I see is the increased 24 competition. There are more boats hinting and more 25 people coming in on the airlines and on the ferry and 26 hunting local so there's more competition in the 27 Lisianski Inlet and more competition in the outer 28 costal areas. Large seine boats are coming up from 29 Sitka with three or four smaller boats attached and 30 they are hunting areas that were traditionally hunted 31 by people who had Forest Service leased cabins so 32 there's more pressure all the way from Sitka to here. 33 On the outer coast there's more space and area for deer 34 than there is in the Inlet. The Inlet is restricted by 35 limited drainages. A resident noted that commenting on 36 the impact of increased hunting competition, she noted, 37 I'm also the Chairman of the Food Bank in Pelican and in the last year we distributed over 2,000 pounds of 38 39 food to residents of Pelican because of shortage of food and because of limited ferry service so I think 40 41 it's important to know the degree to which people in 42 this area depend on wild game and fish.

43 44

45

46

47

48

Pelican residents have noted that deer harvest tend to vary somewhat from year to year based on numerous environmental factors. One area resident explained the recent winters have been less severe with less snow which can impact whether the deer are being driven to the beach fringe or not. Fewer deer

sightings may have been because the snow level was well above the beach fringe. Similarly, other Federallyqualified and non-Federally-qualified users have suggested that deer hunting issues currently being 5 experienced by residents of places like Pelican stem from local preferences for beach hunting. They note 6 7 that the perception of localized declines in Unit 4 may be due to recent mild winters which resulted in deer being spread out through Forests rather than 9 10 concentrated and easily observable on the beaches. 11 Still, other Pelican residents who hunted in areas 12 beyond the beaches also found it difficult to harvest 13 enough deer to meet their needs in 2020. For example, 14 one resident explained I've hunted off the lower part 15 of the hills and I haven't had any luck this year. Another resident commented, I've been out in the hills 16 17 hunting and there's a definite lack of deer. Some 18 Pelican residents note that they have the resources to 19 go out to the outer coast to seek deer and have been 20 more successful while others must stay closer to 21 Pelican because they lack the appropriate boats or 22 money for fuel to require to travel further away. As 23 researchers and residents have noted, most rural 24 Alaskans now rely upon gasoline and motorized transport 25 to hunt and harvest subsistence resources. In a recent 26 study of eight rural Alaskan communities quantified the 27 impacts of rising fuel costs and depressed local 28 economies as I discussed before.

2930

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

Recent reductions in deer hunter days and harvest reported by Pelican residents could be related to the impact of rising fuel prices in the area coupled with the declining -- impact of declining commercial fisheries, employment and income earning opportunities. Reductions in the number and distance of trips that Pelican residents can afford to take to harvest subsistence resources would certainly contribute to issues of user conflict and competition in the proposal area.

39 40 41

Turning to the available harvest data that we have.

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

Recognizing that harvest data does have limitations we've discussed before, looking at it from 2000 to 2021, proximity to Pelican appears to be a key factor like all the other communities we've discussed for residents when selecting deer hunting locations. According to the available data about 71 percent of

Pelican residents reported deer harvests and 66 percent of their hunting days took place in the WAAs encompassed by the proposal area. Yakobi Island and Upper Lisianski Inlet accounted for roughly half of these harvests and hunting days while a smaller percentage of Pelican hunting days and deer harvest took place within the west coast Chichagof and Port Althorp area. Pelican residents reported relatively minimal hunting occurring in Wildlife Analysis Areas located outside the proposal area. Based on the reported data an average of about 147 users hunted for 535 days harvesting a total of 248 deer within these Wildlife Analysis Areas. Of course this varied from year to year. In most years Federally-qualified users harvested more deer from this area due to the larger number of hunters. On average, roughly 57 percent of all hunters utilizing the proposal area each year were Federally-qualified users. However, over half of those Federally-qualified users that reported hunting in this area came from outside Pelican. The data also shows a decreasing proportion of Federally-qualified users in the proposal area over time coupled with an increasing proportion of non-Federally-qualified users. This change corresponds with the declining population witnessed in Pelican and other nearby rural communities during this period. The largest portion of non-Federally-qualified users hunting in the area came from Juneau.

The estimated yearly data on harvest in this area shows similar trends. On average Pelican residents were responsible for about 18 percent of harvest taken while other Federally-qualified users were responsible for about 41 percent. Non-Federally-qualified users were responsible for about 41 percent as well.

The reported data on hunter days in this area exhibits a bit of a different trend. Non-Federally-qualified users reported spending more days hunting in the area during 15 of the 22 years in this period, however, the overall average difference was relatively small. On average non-Federally-qualified users were responsible for about 51 percent of hunter days. Pelican residents were responsible for about 12 percent and then other Federally-qualified users 36 percent.

Overall, each user group in this area

has reported declines and average yearly hunters, hunter days and harvest in the Wildlife Analysis Areas encompassed by the proposal area between the 2001 to 2005 reporting period and the 2016 to 2020 reporting periods. Among the different user groups Pelican hunters reported the greatest percent declines and average yearly hunters, hunter days and harvests. Thought non-Federally-qualified users composed a significant portion of the hunters utilizing this area, the proposal area accounted for a relatively small amount of their overall hunting efforts and harvest in Unit 4 as a whole.

Somewhere, about four percent of all non-Federally-qualified users reported hunting in this area between 2000 to 2021 and roughly six percent of non-Federally-qualified harvest in Unit 4 came from this area.

Once, again, this is a very preliminary conclusion as I stated before, the OSM conclusion is to oppose WP24-06 at this time for the same reason, we're not sure right now that the level of competition being experienced in this area justifies a closure to non-Federally-qualified users. Based on the reported data, west coast Chichagof appears to be the portion of the proposal area most heavily utilized by non-Federally-qualified users accounting for roughly half of all the reporting hunting efforts and harvests in the proposal area between 2000 and 2021. Only relatively a small portion of this area would be closed under the current proposal and it's not clear whether this portion of WAA is a significant hunting location for non-Federally-qualified users.

Then, of course, the interpretations again of this information are complicated by a number of inter-related issues such as the recent mild winters that many people have discussed.

And overall OSM would like to hear more information to determine whether a closure in this area is necessary and we hope to receive this information, through this meeting, additional meetings of the Southeast Council and the Unit 4 deer working group.

 $\,$  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are there questions from the Council members regarding the OSM presentation of the proposal.

0466

1 Mr. Hernandez.
2
3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I have a general
4 question on your presentation. You cited a lot of
5 interviews or excerpts of interviews, and I don't think
6 we've heard much of before in Federal analysis, did you
7 go out and do interviews or did you get those from

other sources?

8 9 10

11

12

13

MR. ROBERTS: These are not -- through the Chair, sorry, Madame Chair. Those are not interviews, they're taken from transcripts of Council meetings. That's just me going back and searching the transcripts.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, transcripts. Transcripts, okay, that -- thank you, yeah, that makes sense. A lot of what I got from those comments and, yeah, I quess those are impressions I got hearing folks at our meetings was, you know, these proposals came before us about two years ago and in my opinion it seems like they were really prompted by the pandemic and the panic that kind of went through our rural communities when food sources were really jeopardized, outside food sources, not subsistence food sources and that, to me, kind of indicates that all of sudden there was a real increase in the needs for subsistence uses, subsistence resources, and I think that's kind of prompted, you know, these proposals that, you know, really, we're seeing an increase in the needs that are difficult to meet. If you need more, it becomes more difficult and, you know, maybe things were kind of cruising along okay for awhile but then this panic happened and, yeah, it hasn't subsided yet I don't think. Because everything is like really expensive and we've heard all that testimony too and, yeah, these are non-subsistence food sources are just becoming more difficult given the whole economy of gas prices and all that so I think we really are seeing an increase in the need here that's driving this.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there questions for Mr. Roberts. Is it a question, all right, Mr. Smith.

44 45 46

47

48

49

50

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I know I -- I heard you talking about the bear issues and I'm real curious, you know, when I was a young man, I never saw many bears but recently, you know, and when back when I was

a young man they were talking five bear per square mile. And I know it's different there. There are many different bear attacks that happened in Hoonah, Ms. Oliver, one of my educators, Cody Mills, I was there just recently where a gentleman that works for PointsSafia was sharing about bears where he's protecting the community when they're going out to walk out in the viewing site, as he's talking to me he's --he's a big man, strong man, very -- and he was shaking when he was telling me. So I really worry about that, so I just share -- I think I've said this before in other events where you go back to the 1800s almost every ethnicity harvested brown bear and black bear and they are good eating because I love -- I love eating that meat.

So just sharing a perspective of seeing what that number is of if there's any data on that but actually opening it up and dropping the numbers down and opening it up to all.

Just a thought.

 $\label{eq:actions} \text{ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM:} \quad \text{All right.} \\ \text{Questions only please.}$ 

Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: I don't have yes and no questions but I do have observations. Just looking at it, it was interesting, thank you for citing the 1987 data, which came up with an incredible 316 deer harvested in Pelican at that time when the population was 239, which is 1.3 deer per person. And if that same harvest level held today instead of it being the last year of record is 32 deer per -- for Pelican, 83 people living in Pelican should have harvested 107.9 deer rounding it off to 108 deer. Pelicans had like a real population decline. The economy has been really iffy to say the least. Ferry service is rather spotty. And so I can see how there would be a particular interest in maintaining subsistence uses for deer.

I guess I'm supposed to ask a question, do you agree?

47 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that makes sense to 48 me.

0468 1 MR. SCHROEDER: Okay, that was a 2 question. 3 4 (Laughter) 5 6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Just 7 to remind the Council we are -- we still have a lot of business to do and very little time to do it in, and so 9 please, comments and observations about data and 10 things, if we could leave that for deliberation that 11 would be really helpful and to keep things moving along 12 so questions only please. 13 14 Ms. Phillips. 15 16 MS. PHILLIPS: (Shakes head negatively) 17 18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Are you 19 sure? I don't want to discourage questions, I think 20 questions are important but the rest of it could be 21 handled during deliberations so Ms. Phillips. 22 23 MS. PHILLIPS: How do you update your 24 social data for a community like Pelican, because we 25 now have a fish processor in Pelican that's custom 26 processing, you know, hook and line fish? 27 28 Thank you. 29 30 MR. ROBERTS: That's a good question. 31 We depend on readily available sources of data so 32 unfortunately OSM doesn't really get to do their own 33 research so we depend on other sources, other written 34 sources of information. 35 36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. 37 other questions from the Council for Mr. Roberts. 38 39 (No comments) 40 41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 42 have one question. You've -- on all of these proposals 43 you've called it an OSM preliminary conclusion and I'm 44 just curious if OSM changes their potential conclusion 45 after the Council meets and you gather input from these 46 meetings and things like Ian Johnson's data, does that

get reincorporated and do you have the leeway to change

your conclusion before the Federal Board meeting?

47

48

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. And I can tell you that I've done it before for a different Council based on their input to something that I was -- came to learn, I was very far off base on. So, yes, I've done it before and we do have leeway and that's why we call it the preliminary conclusion because we can change it.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. All right, now we have up next -- since we don't have Board consultation with tribes we have agency comments so Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MR. CHURCHWELL: Thank you, Vice Chair Needham. Once, again, for the record this is Roy Churchwell, Southeast Regional Management Coordinator here with Fish and Game comments. So I will try to limit this to comments that are particular to this proposal versus the other ones. As I've mentioned before we do have a multitude of comments that are the same for all three proposals and I think you guys are pretty aware of those.

But our position for this proposal WP24-06 is the same as the previous two, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game opposes this proposal because there are no justifications under the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act for the Federal Subsistence Board to approve this closure.

The stated purpose of this proposal is to establish a meaningful preference for the continuation of subsistence use of deer, however, the proponents provide no substantial evidence in support of claims that the few non-Federally-qualified users hunting in this area inhibit harvest by Federally-qualified users and data provided by Federally-qualified users residing in Pelican clearly indicate that the decline in harvest by that community results from declining participation and effort by Pelican hunters.

We note that Federally-qualified users in Pelican already enjoy several meaningful preferences, including an extra month of hunting opportunity in January, a liberal designated hunter program where any Federally-qualified user can hunt on behalf of another Federally-qualified user and living close to the resource which allows Federally-qualified users to hunt whenever conditions are favorable. In

contrast to reach Pelican, non-Federally-qualified hunters from Juneau need to plan days or weeks ahead and travel over 100 miles by a personal boat or aircraft at a time of year when days are short and inclimate weather is common. The very few non-resident hunters in this area are limited by a more restrictive bag limit of two bucks.

Further, we find no reference in Title VIII of ANILCA to the term meaningful preference, nor could we find justification for limiting non-Federally-qualified users hunting based on safety concerns, economics of Federally-qualified users or the potential for altering deer behavior due to poor non-Federally-qualified user marksmanship. We conclude there is no lawful justification for adopting this proposal and it should be rejected under Section .805(c)(1).

And if I could just go through our summary from our analysis we presented.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game's deer abundance survey data and deer hunting effort and harvest data provided to Alaska Department of Fish and Game by GMU 4 hunters including Pelican residents. To gage measures of hunting effort and harvest we compared the decade prior to the severe winter of 2006/2007 with the decade since 2013 when the deer population was considered recovered. Those comparisons support the following conclusions.

Deer remained abundant in the proposal area, deer pellet group transects, aerial Alpine surveys and late winter mortality surveys all indicate that GMU 4 deer occur at among the highest densities in the state, consequently there is no need to restrict take by non-Federally-qualified users to either conserve the deer population or to ensure continued subsistence use of the deer population.

Although the number of non-Federally-qualified users hunting deer in the analysis area has increased slightly about 7 percent, that increase is small and offset by a declining use of this area by hunters from other Federally-qualified communities. Total hunting pressure in the area is light. In the last decade Federally-qualified users are spending considerably less effort so total hunting pressure in the proposal area is declining. It is also likely that

some of the non-Federally-qualified users hunting in the proposal area are former Pelican residents who moved to Juneau for employment or other opportunities but return to hunt with and on behalf of relatives and friends in Pelican. The average number of Pelican residents participating in deer hunting each year in the period -- the average number of Pelican residents who have -- sorry. The average number of Pelican residents participating in deer hunting each year and the days of hunting effort by those hunters have declined. Between the two comparison periods the average number of Pelican residents who obtain deer harvest tickets declined by 30 percent. Reported hunting declined by 35 percent. And the days of hunting effort reported by Pelican residents declined by 53 percent. That dramatic decline in hunting effort is the reason deer harvest by Pelican residents has declined not competition from non-Federally-qualified user hunters. The days of hunting effort Pelican hunters require to harvest one day -- one deer remains very low at 1.2 days of hunting per deer harvested. The proposal emphasizes that subsistence hunters need to be efficient and this is among the most efficient hunting anywhere in Alaska.

I will also say that since it's been asked for the other two proposals, the reporting rate for Pelican was 84 percent so that was our second highest reporting rate next to Gustavus.

With that that concludes my remarks.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Churchwell. Are there questions from Council members for Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I have one question if there are no other questions from the Council and that is can you -- how easy is it for Pelican residents to obtain deer harvest tickets?

MR. CHURCHWELL: I guess it depends on if they have internet access. If they do have internet access it's quite easy, anyone can get deer harvest tickets on the internet. If they don't have that available, I guess I would defer to Member Phillips, if there are deer harvest tickets available in town. I

```
0472
     personally don't know the answer to that.
 3
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
 4
 5
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
 6
     And thank you for the question. Yes there is a person
 7
     who lives outside of Pelican, one of the -- at
     Phonograph who, when they come in you can get deer
 9
     harvest tickets from but you can also get them online,
10
     we have a library where you could print them up if you
11
     wanted.
12
13
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
14
    you. Are there any other questions for Mr. Churchwell
15
    at this time.
16
17
                     (No comments)
18
19
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
20
     you. Are there any agency comments from other Federal
21
     agencies.
22
23
                     (No comments)
24
25
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Comments from
26
    tribal entities.
27
28
                     (No comments)
29
30
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Advisory group
31
     comments from other Regional Councils.
32
33
                     MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair, this is
34
     just pertinent to Southeast. Thank you.
35
36
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any
37
     comments from Fish and Game Advisory Committees.
38
39
                     MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair. I would
40
     like to reference the comments that was mentioned
41
     earlier from the Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee.
42
    They did submit a comment for all three deer proposals.
43
     It was included in the summary given by Dr. Roberts
44
     earlier, but I will highlight a few comments within
     that letter. The Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee
45
46
    understands that the proposal's authors wish to ensure
     a significant and meaningful priority to be afforded to
47
48
     all Federally-qualified users but do not feel that
49
     these proposals address this concern. Instead, they
50
```

feel it creates a significant loss of opportunity for non-Federally-qualified users when they do not appear to be conservation or Federally-qualified user hunter success concerns. They urge the Board to not follow suit and support these proposals. Further, they believe that we need to support rules and regulations that create equitable and sustainable fishing hunting opportunities. And, finally, they worry the proposals could, instead, amplify tensions between Federally-qualified and non-Federally-qualified hunters straining cultural and family ties between communities in Southeast Alaska.

Again, the Council does have the entire comment in its packet and just wanted to let folks know that this does apply to the three deer proposals we've been discussing.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Are there any comments from Subsistence Resource Commissions.

MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair.

MS. PERRY: Thank you. All right, at this time can we get a summary of written public comments.

MR. ROBERTS: Ms. Vice Chair. Members of the Council. Jason Roberts, again, OSM. We've received this time 46 written public comments on this proposal all in opposition.

The commenters noted that ADF&G data shows that there are no conservation concerns regarding deer populations in the area and the level of competition for deer in the area does not warrant a closure. The primary issue impacting deer hunting recently has been the impact of warmer weather and this lack of snow means that deer are not being pushed down to the beaches where they can be more easily harvested. They also state that this proposal would restrict the rights of long-term seasonal residents and others with local ties to the area to hunt deer.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{The}}$  commentators [sic] also note that this proposal does not consider the impact of other

0474 Federally-qualified users. 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 4 you. Now, we'll move into public testimony. Are there 5 any blue cards for the room for public testimony on 6 this proposal. 7 8 MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair. And for 9 those who are sitting in the audience, again, if you 10 would like to make a comment there are blue sheets by 11 the sign in table. I do not see any public that wishes 12 to do so, Madame Chair. 13 14 Thank you. 15 16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 17 you. And then, online, it sounds like we have at least 18 one person who would like to provide public comment 19 online, so Ms. Perry can you address that person. 20 21 MS. PERRY: I would be happy to. 22 have a caller whose phone number ends in 3-2, I believe 23 that might be Mr. Orr, if you would press star, six to 24 open your line that will unmute you. Star, six. And I 25 do see you are unmuted at this time, please go ahead 26 with your comment. 27 28 MR. ORR: This is Nicholas Orr again. 29 I think the same issues with -- sorry, as in the Hoonah 30 and the Angoon proposals is obviously there is not a 31 conservation concern. The criteria in ANILCA states 32 that you need to demonstrate that non-Federally-33 qualified users are creating an impedement --34 impedement -- impedement to the continuation of 35 subsistence uses and I don't think it's clear here. 36 The data seems to indicate that Pelican has the highest 37 success ratio in the state for big game measured by days per hunter animal -- hunter days per animal, so 38 39 the hunter efficacy is the highest in the state. I 40 think that's the way you measure this. It's not 41 necessarily whether things are expensive or it's 42 difficult to get around, it's hunter efficacy. 43 44 So all right, thank you. 45 46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. 47 do we have another public comment. 48 49 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair. We have

0475 1 someone's number that ends in 3-7, I believe that might be Ryan Beason and that caller's line is open so you 2 can go ahead with your comment. 4 5 Thank you. 6 7 MR. BEASON: Thank you. Yes, Ryan 8 Beason here again. I'll just keep this brief. Just the same thing the Territorial Sportsmen opposes this 9 10 proposal as well based on all the previous facts on 11 data, facts that the Fish and Game has stated and I'll 12 leave it at that so thank you for your time. 13 14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 15 we have any other public comments by phone at this 16 time. 17 18 MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair. 19 20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, that 21 concludes the introduction and comment period for the 22 proposal and now it's time for the Council to make a 23 recommendation and I'd entertain a motion. 24 25 Mr. Hernandez. 26 27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I move 28 to adopt Wildlife Proposal 24-06. 29 30 MR. CASIPIT: Second. 31 32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 33 you. A motion is now on the table for Wildlife 34 Proposal 24-06. Is there any Council discussion 35 regarding the proposal and also a reminder that we need 36 to enter a justification into the record. 37 38 Mr. Hernandez. 39 40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame 41 Chair. I think I would also like to make a motion to 42 amend the proposal. I think we should remain 43 consistent with these Unit 4 proposals on the closure 44 dates so I would make the motion that we amend the 45 proposal so that the closure date runs for non-46 Federally-qualified users, runs from November 1st 47 through November 10th. 48

MR. CASIPIT: Second.

49

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. We now have an amendment to the proposal on the floor, is there any discussion.

MS. PHILLIPS: Question.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The question has been called so we are now voting on the amendment to the proposal to modify the closure dates to November 1st through the 10th. And I would like to get a unanimous consent so if there's anyone in opposition.

(No opposition)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. The proposal's been amended and we're back to the main motion for Wildlife Proposal 24-06. Is there any discussion from Council.

Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair. So this topic of closure for the Lisianski Inlet area began in March 17th, 2021 and there were several qualified rural residents of Pelican who called in to the Southeast RAC's winter meeting and their primary concern which was indicated in the analysis, thank you OSM you did a good job, is that deer is the main source of meat and there's outside pressure affecting their ability to meet their subsistence needs and the effects of the high cost of fuel has shortened the amount of trips they can go out to do their harvest and that elders are now hunting the beach fringe because they don't have the ability to go up into the -- you know, up into the Alpine. If they're not able to get a deer then there's some residents who have anemia because of -- they have a lack of iron if they're not getting the meat that they need for their health.

One thing I didn't say when I was introducing myself is that I'm the Mayor for the city of Pelican. I've served as Mayor and Council member for a lot of years. 12 years Mayor. Sometimes as an elected or an appointed representative of a community I live in I have to make decision in the best interest of the community, sometimes that means setting aside some of my own opinions to meet the best needs of the community. Previously I have indicated that I was concerned about, you know, this issue of family members

2

5

6

no longer residing in Pelican and residing in non-rural communities, but since then I've realized that my charge as a Southeast RAC member is for the continuation of subsistence resources and how can I best do that so I have to represent that voice that came to this RAC saying that their subsistence needs aren't being met.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Also I would like to reference, again, the preliminary results of the SASSI deer work for Southeast Subsistence RAC prepared by Ian Johnson, Hoonah Indian Association, 10/24/23, the section for Pelican says the greatest concern that the community members that were interviewed have that -- the concern they have is abundance. And so -- and he also had some interview statements that the traditional ways of knowing, being -- aren't being passed on and we need more of our traditional Tlingit ways of being and knowing being taught to our community in use, and fact of the matter is most hunters equals more -- more hunters equal more spooked deer than having to relocate as a hunter and dealing with a population of deer that are more weary so hunting trips I take usually go out further where most go to avoid these scenarios and one person said a local -- would prefer a localized preference for local hunters.

262728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

In the analysis on Page 234, so it talks about the deer pellet surveys and it also stated that there haven't been current deer pellet surveys in the Lisianski area and that the deer pellet surveys were conducted at Finger Mountain, which is between Hoonah Sound and Tenakee Inlet and at Pavlof, which is at Freshwater Bay east side of Chichagof Island, about 8.5 miles east of Tenakee. I brought this to the attention of the RAC before but the Lisianski Inlet area has its own micro-climate, we have Brady Glacier on the other side of Cross Sound that's sending down a lot of cold air, the Lisianski Straits area acts as a refrigerator where this cold air gets blocked in so we get higher levels of snow and snow that stays longer, which impacts the survivability of deer populations. And in the transcripts from the March 17th, 2021 it talks -- one of the trappers talks about when he was running his trapline he would find the mortality of deer was like every 50 yards.

46 47 48

49

50

So -- also that there are limited small boat anchorages and there's greater fragmentation of

the landscape from landslide, wind blow downs and just from, you know, just the topography of the area, a lot of like cliffs and hard to -- it's impossible to traverse across those locations so where you have alluvial fans you'll find, likely find deer populations. So the deer population surveys are not specific to the conditions in Lisianski Inlet.

So, you know, we as residents of the Pelican area are familiar, you know, that's our local knowledge that they brought forth to this Regional Advisory Council.

And let's see, I -- the community -- I have to listen to the voice of the community and we did hold a community meeting after that first proposal and it was, as OSM indicated, there was a lot of stress and tension and people don't really want to sit in on those kind of meetings and so why should they be involved if -- that they're wary of their life is going to be torn up or, you know, hard feelings are going to be, you know, as a result of those sort of types of meetings. And as the Chairperson of the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee it was a very uncomfortable meeting and I was distraught after it that I had to put my community through that sort of a -- trying to find consensus, you know, it's either one way or the other.

So I applaud the Regional Advisory Council for, you know, sticking to their authority, to their call to arms on protecting the continuation of subsistence rights by, you know, resubmitting another proposal. This proposal, you know, it was a October, November, December closure for non-Federally-qualified and now this proposal that we're talking is a 10 day proposal, so I think we listened to the voice of the non-Federally-qualified hunters and if you look at the data in the book it talks about the number of hunters. Well, the overall harvest from the Lisianski Strait area is 4 percent of the Unit 4 harvest, so it's 4 percent and then the number of hunters is -- there's a significant amount of non-Federally-qualified and so this perception that there is competition is real and the amount of deer that they take is what -- you know, the abundance that we see is real because the amount of deer -- winter mortality is greater than the amount of deer mortality for other areas of Southeast Alaska due to the heavy snowfall events and, yeah, so I guess I'll leave it at that.

```
0479
 1
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
 2
 3
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
 4
    Phillips. Are there other Council comments or
 5
     deliberation on this proposal.
 6
 7
                     Mr. Douville.
 8
 9
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I drove my boat up and
    down Lisianski, I used to fish there back in the day
10
11
     and there's not a lot of good beaches for deer there,
12
     it's steep ground. So most of the deer here according
13
     to this are taken during the month of November and
14
    there is significant competition from outside as well.
15
     Just looking at the percentages. And this proposal is
     only asking for a small window in that November, which,
16
17
     to me, leaves adequate time for any non-rural users to
18
    hunt. But it does provide a rural priority and that's
19
    our job. We're not saying there's a conservation
20
     concern, there's a competition concern. And I think
21
    this would address it and perhaps give that opportunity
22
    to rural users.
23
24
                     I intend to support this proposal.
25
26
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
27
     Douville. Other Council comments.
28
29
                     Mr. Bemis.
30
31
                     MR. BEMIS: Madame Chair. Yes, I agree
32
    with the amendment based on the area and if we're going
33
    to stay consistent it would be breaking up and possibly
34
     look at favoring one user group versus another. And if
35
     we keep this consistent along with the consistent
36
     information they have given it looks like the non
37
     oppose -- I mean the opposers outweigh the actual
38
     users. So it's kind of a Catch 22, darn if you do,
39
     darn if you don't so I am agreeing that we hold
40
     consistency and we go with what we agreed upon.
41
42
                     Thank you.
43
44
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
45
     Bemis. Any other Council.
46
47
                     Mr. Schroeder.
48
49
                     MR. SCHROEDER: I just -- I think the
50
```

rationale for this proposal is very much like the rationale for the last two with respect to our responsibility to ensure the continuation of subsistence uses so I'd simply reference our main statement that we're making in this cycle. I think, if anything, our record, public record on this proposal is particularly strong because of the major input from Pelican residents at previous meetings, which Council members have heard and are incorporating into the evaluation of this proposal.

 So I'll be voting in favor of this proposal and I think it, again, follows this Council's desire to ensure the continuation of subsistence uses while having the least affect possible on non-Federally-qualified hunters.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

21 Schroeder.

Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: I would like to thank Patty for her TEK in this area pointing out that it is an ice box. There are some places like that. We have them here even though they're smaller based, and they're just cold. They don't warm up for whatever reason. I mean the groundwater for ice fog is in there and it's warm everywhere else. It's an interesting observation that it holds more snow and it keeps it longer. And barring that they haven't done any real scientific research even as far as deer pellets in there. But thanks, Patty, for pointing that out.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

38 Douville.

Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. So Page 248, Table 8, the five year average for Federally-qualified hunters from 2016 to 2020 is 87 and the non-Federally-qualified is 62 and then for 2021 which is the heavy snow year it -- the number of Federally-qualified -- total number of Federally-qualified hunters was 124 and non-Federally-qualified was 63 so besides, you know, the Pelican hunter you

```
0481
     also have the other Federally-qualified hunters which
    use this area but it also -- it isn't -- this table
     isn't limited to only the proposal area because the
     outside of Yakobi is -- their harvest and number of
    hunters is included in these numbers, which there's
 5
    quite a bit of hunters that go to the outside of
 6
 7
    Yakobi for their hunting and they can still do that
 8
    because we're not closing that area off.
 9
10
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
11
12
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you,
13
     Phillips. Are there any other Council comments.
14
15
                     (No comments)
16
17
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Anyone ready to
18
     call for the question.
19
20
                     MR. KITKA: Call for the question.
21
22
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville.
23
24
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I guess my question
25
    would be did we cover the criteria in the
26
    recommendation unnecessarily restrict other uses. I
27
    think it's a necessary restriction and it's a small
28
    restriction overall. And I think it is necessary. It
29
    isn't unnecessary, I believe it is necessary. And it
30
    will be beneficial to subsistence needs of Pelican
31
    rural users, they depend on it, they have to have it,
32
    they don't have a lot of resource, or airplanes, ferry
33
     occasionally, and those are really valuable. And I
34
    believe that biologic and traditional ecological
35
    knowledge plays a part here. So there is no
36
     conservation concern.
37
38
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for
39
     that.
40
41
                     MR. KITKA: Question.
42
43
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The question's
44
    been called. So now we will have a roll call vote
45
     regarding Wildlife Proposal 24-06 which requests to
46
     close Federal public lands and that closure would be
47
     from November 1st through the 10th.
48
```

49 Ms. Perry. 50

```
0482
                     MS. PERRY: And as a reminder this is
 1
 2
     on the motion as amended just stated by the Chair.
 4
                     Larry Bemis.
 5
 6
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes.
 7
 8
                     MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
 9
10
                     MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
11
                     MS. PERRY: Mike Douville.
12
13
14
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
15
16
                     MS. PERRY: Albert Howard.
17
18
                     MR. HOWARD: Yes.
19
20
                     MS. PERRY: Louie Wagner, Jr.
21
22
                     MR. WAGNER: Yes.
23
24
                     MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
25
26
                     MR. KITKA: Yes.
27
28
                     MS. PERRY: John Smith, III.
29
30
                     MR. SMITH: Yes.
31
32
                     MS. PERRY: Robert Schroeder.
33
34
                     MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
35
36
                     MS. PERRY: Patricia Phillips.
37
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
38
39
40
                     MS. PERRY: Donald Hernandez.
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
43
44
                     MS. PERRY: Cathy Needham.
45
46
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
47
                     MS. PERRY: And just checking on the
48
49
     phone for our other two Council members, Frank Wright,
```

0483 if you are on the phone press star, six and open your 2 line. 3 4 (No comments) 5 6 MS. PERRY: Frank Wright. 7 8 (No comments) 9 10 MS. PERRY: And Member Jim Slater, are 11 you on the line to vote? 12 13 MR. SLATER: Yes, I am. I vote yes. 14 15 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Slater. 16 Madame Chair. The vote passes 12 to zero, one absent. 17 18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms. 19 Perry. At this time I'd also like to acknowledge that 20 during the deliberation of this proposal there was 21 somebody who raised their hand to provide public 22 comment, unfortunately because there was a proposal on 23 the floor and we were in deliberations we could not 24 take it at that time but that person also submitted 25 written comments to us which the Council does consider 26 in its decisionmaking process and if you are still on 27 the line we encourage you to continue to put your public comment forth, you'll have another opportunity 28 29 at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting as well as we 30 do have your written comment. 31 32 Next up on our agenda we have statewide 33 wildlife proposal that it is at this Council's 34 discretion if they would like to hear this proposal. 35 An option is also to take no action on the proposal. 36 So on the agenda is Wildlife Proposal 24-01 to allow 37 the sale of brown bear hides and I'd like to know what 38 the Council would like to do about this, if we take no 39 action then we don't necessarily need to go through the 40 presentation process. So are there any thoughts -- are 41 there any Council members that would like to go through 42 the entire process for Wildlife Proposal 24-01. 43 44 Mr. Casipit. 45 46 MR. CASIPIT: I guess before I can make 47 a decision like that I just wanted to know from Staff 48 if there are any places in Southeast where under our 49 regs we allow two bears every regulatory year in

```
0484
 1
     Southeast.
 2
 3
                     MR. VICKERS: Not that I know of.
 4
 5
                     MR. CASIPIT:
                                   Then I -- yeah, okay,
 6
     that answers my question.
 7
 8
                     MR. VICKERS: But....
 9
10
                     REPORTER: Brent, if you're going to
11
     talk turn the mic on.
12
13
                     MR. CASIPIT: Follow up.
14
15
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Casipit.
16
17
                     MR. CASIPIT: You had a but there, I
18
     want to hear the but part.
19
20
                     MR. VICKERS: No, you're correct, from
21
     what I see in the regulations there's no area within
22
     this region that has a two bear limit. The proposal is
23
     for the sale of brown bear hides, that's all.
24
25
                     MR. CASIPIT: But, again, in places
26
     where there's a two bear limit?
27
28
                     MR. VICKERS: That's not the propo --
29
     that's not the -- what's written by the proponent.
30
31
                     MR. CASIPIT:
                                   That's your modification,
32
     that's the OSM modification?
33
34
                                   (Nods affirmatively)
                     MR. VICKERS:
35
36
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wagner.
37
38
                     MR. WAGNER: If I can, would I be
39
     allowed to ask, who would be able to sell these bear
     hides, I mean besides the hunter, is that every brown
40
41
    bear tag that's given out, they can sell the bear hide?
42
43
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I
44
     think since there are questions by the Council what we
     probably should do is go through the process of having
45
46
     the proposal presented to us and then we can decide
47
     after the public testimony portion whether or not we
48
     want to take action on it and deliberate the proposal.
49
     So I'm assuming Mr. Brent Vickers is up here to present
50
```

the proposal, if you could do so at this time that'd be great?

2 3 4

MR. VICKERS: Thank you, Madame Vice Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Brent Vickers of the Office of Subsistence Management. The analysis of Proposal 24-01 begins on Page 266 of your Council books. It was submitted by Caleb Rowland of McCarthy, Alaska and there's a request to allow the sale of brown bear hides.

The proponent states that subsistence users in many areas of Alaska must salvage the hides of brown bears, however, hides must not be sold. The proponent continues that the hides of many other legally harvested big game species may be sold and brown bears should be added to this list.

First of all the Federal Regulatory Handbook produced for the public that describes legal uses of brown bears is incorrect. It implies it is legal to sell brown bear hides but it is illegal. The Code of Federal Regulations regarding the utilization of brown bears are correctly reflected in the appendix in the analysis of your meeting book.

It is also important to note that selling the hide of legally harvested brown bear is legal under State regulations including most of Federal public lands, except for lands designated National Park or Monument, which are only open to hunting under Federal subsistence regulations.

So for the proponent, who lives in McCarthy, which is within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, the primary effect of adopting this proposal would be to allow the sale of hides, brown bear hides harvested from the lands within that National Park. Wrangell-St.Elias National Park is also -- has lands within Unit 5 of this region but as was brought up there's another factor that weighs into the potential impacts of this particular section of the Park in Unit 5 where there is a one bear brown bag limit. Under State regulations a hide of a legally harvested brown bear may only be sold if it is taken in an area with a two or more brown bear limit, therefore, brown bear hides under State regulations cannot be sold from this region.

This proposal requests the sale of any brown bear hide harvested from Federal lands under Federal regulations, this means that for this region the primary effect of adopting this proposal will be to allow for the sale of hide of any brown bear taken on Federal public lands and under Federal regulations and, therefore, Federally-qualified subsistence users from this region could sell brown bear hides harvested in this region.

This is a statewide proposal that will be reviewed by all 10 Regional Advisory Councils. Each Council can inform the Federal Subsistence Board whether the regulation is culturally appropriate for their region.

If this proposal is adopted the edible meat of a brown bear must still be salvaged and the hide — and the hide must have the claws attached and the hide must be sealed by ADF&G according to already existing Federal regulations.

The OSM preliminary conclusion begins on Page 279 of your Council book.

Our conclusion is to support with modification to allow for the sale of brown bear hides in areas where Federal harvest limit is two bears every regulatory year and after first obtaining a permit to sell brown grizzly bear hide and skull available at the time of sealing from an ADF&G sealing officer. This modification to the proposal puts limits on the sale of brown bear hides, the sale of brown bear hides could only occur from brown bears shown to be legally harvested in the areas where there's a two brown limit, which doesn't include this region.

A consideration that -- basically the reason for this modification is because the Convention of International Trade and Endangered Species of Wild Fauna or Flora, or CITES which provides for commercial trade of hides of legally harvested brown bears only if the State of experts [sic] issues permits reporting that the trade will not be detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild. Therefore, a permit from ADF&G is required. ADF&G issues this type of permit before the hide of the brown bear [sic] but only in areas where there is a two brown bear limit. Allowing for the sale of hide of any brown bear harvested from

areas below two brown bear limit would require negotiations with the State over the use of its permitting system.

In terms of regulating harvest, tools exist for the Board to use if harvest were to rise above sustainable yields in an area. Those tools include reducing seasons on the harvest limits, placing monetary caps on the sale on a region by region basis and requiring permits for the -- for and reporting sales.

Again, this is a statewide proposal and will be reviewed by all 10 Regional Advisory Councils. Each Council can inform the Board whether the regulation is culturally appropriate for their region.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Vickers. Are there any questions regarding the presentation of the proposal.

Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame Chair. It kind of sounds like maybe you're kind of preliminary just kind of looking for input from the Council on whether or not you think it's culturally appropriate, which may not necessarily require any kind of vote or action but maybe just want to hear some comments from the Council on that, is that where you're going at before there?

MR. VICKERS: No, that -- I think that -- I didn't write that part and quite frankly I kind of wish I didn't say it that way but I think it's because in a lot of regions of the state where there are a lot more taboo on bears, who the analyst who wrote that sentence included that. That might not be the case for here, I don't know. Really, we're just seeing basically if you find a comment -- recommend the way you want, we want a recommendation.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other comments from Council members -- or questions from Council members.

0488 1 (No comments) 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 4 you, Mr. Vickers. Next up we will have agency 5 comments, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 6 7 MR. CHURCHWELL: Thank you, Madame 8 Chair. This is Roy Churchwell with Alaska Department 9 of Fish and Game. The position for the Department --10 Alaska Department of Fish and Game is they support this 11 proposal if it is modified to only allow the sale of 12 brown bear hides with claws attached in areas where the 13 Federal harvest limit is two bears every regulatory 14 year and after first obtaining a permit available at 15 the time of sealing from an Alaska Department of Fish 16 and Game sealing officer. 17 18 The State allows the sale of brown bear 19 hides in certain units where the bag limit is two brown 20 bears per regulatory year. There is a harvest limit of 21 two or more brown bears per regulatory year in 2023 22 State regulations for all portions of Unit 16, 17, 19A, 23 19D, 19E, 20E, 21, 22A, 22B, 22D, 22E, Unit 23, 24B, 24 25D and 26A. 25 26 I will also say that the Department 27 feels that impacts on subsistence users, so Federally-28 qualified users, can sell handicraft articles made from 29 the hide of a brown bear under Federal regulations. If 30 this proposal is adopted there will be fewer conditions 31 or regulations that come into effect. 32 33 Impacts on other users, if adopted, 34 there would be little anticipated effect on non-35 Federally-qualified users. If, however, this change results in increased brown bear harvest, especially in 36 37 coastal areas then guided bear hunting and associated 38 economic impacts could be affected negatively. 39 40 And that concludes my remarks. 41 42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 43 you Mr. Churchwell. Are there any questions for Alaska 44 Department of Fish and Game. 45 46 Mr. Douville. 47

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Okay, you need a permit to do this obviously, you have

48

49

0489 to have the claws attached to the hide. My question is, okay, I bought a bear from Mr. Schroeder so how far does that apply? If I'm the second person to own it, can I pluck the claws off and sell one to Cal here 5 because they're worth some money? 6 7 MR. CHURCHWELL: Through the Chair. 8 Mr. Douville. My impression based on my personal 9 knowledge of what we're talking about today is that you 10 wouldn't be able to do that. 11 12 MR. DOUVILLE: Would not? 13 14 MR. CHURCHWELL: You would not be able 15 to do that. 16 17 MR. DOUVILLE: But the second person 18 doesn't have to have a permit so I don't see any 19 criteria that says that permit follows the bear in 20 perpetuity. 21 22 MR. CHURCHWELL: Through the Chair. 23 Mr. Douville. I have to admit that I don't have enough 24 background in this topic to be able to answer your 25 question. I can get back to you. 26 27 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you. 28 29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. It 30 sounds like a loophole from the get-go. 31 32 (Laughter) 33 34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any 35 other questions for the Alaska Department of Fish and 36 Game. 37 38 Mr. Kitka. 39 40 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I 41 heard the word subsistence come in there and realizing 42 subsistence and the State of Alaska requires that we utilize everything within the bear. You know our 44 people never utilized anything in the brown bear. did in the black bear but not in the brown bear. 45 46 of it's culture and part of it's the taste of brown 47 bear is not that great. But I don't understand the 48 reason for that. I know that sport hunters don't

really have to utilize everything, I don't understand

49

0490 why there's such a discrepancy. And then -- but I -- I can't see the reasoning for any sale of any bear hides at this point, thank you. 4 5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, any 6 other questions for the Alaska Department of Fish and 7 8 9 MR. HOWARD: Just a comment. 10 11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard. 12 13 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. 14 Having spent all this time with my dad hunting and 15 fishing and everything I seen him eat some pretty questionable stuff and he wouldn't even touch a brown 16 17 bear so I'm not sure -- yeah, that doesn't make sense why we're required to save any of it. I have no reason 18 19 to shoot a brown bear unless he's coming, charging at 20 me and then that's kind of the only reason I'd ever --21 you know, to protect myself or, you know, like the law 22 says, life and property. But having done that once or 23 twice in Angoon, we had to skin it and then send it 24 out, but, yeah. I'm trying to figure out what they 25 mean by edible meat on a bear. If my dad wouldn't even 26 eat a brown bear, he'd eat a black bear but not a brown 27 bear. 28 29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, Mr. 30 Churchwell. 31 32 MR. CHURCHWELL: Yeah, through the Chair to Mr. Howard and Mr. Kitka. It's my 33 34 understanding that under State regulations you wouldn't 35 have to salvage the meat but those are regulations 36 under the Federal system so they would be the ones that 37 are creating that regulation. 38 39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 40 Churchwell. 41 42 Ms. Phillips.

43 44

45

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So as it's written now, State regulations are more liberal than Federal regulations, is that correct?

46 47 48

49

50

MR. CHURCHWELL: Through the Chair. Member Phillips. At least in my interpretation of

```
0491
     salvage that would be the case.
 2
 3
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other
 4
    questions.
 5
 6
                     (No comments)
 7
 8
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
 9
    Churchwell. Are there any agency comments from other
10
     Federal agencies.
11
12
                     (No comments)
13
14
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Tribal entities.
15
16
                     (No comments)
17
18
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Advisory group
19
     comments. Are there any comments from other Regional
20
    Advisory Councils.
21
22
                     MS. PERRY: I believe Mr. Vickers has
23
    those.
24
25
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Vickers.
26
27
                     MR. VICKERS: This is Brent Vickers,
28
    Office of Subsistence Management. I have
29
     recommendations from 7 Councils that have met at this
30
    point. I'll go through them.
31
32
                     Kodiak/Aleutians Council supported the
33
    proposal as written. It would allow the subsistence
34
    users to make fuller use of the animal in keeping with
35
    basic principles of subsistence. It would also allow
36
     subsistence users to make some money to support their
37
    livelihoods in places where the cost of living is
38
     always high.
39
40
                     Southcentral Alaska Advisory Council
41
     supported the proposal as written. OSM modification
42
    would not have allowed the sale of brown bears in the
43
     Southcentral region because the limits are mostly one
44
    brown bear per regulatory year.
45
46
                     Eastern Interior supported the proposal
47
    with modification. The modification to allow the sale
48
     of hides of brown bears as well as -- oh, sorry, they
49
     -- sorry, this was written poorly. They modified it to
50
```

```
0492
 1
    allow the sale of black bears as well as brown bears.
    That was their -- Alaska Interior [sic] supported their
    modification to allow the sale of black bears as long
 4
    -- as well as brown bears.
 5
 6
                     Yukon Kuskokwim Delta opposed the
 7
    proposal. The Council found that while bear
    populations in their region is increasing as the moose
 8
 9
    population increases and people are seeing bears in
10
    different areas than they were before, it is still hard
11
    to estimate the overall statewide bear population and
12
    bears are slow to reproduce. They also raised concerns
13
    related to illegal harvest, particularly for the
14
    illegal sale of gall bladders.
15
16
                     The Northwest Arctic Council supported
17
     the proposal as written. The change will better align
18
     State and Federal regulations with the understanding
19
    that there will be administrative hurdles. The change
20
    will also increase the capacities of subsistence users
21
    to sell brown bears from their region.
22
23
                     Bristol Bay Council supported the
24
     proposal as written.
25
26
                     And the Western Interior Council
27
     supported the proposal with the OSM modification.
28
29
                     Thank you.
30
31
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
32
    Vickers. Are there Advisory Group comments from Fish
33
     and Game Advisory Committees.
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: I would have to defer to
36
     Office of Subsistence Management for Fish and Game
37
    Advisory.
38
39
                     (No comments)
40
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Subsistence
41
42
    Resource Commissions.
43
44
                     (No comments)
45
46
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Vickers, can
47
    we get a summary of written public comments.
48
49
                     MR. VICKERS: There were none.
```

0493 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: There were none, 2 all right. Is there any public testimony regarding the proposal in the room with blue cards. 4 MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair. 5 6 7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there anyone 8 on the telephone that wishes to provide public comment 9 on the proposal. 10 11 MS. PERRY: I'll go to the phones and, 12 again, let folks know if you'd like to provide a 13 comment by phone, first raise your hand, that feature 14 can be engaged on your phone by hitting asterisk five, 15 that's star, and the number 5, and that will let us 16 know that you want to comment. 17 18 I am looking right now and don't see 19 anything but perhaps we could wait just a moment or 20 two, Madame Chair, to make sure that we don't miss 21 anyone. 22 23 (Pause) 24 25 MS. PERRY: I am not seeing any 26 indication, Madame Chair. 27 28 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms. 29 Perry. All right, what is the wish of the Council 30 regarding Wildlife Proposal 24-01. 31 32 Mr. Douville. 33 34 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair. 35 I move to take no action on YP23-01 [sic]. 36 37 MR. CASIPIT: Second. 38 39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 40 41 Mr. Douville. 42 43 MR. DOUVILLE: I made that motion 44 because we do not have a two bear limit here other than black bear and I believe we can sell a black bear 45 46 should we choose and we don't understand the traditions 47 and we're far removed so it -- it's something that I 48 believe that those affected regions should be able to

49

50

address.

```
0494
 1
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any
 2
     other Council comments.
 3
 4
                     Ms. Phillips.
 5
 6
                     MS. PHILLIPS: I will support the
 7
    motion but I also would support the sale of brown bear
     hide as originally written.
 9
10
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
11
12
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Smith.
13
14
                     MR. SMITH: Yeah, I'm an artist and my
15
     wife and a lot of my family and I really believe that,
     you know, us being able to sell it. And, you know,
16
17
     truthfully, you know, listening to people not eating
18
    brown bear, there's a lot of families that eat the
19
    brown bear and use lots of the parts and maybe we need
20
     to get them on the table. But, you know, earlier
21
     talking about the population and there's -- and, of
22
     course, I want to hear the number of what that is
23
    because I know it's outrageous, it would also cut down
24
     a lot of the incidences with the bear but it also would
25
     support our deer and our other population with other
26
    animals. So make note that it wasn't just the Alaska
27
    Native and American Native people that were hunting the
28
    bear it was all cultures that were hunting the bear for
29
     the food. If you didn't have a bear up on your, you
30
     know, it was kind of a sign of healthy living and it's
31
     good meat. Trichinosis, making sure that you cook it
32
     well was the issue. I know that a certain time people
33
     stopped eating it because of the warning of that.
34
35
                     Anyhow.
36
37
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
38
     Smith. Any other Council comments.
39
40
                     Mr. Wagner.
41
42
                     MR. WAGNER:
                                 Thank you, Madame Chair.
43
     Could you read the motion again, please.
44
45
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The motion was
46
     to take no action on Wildlife Proposal 24-01.
47
48
                     Mr. Wagner.
```

MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Madame Chair. I agree with the motion. I do not agree with selling the hides. With the charter industry in here and from the amount of bears I've seen throughout my life hunting on the river for deer and fishing shrimp throughout Southeast and up in Beam Canal in 2020 and 2011 my crew and I, we were enjoying watching this, about six brown bears come down every evening and morning they would feed on the flats. Well, the day we were going into town to sell the shrimp here comes a yacht, he comes in there, I came back up two days later, those bears never seen them again, they were gone, they had to have taken all six of them. And we don't have that many brown bears in lower Southeast.

So thank you, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Wagner. Any other Council comments.

Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, thank you. I have more of a comment than anything. Years ago when my dad was a young man there was a bounty on the noses of brown bears and bears in particular whereas they pretty near wiped them down to where we almost didn't see any bears. And during that time they found out the reason why there were bears within our areas, the bears are very essential in keeping the fish moving in the streams so they don't get contaminated, they keep the fish moving, if the fish didn't keep moving they'd cause a disease within that area. Like a lot of things, part of the cycle of what we live by, the bears are very important to our streams and our fishery.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

Kitka.

Mr. Bemis.

MR. BEMIS: Yes, thank you, Mrs. Chair. I can say that you wouldn't believe the amount of brown bears that we've got in Yakutat and in the area, I mean there has to be at least a couple every square mile, I mean they're everywhere. When they don't have a fish on and the water conditions are low those bears come

down out of the mountains, down the streams, into the city, into the camps. We had 16 break ins in one fall time of camps and they just kept ravaging once they figured out -- and I had a bear go into my trailer that I had at camp and he didn't go in to eat anything, he was trying to get to the rodents in the insulation. Same with my cabin across the street. Ripped it apart to get the rodents out of the insulation.

What I'm getting at, I've had them -put garbage in the back of my truck right in the city
and I ran in to grab more, I bring it from camp, I ran
out to bring more and the bag was gone and here's
prints in broad daylight in my truck. But like the
fishing's good, the bears are are -- and I would say
that if you started selling hides that place would be
the first place people would go because it isn't very
hard to run across bear there.

I'm going to be a neutral on this until there's more information and also I would like to see what the northern people are doing, you know, and get a feeling for this. I don't 'think we have enough information and enough support from all the different regions to make a decision on it.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

 Bemis.

Mr. Howard and then Mr. Smith.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. Is there any instances of illegal sales of hides that you're aware of?

 MR. CHURCHWELL: Through the Chair. Mr. Howard. I guess I would say that I am aware of a few. Occasionally you do see -- we usually see them on Facebook, folks pop up and try to sell a bear hide occasionally.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Follow up, Mr.

43 Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair. So that's the only thing I have a problem with, is someone might abuse the privilege of doing this, you know, they sell one legally and then they get a taste of it. Does this fall under the criteria of you're only allowed to make

\$300 off your subsistence or do they actually sell them for more than that?

MR. CHURCHWELL: Through the Chair. Mr. Howard. I guess the prices that I've seen have been more than \$300.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you. So Madame Chair I mentioned mountain goat hides and encouraging hunters to bring the hides back down for the weavers and I'm not going to say how much a weaver was willing to pay for a hide just because of the \$300 threshold I seem to keep it back in the mind somewhere from somewhere but -- thank you, Madame Chair. I'm going to have to -- this is a hard one for me because I could see this -- once you allow the sale of this, someone's going to assume you don't need a permit and you don't -- yeah, this could just get really bad.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. I also want to remind the Council that the motion on the floor is to take no action on this proposal. We are discussing support and opposition in our deliberations, which is probably fine for the record but when it comes down to the vote at this point the motion on the floor is take no action.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: I just want to echo the, you know, the -- what Larry was sharing. You know when I'm in Hoonah, there was -- like I said they had a gentleman coming to keep the community safe and even through years of being in Hoonah when the bears came in Mr. (Indiscernible) was a bear guide and a lot of times the cops -- then they would go through the Fish and Game and they would actually harvest that bear just for safety reasons. But like what Albert was saying, I think he's right, even though if we do be able to sell the hide I think we still should keep the -- you know, that way we're keeping track of who's out in the field and what they're doing and the reporting.

Thank you.

MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.

0498	
1	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the
2	question's been called. Do we need a roll call I
3	don't know that we need a roll call vote. So the
4	motion on the floor is to take no action on Wildlife
5	Proposal 24-01 all in favor signify by saying yah.
6	
7	IN UNISON: Yah.
8	
9	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Anyone opposed
10	to taking no action say nay.
11	
12	(No nay votes)
13	
14	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carries.
15	All right, that concludes our proposal work, however,
16	I'd like to remind the Council that we still have a
17	number of action items and so given that it's getting
18	late in the afternoon we are going to go through the
19	agenda and address action items next and first, before
20	we go to non-action items.
21	
22	So the next agenda item is topics for
23	the annual report.
24	MD GOMBOEDED IN 1
25	MR. SCHROEDER: We have to put
26	something on the record for our comments on
27 28	aquaculture.
29	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, Mr.
30	Schroeder, that's on the list. Do you need me to let
31	you know annual reports is the next action item,
32	aquaculture is down there a ways as an action item.
33	aquacultule 15 down there a ways as an action reem.
34	Mr. Douville.
35	III. Douvillo.
36	MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
37	The T&H was asking for our support for their efforts
38	on co-management of sea otter and blood quantum.
39	
40	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
41	you, Mr. Douville. Are there other items that we want
42	to put on the annual report. We have talked about at
43	this meeting:
44	
45	Green crab.
46	
47	Support for T&H's co-management.
48	
49	Mr. Hernandez did well, actually
50	

we'll get to that -- sorry. But there will be an annual report item regarding the section we removed out of the position letter. The position letter for meaningful priority and continuation of subsistence uses. There was a page that was deleted out of that. We'll talk about that subsequently but the idea was to put that in our annual report rather than leave it into a letter so we're just taking topics for the annual report.

Mr. Howard.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  HOWARD: Are we taking topics now, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.

MR. HOWARD: Can we add the self-guided boats that have pretty much taken over -- I've seen them -- they're basically taking over Chatham -- not Chatham Strait but Icy Strait, I mean you could see them from Point Agusta all the way over to Mud Bay, they're on both sides. They're allowed to take and I know we've discussed this before, as well, is the bag limit. You know you get six cohos a day and you're here for six days that's 36 cohos for one person. So that's, you know, if you look at the numbers and the permits we have, that's pretty close to what we're allowed to take for the whole year as residents of Alaska, which is interesting. I think we should remain concerned with that and try to lower the bag limit.

I -- my memory is not what it used to be so that must indicate my age is getting up there but I recall in the beginning of this meeting that the bag limit started at six in an area, six or four, then it went to six and then it went to nine just because there was so much fish in the area that they kept raising the bag limit. It'd be interesting if they could do that for us in Basket Bay or Sitkoh Bay but apparently there's two different standards for that. But -- so maybe -- I'd like to see the self-guided fleet be a part of our annual report and our concerns with it because I kind of have a feeling there's going to be a fleet in Angoon just because that sounds like what the plan is of the gentleman that bought property in Hood Bay, is he wants to start his own self-guided fleet.

So I'm sure I had more but that's all I

0500	
1	have for now.
2	
3	Thank you, Madame Chair.
4	
5	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
6	Howard. Are there other topics that we need to include
7	in our annual report.
8	<u> </u>
9	(No comments)
10	(
11	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Perry, would
12	you be able to give us a list of all the topics thus
13	far because we may have identified some at our last
14	meeting, correct no?
15	modeling, collect no.
16	MS. PERRY: Not to my knowledge, but
17	during this meeting there was talk in the annual report
18	to address the Department of Commerce being part of the
19	conversation, not being responsive to concerns, and
20	possibly a letter from us through the Board to the
21	Secretary. Anyway, I just thought I'd put that on your
22	radar, that was talked about today or, I'm sorry,
23	<del>_</del>
23	this meeting, not today.
25	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: It feels like
26 27	today.
	(I anglet an)
28 29	(Laughter)
30	ACMING CHAID NEEDHAM. I think and did
	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I think we did
31	discuss that and I think it's a great annual report
32	topic myself.
33	
34	Do you need more discussion or
35	justification on any annual report topic on the record?
36	
37	MS. PERRY: That would be helpful
38	however I can comb the transcripts and capture some of
39	that information and I believe the meaningful priority
40	letter is self-explanatory. We have the testimony
41	regarding blood quantum and sea otters for T&H co-
42	management and then Mr. Howard just mentioned the
43	unguided fisherman bag limit and gave some details.
44	
45	Those are the four items that I have so
46	far so if there are details to add that would help
47	build our annual report.
48	
49	Thank you.
50	

0501 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 2 you. Are there other report topics. 3 4 Ms. Phillips. 5 6 MS. PHILLIPS: So were we going to add 7 the letter to the Secretary of Commerce, I mean I heard her mention that? Because of the bycatch issue that 8 9 the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council has not 10 been responsive. 11 12 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, I 13 think.... 14 15 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, thank you. 16 17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I, personally, 18 said I would like to see it added to the annual report. 19 Other Council members. 20 21 (Council nods affirmatively) 22 23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, Mr. 24 Casipit, yes. Okay. Is there any other annual report 25 topics from Council members. 26 27 (No comments) 28 29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I believe this 30 is probably our last time. Normally we would have our 31 spring meeting to tighten things up a little bit more 32 but it's going to be an All Council meeting and I'm not 33 sure how that is going to work in terms of the amount 34 of work that individual Councils will have so we should 35 probably try to be as inclusive as possible at this 36 meeting to have a thorough annual report. 37 38 Ms. Perry. 39 40 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair. I just 41 wanted to confirm that there is a change during this 42 cycle for the annual report. We'll be able to put 43 together a list at this meeting, however, at the winter 44 meeting we will not be able to add any items, only 45 approve the drafted annual report and it's because of 46 the All Council meeting, which you mentioned. 47

Thank you.

49 50

0502

1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
2 Perry.
3
4 Mr. Kitka.
5
6 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. Probably I think the first meeting I really listened to about where we tackled not a conservation concern but communities that needed assistance and their needs not being met, and a meaningful opportunities to subsist for their food and I think we need to kind of make note of that to the Board that we need to look at this closer and they need to look at it from our point of view. Because sometimes they look at it just from a conservation concern and not really whether it was a conservation for our people.

## Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. And I think to add to that, this Council -- the next agenda item is a letter that we wrote as a Council that addresses that and I'm not saying that we shouldn't have it in our annual report as well because I think if we can provide it as -- I think it's an important topic and I think providing it in most places but I just wanted to let you know that on the first day when you weren't here we did go over a letter that the work group of this Council wrote regarding that topic and we're going to handle that as the next agenda item as well. So I think we have lots of justification and information on that, that it could be included in our annual report as well if the Council wishes.

## (Council nods affirmatively)

 $$\operatorname{ACTING}$  CHAIR NEEDHAM: It looks like I'm getting nods of affirmation. Are there other topics.

Mr. Casipit, did you have one.

MR. CASIPIT: Well, it's -- this is more for the letter to the Commerce Secretary and my mind's foggy, it's so full of stuff, but I remember looking at some data stuff when I was working on that testimony on unguided to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, I was looking at some of that bycatch information and for king salmon, the bycatch of

king salmon in the Gulf of Alaska trawl fisheries exceeds the sportharvest of chinook salmon in Southeast and that's where we get our subsistence chinook. Because we're not allowed to get kings for subsistence. IF we want to eat kings we got to take it out of our sport catch. So I just think that that should be a pretty major point to that letter for Commerce. And I'm probably getting down into the weeds, and I'm sorry.

## ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Bemis.

MR. BEMIS: I totally agree with him. And you know what I'm really impressed that we are, as a Council, or even a Federal entity is going up against the raiding of the ocean and intercepting Federal fish that are going to Federal waters and for subsistence users. This is the first time an intercepting type situation's been addressed. They're very powerful, nobody wants to go up against them and I think once we get this rolling, it might take awhile, but we need to tone them down, they seem to just keep going. They kind of remind me of a tour ship, they just keep touring so that's all I have.

 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Bemis. Just as a reminder, for the annual report it is our opportunity to summarize our work and bring issues that have been presented to us up to the Federal Subsistence Board level.

## So -- Ms. Perry.

MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. I know you mentioned the European green crab invasive species, but I'm not sure I was clear that we were indeed going to add that to the annual report, could you please clarify or confirm.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. I wrote it on the list that I had going for running topics and we received testimony during our -- the first day regarding the invasion of the green crab and the impacts that it's having starting in Metlakatla but will probably be migrating as climate change kind of exacerbates that issue and I think it's something to bring up because it's starting in our region and it could be working north, it could be impacting Prince of Wales residents and Ketchikan residents next as it's

not that much further and the reason why green crabs are able to live in these waters is because they're now becoming adapted and it's getting warmer for doing that and I think that it's a concern. I think this Council would consider it a concern because of the impacts that green crab have on subsistence resources and the foods that they eat.

Other Council members can add to that if they feel like this is also a continued important issue or something that we want to bring to them. I'm not sure if there's anything that we can ask the Federal Subsistence Board to do at this time but it is for awareness that we know this is an emerging issue within our region.

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  Are there any other topics for the annual report.

Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I don't know if you guys heard the latest from the North Pacific Fisheries, the bycatch for herring from the North Pacific, they have an unlimited amount that they consider as bycatch. So one of the major forage fish in the ocean is they have no limit on how many they can kill. That just came out recently.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

31 Kitka.

Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: I think Mr. Kitka's point is really good and it probably should be included in that letter to the Secretary of Commerce. That's just another issue of bycatch getting out of hand.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I think wildlife corridors should be a high priority in landscape management, especially as we're -- the Forest Supervisor said it's -- the Forest Plan is going to go into some sort of revision and these corridors are so essential for subsistence.

0505 1 Thank you. 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms. 4 Phillips. And I'd like to add to that since you did 5 bring up the Forest Plan Revision. I think that's 6 something we could elevate to the Federal Subsistence 7 Board, to let them know that this process is going to be starting and we've asked for a little bit more 9 engagement from the Forest Service on that since we do 10 have input into the subsistence resources section and I 11 think it's good for the Federal Subsistence Board that 12 we're probably going to be spending a significant 13 amount of time addressing the Forest Plan Revision in 14 the future. 15 16 Other topics for the annual report. 17 18 (No comments) 19 20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Perry, can 21 we just get a bullet point list, could you just read 22 through the list of the topics that we have to make 23 sure we didn't exclude anything at this time. 24 25 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. For the 26 annual report I have items regarding -- usually I have 27 a for your information section which doesn't require 28 the Board, because the purpose of the annual report is 29 kind of twofold, one, we're asking the Board for action 30 and then, two, hey, this is coming down the pike, so 31 it's not in any particular order or section. 32 33 But there is verbiage from our meaningful priority letter, the last page talking about 34 35 some items of interest to this Council and a head's up 36 that we probably will be sending letters and bringing 37 those items to the Board's attention. We'll have that 38 as one item. 39 40 Letting the Board know that this 41 Council intends on sending a letter of support for 42 Tlingit -- Central Council Tlingit & Haida Co-43 management, specifically regarding sea otters, and also 44 the issue of blood quantum. 45 46 Unguided fishermen bag limit. Talking 47 about the increase and the impact on resources. 48

Communities affected and the need to

49

```
0506
     provide meaningful priority, perhaps we can have an
     intro paragraph and reiterate to the Board that we are
 2
     sending a meaningful priority/continued subsistence use
 4
    position statement from this Council, which I believe
 5
     will cover all of Mr. Kitka's issues that he mentioned.
 6
 7
                     A bullet mentioning to the Board that
 8
     we will be sending a letter, probably through the
 9
     Board, to go to the Secretaries regarding the
10
    unresponsiveness from the Department of Commerce, this
11
     is regarding the North Pacific Fisheries Management
12
     Council and the bycatch issue. Will have things in
13
     there such as king salmon and herring, which was just
14
    mentioned by Member Casipit and Member Kitka.
15
16
                     Wildlife corridors will probably be a
17
    bullet maybe under the Forest Plan Revision, that we
18
     are going to be advising the Board that this Council
19
     expects to spend significant time providing input.
20
21
                     Those are the ones -- oh, sorry, and
22
     the European green crab invasive species and impacts.
23
24
                     Thank you.
25
26
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
27
     you. Last call for annual report topics for 2023.
28
29
                     (No comments)
30
31
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Ms.
32
     Perry, do we need to do any kind of action on that or
33
     is that agenda item done?
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair, we do
36
     need a vote on that to accept that list. You could do
37
     it by unanimous consent if you'd like to save time.
38
39
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. I'd
40
     like to by unanimous consent, so if there.....
41
42
                     REPORTER: You need the motion first.
43
44
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Oh, we do need a
45
    motion, sorry.
46
47
                     (Laughter)
48
49
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm just moving
```

```
0507
 1
    fast.
 2
 3
                     Ms. Phillips.
 4
 5
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Move to approve the list
 6
     for the annual report as stated by Ms. Perry.
 7
 8
                     MR. HOWARD: Second.
 9
10
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any
11
     discussion.
12
13
                     (No comments)
14
15
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Ouestion.
16
17
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,
18
    question's been called. I'd like to do this by
19
    unanimous consent. IF there's any opposition please
20
    state so.
21
22
                     (No opposition)
23
24
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
25
     you. The next action item on our agenda might need a
26
     few minutes for some cue ups, so I'm going to suggest a
27
     five minute or less bio break.
28
29
                     (Laughter)
30
31
                     (Off record)
32
33
                     (On record)
34
35
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, if we
36
    could take a seat.
37
38
                     (Pause)
39
40
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the
41
    next action item that we need to cover is to go over
42
    the work group's work on the meaningful priority
43
     statement for the Council. This is an action item that
44
     we'll need to vote on. Previously in the meeting there
    was this -- the statement was presented to the Council,
45
46
    it starts on Page 61 of our meeting books. There was
47
    good discussion. There were some changes that were
48
     recommended so the work group met at lunch yesterday to
49
    make the overall changes. I'll go over those in
50
```

1 summary.

 To call your attention, up on the screen is the difference between what is in our Council book that starts on Page 61 and what the final formatting looks like. As Mr. Hernandez pointed out earlier there were no substantial, or any real changes to any of the wording, it was mostly a formatting exercise so I'll let you know what we did now.

On the first page we did -- on the one, two, three, fourth and fifth paragraphs, we decided those were repetitive of one another and we kept the fourth paragraph and we did add Section .805 and Title 101 to the list on that one.

Then the letter stays kind of as-is -we struck that last paragraph and then we left it as-is
through the Council's review of pertinent regulatory
history. We kept in all of those that was bulleted
Item No. 1 through 11. All of that remains the same
with the exception of, on Page 64 we have No. 5, there
were some bullet items under there and we talked about
but it doesn't reflect on the end of taking out the
population estimates and making that a footnote. So
that might just be a final formatting thing. So that
5C only just reads notes that the increasing human
population of Alaska threatens subsistence uses and
then the population data will just be a note for that.

Then after Item 11, the formatting of the letter basically then became paragraphs and we moved what you see in the book on Page 67 of Item No. 12, we decided that was really the crux of what the Council is doing. This is our position statement, No. 12. So -- and we decided that the position statement of No. 12 was better suited to be at the end of the letter so that we wrap up the letter with our concluding statement.

So Page 68 is just paragraphs, those stayed as-is.

We deleted Page 69, possible future position policy statements because we felt that that detracted from the actual position that we were trying to take and we decided to move the possible future position policy statements into the annual report because those were things that we want to comment on in

the future and we wanted to keep the letter to just have the position statement.

So then on Page 70 of your book you can see the letter pretty much ends with what we decided was the position statement which was previously known as Item No.12, but now is just the final paragraph in the letter.

That's a summary of the changes that we made. It looks like we're doing a quick switch on the computer.

Mr. Bemis, did you have a question.

MR. BEMIS: On Page 65 down at the bottom, I got it circled. We were thinking about taking that out on Page 65, bottom of the page on 9(a), it was a little overwhelming about the use of a urban residence coming with -- I don't know, all I know is I got it circled and we discussed something about removing that or something, or was that -- I don't know.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: We left it in. I think I had made a comment that fourwheelers.....

MR. BEMIS: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....that fit on drop bow boats was confusing to me and wasn't sure what we wanted to do and then I had an epiphany in our workshop that drop bow boats were actually like landing crafts and once I understand that that was the case it did seem very pertinent so....

MR. BEMIS: Okay. Okay. I just had it circled.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for catching that. All right, up on the screen our Council Coordinator has put the new letter up -- the formatting of the new letter up for us. Maybe you can show sort of how Item No. 11 it drops off from bulleting and now becomes part of the letter again, that's kind of the substantial formatting change that we made. There's the -- oh, wait -- there's the formatting now with the population data as a footnote rather than being embedded in a bullet point. Again, it's still the same

information just in a different format.

2

The overview of the regulatory review ends after bullet Item 11.

4 5 6

7

 $$\operatorname{And}$  we go into paragraph form with the exception of that No.12 becomes our position statement which is now at the end of the document.

8 9 10

Mr. Hernandez.

11 12

13

14

15

16 17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I think it might be worthwhile to read that paragraph 12 again just so the rest of the Council is pretty familiar with what we thought was the crux of this whole issue. Maybe we could just maybe make sure that's clear to the Council what the work group thought was really the most important paragraph in the letter.

18 19 20

So should I go ahead and do that.

21

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I nominate you.

222324

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So the conclusion states:

252627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

This Council believes that ANILCA requires the Federal Subsistence Program to address and ameliorate all conditions that limit or eliminate the ability of subsistence users to meet community subsistence uses and needs. Not surprisingly since the Federal Subsistence Program regulatory actions set harvest regulations for subsistence harvest and establishes meaningful priorities for subsistence harvest, regulatory actions tend to focus on the harvest rather than the uses. The Council believes that this understandable focus on subsistence harvest, rather than on subsistence uses has deviated from Congressional intent and is in error. Operationally harvest regulations are clearly necessary, however, the objective of harvest regulations under ANILCA directions must be to ensure that community subsistence uses and community needs are met. The objectives should not be a matter of satisfying individual harvesting opportunities. Protecting communities subsistence uses and providing a meaningful priority for subsistence uses may require restrictions on nonsubsistence uses even when there may not be a serious conservation concern, a low harvestable surplus or a

0511 population decline in a fish and wildlife population. 2 3 That was kind of the crux right there 4 stated. 5 6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 7 Hernandez. 8 9 Mr. Smith. 10 11 MR. SMITH: Yeah, can we put some 12 wording in there just in the beginning of that, 13 therefore, this Council believes because it's the end 14 of our -- just a thought. 15 16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are you 17 suggesting that goes in after the bolded section that 18 says focus on harvest rather than uses? 19 20 MR. SMITH: Just starting in the 21 beginning of the 12 that we're putting at the end and 22 he went right in, this Council believes that ANILCA, 23 but changing it, putting; therefore this Council 24 believes that ANILCA -- does that make sense -- no? 25 26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, it makes 27 sense, thank you for that clarification. 28 29 MS. PERRY: I didn't catch that. 30 31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Adding -- do you 32 see where it is up on the screen right now. 33 34 MS. PERRY: Yep. 35 36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Adding, 37 therefore, this Council believes that ANILCA 38 requires.... 39 40 MS. PERRY: Okay. 41 42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. I 43 was not a part of the original working group on this 44 but I think that they did a very thorough job and we did get a good presentation about what they put in when 45 46 Mr. Schroeder read the sort of overall justification and where the working group was coming from and so at 47 48 this point we have this draft letter that has had 49 mainly formatting changes done to it so now we're at

```
0512
     the point where the Council needs to decide if they
     want to adopt this letter and submit it to the those
     that are listed in the letter on Page 61.
 4
 5
                     So we could probably do that by motion.
 6
 7
                     Mr. Howard.
 8
 9
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair. I move to
10
     adopt the letter.
11
12
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
13
14
                     MR. SMITH: Second.
15
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it's
16
17
    been moved and adopted to accept this letter and
18
     submit. Are there any other Council members that would
19
     like to add anything.
20
21
                     Mr. Bemis.
22
23
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes. I've got another
24
     excerpt here. It's -- let's see it's Page 63, No. 2,
25
     the Congress record and deliberations leads up to --
26
     and I've got 101(c), were we going to put that in there
27
     as some kind of a passage of what we were directing on?
28
     That's what I had in there, I don't know if we did that
29
    or not?
30
31
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, I believe
32
    we did that....
33
34
                     MR. BEMIS: Okay.
35
36
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....on the one,
37
     two, three, fourth paragraph of the letter.
38
39
                     MR. BEMIS: All right, thank you.
40
41
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
42
43
                     Mr. Casipit.
44
45
                     MR. CASIPIT: Call for the question.
46
47
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the
48
     question's been called. The motion is to adopt and
49
     submit the letter regarding our meaningful priority
```

0513 1 statement. 2 3 All in favor say aye. 4 5 IN UNISON: Aye. 6 7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed 8 signify by saying nay. 9 10 (No opposing votes) 11 12 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carries. 13 The next item on our agenda is to hear from the working 14 group for the aquaculture. I believe Mr. Schroeder was 15 going to bring that back to the Council. 16 17 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. Let me just cue 18 The idea is that I'll be giving the that up here. 19 working group stuff to DeAnna and she'll do the final 20 formatting. 21 22 Basically we met Wednesday, the 25th, 23 in the evening, John, Albert, Larry and me. And our 24 key points in rough order are: 25 26 We thank NOAA for giving us the 27 opportunity to comment on the types of information 28 needed to responsibly develop aquaculture in Southeast 29 Alaska. 30 31 I'll just read through this, that'll be 32 the quickest because I can read fast. 33 34 The Council believes that appropriate 35 development could benefit rural communities and support 36 subsistence uses of fish and wildlife. The Council is 37 aware of some local successes with existing aquaculture 38 projects as well as conflicts with some planned and 39 constructed aquaculture plans. 40 41 The Council believes that all of the 42 shore and intertidal areas of Southeast Alaska are part 43 of traditional and clan and kwaan territories and may 44 have subsistence uses. The starting point should be assuming that all shore and intertidal areas are used 45 46 for subsistence uses. Projects or plans to develop 47 aquaculture in specific areas will need to be cleared 48 with people who may use these areas. A broad brush

approach identifying AOA areas is not appropriate.

49

0514 1 The Council suggests and prefers that 2 the economic benefit of developing aquaculture in Southeast Alaska should go to local tribes and 4 communities and be a benefit to subsistence users. 5 6 The Council believes that information 7 gathering needs to work through recognized 8 representative organizations. Comments by individuals 9 are important but the many existing organizations that 10 focus on subsistence, fish and wildlife use and 11 conservation should be the main sources of information. 12 These are the groups that have the authority and 13 responsibility to speak for their constituents. These 14 include tribal councils, including Tlingit Haida, city 15 councils, other organizations dealing with resource 16 management, the Southeast Regional Advisory Committee, 17 conservation organizations such as SEAC Sitka 18 Conservation Society and other conservation 19 organizations, Fish and Game Advisory Committees, and 20 of course Fish and Game would be doing its own thing. 21 22 And we also mention that permitting 23 aquaculture operations creates an almost defacto 24 property right for common property resources. The 25 Council notes that aquaculture locations are likely to 26 be unavailable for subsistence uses. 27 28 And those are our main points and then 29 we do something that says thank you for the opportunity 30 to provide these comments. 31 32 So that's what we've got. So if we 33 could get Council approval on that then the final 34 wording would be up to Don and DeAnna after I give the 35 submission. 36 37 Thank you. 38 39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 40 you. 41 42 Mr. Hernandez. 43 44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame Chair. I move to adopt the work of the aquaculture 45

working committee as a letter from the Council to NOAA.

48 MR. SMITH: Second.

46

47

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Is there any discussion, questions from the Council.

Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes, I appreciate this approach. It seems like these mariculture projects want to go in kind of sheltered waters and places that are well used for subsistence, the exception was the company from the Netherlands that actually wanted to --I know we don't have much time but, anyway, they wanted to put a farm between Cape Addington and Granite Point, which is a high king salmon trolling, seining and I said how are you going to keep it in one place, you know, we have 30 foot seas here in the winter and they said, oh, well, that's not a problem we'll just design it that way. It was pretty interesting. But they were not growing kelp to eat, like Seagrove is, sugar kelp and things like that, they were growing macrocytic kelp and the -- anyway they did get a permit for Sea Otter but there is different kinds of -- but even though they aren't a high subsistence area they still need to be kept on a conflict of established commercial fisheries, you know, so there's two things here. It's not just subsistence but it's ocean type things that are being looked at also.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

Douville.

Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. I'm hoping this doesn't turn into something like the real good idea of transplanting sea otters here.

(Laughter)

MR. HOWARD: That's kind of been on my mind that way. Because I could see this happening. You have these type of things down in California already and in Oregon. This year was a good example of no market. At some point you're going to create so many of these things that there isn't going to be a market for it and human nature is you're just going to abandon it and then we get stuck with it as residents of Alaska. So I'm hoping this doesn't turn into the sea otter idea.

0516 1 That's all I have to say, thank you. 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 4 Howard. 5 6 Mr. Smith. 7 8 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I really believe this 9 is a good chance to, you know, be looking at the carbon 10 issue that we're having in the world and the more of 11 these, you know, make note that the ocean makes like 12 75, 80 percent of oxygen for the world but also knowing 13 that, that these plants are absorbing carbon and I 14 believe that the more of these bull kelp farms and 15 other growing of this is really going to help our 16 environment. So I really encourage a lot of this. 17 18 Thank you. 19 20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 21 Smith. 22 23 Mr. Howard. 24 25 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. 26 It seems like nature has a way of taking care of 27 itself. If there's so much pollution in the area and you need to get rid of carbons or whatever, this is 28 29 kind of your whole department, I try not to get too 30 involved in carbons or, but it seems like kelp would 31 start growing more if it needs to. I sit here and I 32 watch the whole -- the whole thing about wolves and everything else, and endangered species, it's 33 34 interesting to watch all of this. But I remember being 35 on the Yukon River with my former father-in-law he 36 said there's a lot of rabbits around so there's going 37 to be a lot of cats around -- I forget what they're 38 called, they're not cats, they're -- but he said it's 39 just nature. You get a lot of rabbits, you get a lot 40 of predators around, all the rabbits go away, the 41 predators starve but they don't go completely away. If 42 we start supporting something like this that someone tries to tell us it's going to fix nature or it's a 44 good idea, you're never going to see me eat kelp, I've had -- I'll eat seaweed but I won't eat the bulb kelp. 45 46 I've had clients on my boat pull bulb kelp out of the

water and eat it even though they had a perfectly good

47

48

49 50 sandwich in the boat.

(Laughter) MR. HOWARD: So I think we need to approach this with caution. It could end up being an environmental disaster. And, Madame Chair, I teach my sons, if there's kelp there there's probably a rock under it. You start putting these things all over the place, you know, I just -- I'm not buying it. Thank you, Madame Chair. ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Howard. Are there -- Mr. Douville. MR. DOUVILLE: I speak in favor. I believe that they need to consult with affected people before they put these in, and as far as nature taking care of things, we didn't' have kelp in a lot of these places we had urchins, we had all kinds of -- the otter turned that upside down and not only global warming, we have kelp where we never saw kelp before. And with the new charting they do overflights and some of the kelp, it could be three, four fathoms there and some other charting is hitting that kelp that is so dense that they're marking it down as rock and there's no rock there. So, you know, it's kind of interesting how things turn out. But the one advantage that I was thinking is that they wanted to put one out in the Gulf

(Laughter)

place to hunt otter, you know.

 $\mbox{ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank} \mbox{ you. A re there other Council comments.} \label{eq:acting_chain}$ 

Iscubell\* and it was pretty significant, it would make

a huge kelp patch and I thought this might be a good

38 Mr. Bemis.

MR. BEMIS: Thank you, Mrs. Chair. I'm thinking that our corporation just bought one kind of from keeping it out of hand. I mean \$30,000 for a permit and everything to do, 14 acres, I think is what they were talking and it's pretty significant in size but in a square it's not that big, but I commented because I was on a teleconference yesterday around 1:00 -- or 1:30 or somewhere in there, that if it was a private entity on the lease and it was impeding the right-of-way or the subsistence user or the troller and

they're members of the tribe and we had first option on it and then we turned it down and somebody else came in and they enforced the privacy zone of the lease, that maybe the members wold come back on us and say, well, why didn't you just buy it, it was only \$30,000. I mean — so I kind of let the Council know, you know, darn if you do and darn if you don't. And it's a price that will keep something out of the water and if you want to venture into it and spend more money at it then you can go ahead and put it in the water and build it and use it the proper way.

But I'm thinking as far as this Council goes, is that we should just -- we're not totally embracing it but we're not totally against it but the main thing and the focus, I think, that we need to really emphasize on is we don't want to take away from our normal usage, passage, food, subsistence, our way of doing whatever. In other words, if somebody comes in to some place that we're using it's just going to be a problem and then it's going to be a bigger problem and then pretty soon it's -- I don't think we want to be involved in that, but if it's properly done, out of the way, something like that because I don't see us stopping it, we're weighing in on this, you know, we're not going to stop this from happening but what we can do is give them -- we're very much wanting to make sure this thing is well thought and well dealt with before anybody votes in on it.

And we kind of need to tell NOAA that and we need to tell anybody else, the Fish and Game, whoever's involved in this, that it's very important for the size of the lease for privacy that we make sure we went over everything before we allow it. And I know we're not going to be the ones that weigh in on whether you can or cannot have that permit but at least we can put the criteria in there for the subsistence user and the community and all the proper channels to do something about it.

Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{ACTING}$  CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank you for that Mr. Bemis.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Just a thought. I looked

at some of the diagrams of how they were setting that up and, of course, the way they were setting up it takes a lot of square footage, a lot of area you see the photo over there, you can do a grow just like only going maybe a couple fathoms on the top line, you would put all your seed and it would just be on one line so then everybody can go around it and not worry about it. Just thinking of different ways of growing it that it's not getting in the way of -- and taking room in our Federal subsistence areas.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair. There's two instances here. One, they didn't even know it was happening until they showed up. And then the other, they weighed in on it but they still did it anyway. If that doesn't 'concern anybody we just open the door widen open for people to do whatever they want, it doesn't matter whose backyard they're in. And I was trying to figure out how we can put those concerns in writing.

I figured out why DeAnna put me here because she can tap on the table if I'm going in the wrong direction so now it has me wondering how to properly word things without....

MS. PERRY: I'm just (indiscernible) that's what it's about.

MR. HOWARD: But I think we need to mention the fact that they've already allowed one even though the community members weighed in on it and didn't want it in that area, they did it anyway. I could see this -- I don't know, if you do enough of these you're going to have buoys all over Southeast Alaska and we're going to look like just one great big farm and, you know, the cruise ships, so pristine Alaska, all of a sudden you have all these farms around and it's not pristine anymore.

But I think in the letter, maybe, Madame Chair, you can do it because you seem to be good with words, better than I am, but I think we need to mention the fact that we recognize that they've done two of these already, one without any local input at

0520 1 all and the other with local input and still did it 2 anyway. 3 4 Thank you, Madame Chair. 5 6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 7 8 Mr. Schroeder. 9 10 MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, just real quick. 11 You know, kind of -- I think this is exactly what one 12 of the things that's good about our Council, we not 13 only get through our proposals but we take on work that 14 no one said we had to do but is really beneficial for 15 people. And you know we'll be following this, there'll 16 be something next round on this because their planning 17 process is set to go on for a long time and, you know, 18 we'll hit them again and pay attention to this. So 19 it's another piece of work that we took on and I'm kind 20 of proud of the Council for doing those things. 21 22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 23 24 Mr. Hernandez. 25 26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Call for the 27 question. 28 29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. I guess I 30 had a question before we end that. Is it safe to say 31 that, you know, the working group provided this -- it 32 wasn't really a draft letter, it was like the key 33 points and then some of these key points that were 34 brought up during the discussion can be added to that 35 and that's what we're voting on and we don't need any 36 kind of amendment to what we're doing? 37 38 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. I think what 39 we heard around the table was just to provide details 40 and examples of those points already articulated by the working group. 41 42 43 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 44 The question's been called. So the motion was to 45 the working group letter on aquaculture, request for 46 information to be submitted to NOAA. 47 48 All in favor signify by saying aye.

1 IN UNISON: Any opposed signify by 2

saying nay.

3 4

(No opposing votes)

5 6

7

9 10

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carries. All right, next up on our agenda, it might not have an asterisk requiring a vote but it does require Council input and that would be the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, the 2024 one, and so I'd like to call Rob and/or his designees up to present that.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

MS. MORROW: Hello, Madame Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Christine Morrow. I am with the Anthropology Division at the Office of Subsistence Management. Today I will providing some updates on the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. I know it's been a really long meeting and we're short on time so I will try to move pretty quickly. not an action item but we are going to be asking for Council comments on the fisheries projects that are proposed for your region for the upcoming cycle.

22 23 24

25

26

So the material for this information starts on Page 296 of your meeting book. There's a lot of information on this topic but I'll highlight just a few key points.

27 28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

So as a bit of background information the Office of Subsistence Management provides funding for fisheries research and monitoring on Federal public lands. Projects that are funded by OSM are selected every two years and projects that are selected can receive funding for up to four years. The process of selecting projects for funding begins with first developing a list of priority information needs for each region. A list of priority information needs for your region was reviewed and approved at the fall 2022 meeting and that list can be found on Page 305 of your meeting book. These priority information needs were included in the announcement requesting proposals to be submitted to OSM for consideration for funding and the proposals for the current funding cycle were received in February 2023.

44 45 46

47

48

After these proposals are received by OSM, they're first reviewed by a Technical Review Committee, which is a panel of expert scientists. These reviewers evaluate the submitted proposals based

on five criteria which are listed on Page 299 of your meeting book. These criteria include:

First, strategic priority or the ability of that project to address one of the priority information needs.

Two. The technical scientific merit of a project so essentially how rigorous scientifically is that project.

Third. The investigators ability and resources, or feasibility to meet project goals.

Fourth. Partnership capacity building, or the projects must have significant support from local organizations and provide for meaningful participation by local organizations or individuals.

Five. Is the cost benefit to the cost of a proposed project must be reasonable for the amount of work that's going to be accomplished and the potential benefits that can be obtained from that project.

Based on these five criteria the Technical Review Committee evaluates projects and offers a justification that summarizes their evaluation of the projects merits and feasibility and after the Technical Review Committee has written these justifications the proposals are brought forward to the Council, like we're doing at the meeting today, for Councils to have the opportunity to provide input on comments -- or on proposals for projects for their region. Comments from the Council are included along with the Technical Review Committee justification in a draft Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan, which is presented to the InterAgency Staff Committee. This draft plan includes the Technical Review Committee's justification and Council comments and then the ISC, or the InterAgency Staff Committee adds their recommendation on which projects to fund for the upcoming cycle. The final selection of projects is determined by the Assistant Regional Director for OSM based on this cumulative input from the Technical Review Committee, from the Regional Advisory Councils, and from the InterAgency Staff Committee as well as based on the funding that is available.

Projects that are selected for funding for this current cycle will start in the spring or summer of 2024.

Today we're asking the Council to provide comments about the projects proposed for your region so it is not an action item but we would like to know if the Council has any specific concerns or comments about the proposals provided for your region. These comments that you provide today will be included in information that is sent along in the rest of the review process for these proposals.

This year two proposals were submitted for the Southeast region and one proposal was submitted, which covers multiple regions including in the Southeast. In your meeting book you can find an executive summary of each project and the Technical Review Committee justification for these proposed project. I understand that you may not have had time to read through all this material so if it's okay with you I can provide a brief summary of each of these three projects and pause after each summary so that there's opportunity for comment.

Does that sound okay?

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: (Nods

affirmatively)

306 of your meeting book.

MS. MORROW: Okay, thank you. So the first project is Project 24-600 titled Unuk River Eulachon Population Assessment. Information for this project begins on Page 306 of your meeting book. This project was submitted by the U.S. Forest Service and the proposal is for four years of funding to continue monitoring eulachon populations in Unit 1. The objectives of this project are to document the run timing and spawning locations and estimate biomass of eulachon in the Unuk River, Chickaman, Kluhini, Wilson, Blossom Rivers and in the Carroll Inlet and Carroll Creek to estimate the age, sex, length, distribution of the eulachon escapement, to document harvest methods, harvest levels and run timing by on site observations and to expand the capacity of the Ketchikan Indian Community to conduct future eulachon monitoring. Again, more information about this project is on Page

Are there any comments from the Council about this particular proposed project.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, I think this was a pretty high priority with the Council and I think the Council would also be pretty pleased to hear that you want to work with the Ketchikan Indian Community on this building capacity so I think that's a pretty worthwhile project.

MS. MORROW: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez.

 $\,$  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any other comments regarding this project that we want to provide at this time.

Mr. Casipit.

 MR. CASIPIT: Just echo what Chairman Hernandez said. This is something that this Council has been struggling with since the year 2000 and even before then so this is good information, and it's needed and I think the Council supports this work and I do too. And like I said, we've been at it for awhile.

 $\,$  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. You want to tackle the next one.

MS. MORROW: Sure. Yes. The next project is Project 24-650 titled Documenting Salmon and Non-Salmon Fish Harvest and Use Patterns in Four Central Prince of Wales Island Communities. Information for this project begins on Page 308 of your meeting book and it was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. There are three objectives to this project. The first is to produce reliable estimates of the harvest and uses of salmon and non-salmon fish for the 2024 year by the residents of Thorne Bay, Hollis, Coffman Cove and Naukati Bay. The second is to record the geographic extent of search and harvest areas for wild resources by residents of these communities. And the third is to document observations of subsistence harvesting practices, harvest trends, resource abundance and characteristics and areas used for subsistence fishing activities over time.

0525 1 Are there any comments about this 2 proposed projects. 3 4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Questions or 5 comments regarding this project. 6 7 I have one if -- oh, go ahead, Mr..... 8 9 10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead, no 11 you first. 12 13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I was curious 14 what the -- is there a tribal government or tribal 15 entity in this project? 16 17 MS. MORROW: Thank you, Madame Chair, 18 for that question. I would have to check the details 19 of this particular project. I'm not sure if any of my 20 colleagues are aware. 21 22 MR. CROSS: Yeah, Madame Chair. 23 the record my name is Rob Cross, the Tongass 24 Subsistence Program Manager. Yeah, I think the details 25 of this are in the meeting book. I actually believe 26 one of the proponents is here and could probably speak 27 more thoroughly to this than I ever could so I don't 28 know if you want to call Lauren Sill. 29 30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: If she's 31 willing, I would be interested in knowing kind of 32 actually how the project came about, like why it was a 33 priority for the Fish and Game to propose it and then 34 whether or not there were any attempts to partner with, 35 I guess, local communities and tribal governments. 36 37 MS. SILL: Sure. For the record my 38 name is Lauren Sill, I'm with Department of Fish and 39 Game, Division of Subsistence. How this project came about for us is that we don't have a lot of -- I mean 40 41 most places in Southeast we don't have a lot of updated 42 data and we're trying to fix that and so Prince of 43 Wales is an area that we're interested in working on, 44 ideally for more than just fish, but since this 45 opportunity is available for fish we were looking 46 there. We haven't done a survey in Naukati Bay since 47 1987, Coffman and Thorne Bay and Hollis, I think, have 48 been since the mid-90s so they were outdated and due.

You know to try to get more information in those areas.

49

In terms of working with communities, yes, we are trying. I've called all of them and we've spoke with -- I don't think I ever found somebody in Naukati Bay to talk to but we're attempting to, and if this goes through then we'll make more efforts and actually be able to go down to Prince of Wales and -- we'll come down here and travel physically to the communities and be able to talk to people that way. So we are attempting to but as of right now we don't have any -- I don't think we were able to include any letters of support on this one. And for all of our projects, when we go, we do hire local people to train so there will be that component of it.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for answering that. All right, I guess another question would be, these are the only two proposals that were submitted?

MS. MORROW: These are the two proposals specific to the Southeast. There's one additional proposal that covers multiple regions including the Southeast and there were -- as far as I understand no other projects proposed for the Southeast region.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. I was -- I mean the reason why I asked the question, too, you know, we put together priority information needs and I just don't remember this being necessarily high on that but that's just -- but I think it's the off cycle of -- now we're on this two year cycle, right, for doing proposals and a lot of the projects that address the priority information needs are kind of the sockeye fish projects which are on a different cycle -- different proposal cycle now, so I was just wanting to make sure that none of those projects were getting preempted necessarily for this priority. But that was my only comment.

Mr. Cross.

MR. CROSS: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yeah, so for the priority information needs, the Technical Review Committee doesn't really see them as a ranked list. I think that that's something that I think these comments are very useful for because we are generally looking at less funding than what these projects are requesting. So I think that that's all

really useful information but, yeah, we don't necessarily look at it as a ranked list of priority information needs.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. I would like to follow up, that I am supportive of this project. I think that's important to say I just wanted to question sort of how that kind of works for my understanding but I think whenever we can update information from communities about use and harvest and things like this that it's information we need at this table for decisionmaking so that would be my comment on it.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I might be out of order but I remember when we were in Ketchikan, my first adventure, we realized that a lot of data wasn't on the table and I think we made a lot of requests and I don't know if that's in our records of what we requested but I do remember one of those requests and I wrote it down, I could share it later, but maybe we could find that, I don't know if we did or not, or we were just voicing that. I'm not sure.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Did you want to answer that Mr. Cross.

MR. CROSS: Yeah. Madame Chair. I was just scrolling through the notes that I have but I'm pretty certain the priority information needs are in the book.

MS. PHILLIPS: 305.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are there other Council comments regarding either one of these proposals for the FRMP project.

Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I really like the idea of the Fisheries Monitoring Program. Several years back we asked how much longer were we going to have to do the monitoring, you guys, overall there's streams that have been low and continue to be low for a long period of time. Realizing some of it had to do with the commercial industry, but some of

1 it didn't, you got some streams that for one reason or another had something happen that the recovery was going to take almost a long, long time because of whatever happened during the spawn and whatever 5 happened during the raising of the little ones that lived in the stream for a year, realizing they found a 6 7 way to cure some of that at Redoubt and the population has kind of exploded the last few years. So I was 8 9 wondering just how long you're going to monitor some of 10 these returns on some of these streams and look at the 11 habitat?

12 13

## Thank you.

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

MR. CROSS: Yeah, through the Chair. Member Kitka. I'm not sure that there's any plan to stop the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. It's a very powerful tool and in some cases I'm pretty sure I know at least one of the streams that you're referring to and I think in some cases where, in particular where we have a tribal entity that we're either partnering with or taken lead on these projects they're able to use the data that they're collecting to inform inseason management and work with the State in sometimes ways that we're not able to and try to effect change through that. So it always comes down to funding. You know, in particular, for these projects that are up right now, as everyone's aware we're operating under a continuing resolution so there's a little bit of a TBD on what funding we'll have to -- to enact these projects. But yes this is recognized as a very powerful tool that we have to inform in-season management. So, yeah, I think as long as there's the desire there from partners and we're doing outreach properly for these projects and working with, in particular, tribal entities to try to put together these application packages, I think that this program will continue.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

And so I can't necessarily -- I know I'm being long-winded, but I can't necessarily say how long each entity will be interested in monitoring these systems but it seems like there's a handful that seem to have the desire to continue for the foreseeable future.

45 46 47

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

48 49

Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. That's twice he mentioned funding and I understand that part of it and I'm sure we all do because the cost of living's going up, the cost of everything is going up. I don't know if this is something we can address or ask for for more funding, especially when you have someone like me that's trying to add on to their plate by asking for stream aging and water quality standards or samples to get a clearer picture of what's happening in the stream. I'm kind of excited that if the market stays the way it is for salmon, I'm going to have a fun next couple years, but is that something we can address, the funding part of that. Because they're having to work with the same amount of money while the cost of materials and everything is going up. Now, I don't know if we can address that or not.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Howard. We're going to have to get back to that. If we can address it -- it might be too late to put it in the annual report as an item.

Mr. Cross.

MR. CROSS: Yeah, through the Chair. Member Howard. I can also say that I wouldn't let the ambiguity of potential funding stop you from putting in proposals. I think that one very important way that we can judge the need for funding is by how many projects are being put in. So if we can show that there's a large amount of projects that are deemed valid and important, that we're not able to fund then that's something that we can move forward with. So I would not deter anybody from putting in a project and going through this process.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thanks.

Mr. Douville and then Ms. Phillips.

 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. These communities, it sort of indicates you're thinking that halibut is taking over where salmon is not so much, but according to second hand data, is that, rental boats and self-guided rigs take more pounds of halibut than all the charters combined in the state. The charters take more numbers, but not more pounds. So some of

these operate out of places like Coffman, would that be included or are you just looking at -- like some of these come here and they have a primary, what they say is a residence here, which gives them the opportunity to fish as a resident and they live somewhere else, but they do have a residence. There some effort to change that to where you must be -- where you not collect the Permanent Fund but to qualify for it to say you are a resident, and I don't know if this RAC could address that. I think we've talked about it several times. But in any case, I guess this study would include some of that so you could get a window into what is really going on?

MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member Douville. So to be clear, what we're doing is presenting the proposals that were submitted to OSM for funding so this isn't a project that we've put in. That being said, I think it's a great opportunity that you have the primary investigator right there in the room so I think that these are really valid comments that I would think that Lauren would consider.

MS. MORROW: For the record this is Christine Morrow. On Page 310 of your meeting book there are -- there's a little bit of information, summary of the methods proposed for this project and it does note that they ideally will be working with long-term residents of each study community.

MR. DOUVILLE: What was that?

MS. MORROW: Long-term residents, so residents that have lived in those communities for long periods of time. It does not that the sample size, you know, estimating goal of 28 households in Hollis, for instance; 69 households in Coffman Cove, so there are some additional details in the meeting book about that. But like Mr. Cross mentioned, you could maybe take advantage of having one of the researchers here with us to answer these questions.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it sounds like maybe if you have specific questions about the project, maybe after the meeting you could ask the PI for the proposal, like your concerns regarding that.

0531 1 Are there other comments regarding the 2 proposals that were submitted. 4 Mr. Bemis. 5 6 I'm sorry, I did acknowledge Ms. 7 Phillips and then Mr. Bemis. 8 9 MS. PHILLIPS: I appreciate the review 10 that's gone through these proposals and I support both 11 of them. Thank you. 12 13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. 14 15 Mr. Bemis. 16 17 MR. BEMIS: Yes, thank you Ms. Chair. 18 I would like to say I agree with your proposal for the 19 funding. And the one thing that I would like to see 20 more of is I'd like to see matching partners as much as 21 you can. I mean usually like in my community, we're 22 more than glad to step up to the plate and help fund a 23 combined -- out of Yakutat. And I think that, you 24 know, with the times being what they are, budgets and 25 everything, and maybe a change in the Administration 26 and what not, the more that we can get partners 27 involved in this, I'm thinking would be a lot more 28 strength in it to get the help to back it up because if 29 you've got a long-term project going on it's hard to 30 fund because we don't know where the next budget of 31 money is coming from but if you got a project that's 32 already backed up by something it seems to me that the 33 funding goes a little easier. 34 35 Thank you. 36 37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are 38 there any other comments. 39 40 (No comments) 41 42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I 43 think that concludes the -- oh, you have something 44 else? 45 46 MS. MORROW: For the record this is 47 Christine Morrow. I do apologize there is one more 48 proposed project that is a multi-region project

including the Southeast if you would like me to

49

```
0532
     summarize that briefly.
 2
 3
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, sounds
 4
    good.
 5
 6
                     MS. MORROW: Thank you, Madame Chair.
 7
     Project 24-750 titled Evaluating Ecosystem Change on
     Traditional Salmon Subsistence Practices and Community
 8
     Food Security in Three Coastal Alaska Communities
 9
10
    begins on Page 316 of your meeting book. The
11
     objectives of this proposed project are to document,
12
     characterize and quantify salmon harvesting and
13
     processing and changes thereto and Akutan, Nanwalek and
14
    Hoonah to better understand impacts of ecosystem change
15
     on community subsistence practices and food security.
    The second objective is to estimate subsistence salmon
16
17
    harvest amounts and locations for these three coastal
18
    communities for the study year of 2025 and to record
19
    the geographic extent of harvest in use areas of salmon
20
    by residents of these communities during the study year
21
    and to compare these areas used for salmon with harvest
22
     activities over time. More details about this project
23
     are on Page 316 of your meeting book.
24
25
                     Are there any comments about this
26
    proposed project.
27
28
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there
29
     comments on this project by Council members.
30
31
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.
32
33
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.
34
35
                     MS. PHILLIPS: It doesn't say here --
36
     it says characterized, so I would characterize that
37
     there's a lot of sharing in the harvest of salmon
38
     harvest for subsistence and I hope that that is part of
39
     the study that the sharing component -- the sharing
     from harvesters to non-harvesters in the communities.
40
41
42
                     Thank you.
43
44
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any
45
    other comments on this project.
46
47
                     (No comments)
48
49
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right -- oh,
50
```

0533

1 Mr. Hernandez.
2
3
4 also seems lik
5 plan on partne
6 on this one so
7 well.
8
9

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. It also seems like a worthwhile project and I see they plan on partnering with the Hoonah Indian Association on this one so I think we'll be glad to see that as well.

 $\label{eq:acting chair needham: All right, any other Council comments.} \\$ 

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you so much for bringing that before us and allowing us to provide comments. I think that, you know, this FRMP program is important to the Council and making sure that we collect data that can be used and brought back for decisionmaking is always good and we appreciate the opportunity to provide our input into what we need, what we think we need. So thank you.

Did you have something else?

MS. MORROW: Thank you, Madame Chair. OSM had planned to provide a brief update on the Fisheries regulatory cycle and the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program, if you would like me to give those updates.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, I did just see that, and the Council Coordinator reminded me that that wasn't on my list, so if you can do that briefly that would be great.

MS. MORROW: I can be very brief, thank you. For the fisheries regulatory cycle, we have just some brief notes to share, that the Federal Subsistence Board took action on all fisheries proposals and closure reviews at their January 2023 fisheries regulatory meeting. The new regulations have not yet been published in the Federal Register, we do expect them to be published very soon. Information about how the Board voted in comparison to the Council's recommendations can be found in the Section .805(c) report which begins on Page 17 of your meeting books. Our next call for fisheries regulatory proposals will occur during your winter 2024 meeting and you may submit proposals to change Federal fish and shellfish

0534 regulations at that time. 2 3 That concludes the brief update on the 4 fisheries regulatory cycle. And I can now provide a 5 brief update on the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring 6 Program. 7 8 We refer to this as the Partners 9 Program. So through the Partners Program, OSM tries to 10 strengthen Alaska Native and rural involvement in the 11 Federal Subsistence Management Program by providing 12 funding to organizations so that they can hire a 13 professional biologist, social scientists or educator. 14 This program also provides funds for science and 15 culture camps and paid student internships for Native and rural organizations. Last fall the Office of 16 17 Subsistence Management announced a notice of funding 18 opportunity for the next cycle of the Partners Program 19 funding and a proposal review panel chose seven 20 successful proposals. Our new and continuing partners 21 include the Bristol Bay Native Bay Association, the 22 Hoonah Indian Association, the Native Village of Eyak, 23 the Native Village of Napiamute -- I do apologize if I 24 am mispronouncing anything -- the Orutsaramiut Native 25 Council and the Qawalangin Tribe of Unalaska and the 26 Yakutat Tlingit Tribe. 27 28 That concludes my brief update on the 29 Partners Program. 30 31 Thank you, very much. 32 33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 34 you. Any questions. 35 36 Mr. Smith. 37 38 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I found a site here 39 NOAA on here, and there was Alaska regions funding 40 opportunities that you might want to check out and I 41 just think a great partnership right there, I mean, you 42 know, NOAA facility in Juneau is amazing, they're doing 43 genetics and all that. I've done a lot of adventures 44 with the kids in there but there's quite a few

different grants, maybe you might want to kind of

stroll through and see if that makes any sense to you,

48 49 Thanks.

any of those -- but just sharing.

45 46

47

0535 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips, 2 and then Mr. Douville. 3 4 MS. PHILLIPS: Is there like a website 5 or something about the one you just talked about, you 6 know, with the villages that you're providing funding 7 for? 8 9 MS. MORROW: Through the Chair. Thank 10 you, Ms. Phillips. I believe there's information on 11 the OSM website about our Partners Program. I do not 12 believe there is a specific individual website 13 dedicated to this program. 14 15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville. 16 17 MR. DOUVILLE: Just a question, not 18 about this, but we do get a Federal report of the 19 monitoring, how many sockeyes went through whatever 20 stream, are we only counting sockeyes or is there more 21 information available as to how many cohos, humpies and 22 so on or are we not keeping track of those, it's just 23 I'd like to look and see. 24 25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Cross. 26 27 MR. CROSS: Yeah, through the Chair. Member Douville. Most of these projects they are 28 29 primarily focused on sockeye but we are also counting 30 other species. So if there's one in particular that 31 you would like the report on I can get that to you or, 32 yeah, we generally report on sockeye because that seems 33 to be the one that most folks are concerned with. But, 34 while we have personnel at the weir, they're counting 35 all species of fish. 36 37 MR. DOUVILLE: Right. My interest is 38 not only sockeyes but the general health of the other 39 species that use those systems so, you know, that, to 40 me gives me some insight of the temperature. 41 42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any 43 other questions from Council. 44 45 (No comments) 46 47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Was that the

48

49 50 final thing?

0536 1 MS. MORROW: Yes, it was. 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 4 you for that. We do have a few things that I think we can do relatively quickly. We have one more action item that sometimes takes us a little bit longer so 6 7 maybe we should do the action item for sure and that's 8 our meeting dates. 9 10 For fall 2024, on our agenda, future 11 meeting date for fall 2024 can be found on Page 325 of 12 our meeting book. It looks like we have previously identified the week of October 22nd through the 24th in 13 14 Ketchikan. We need to decide if we are going to 15 confirm that. 16 17 (No comments) 18 19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Anyone on the 20 Council want to make a motion that we keep those dates 21 or have a discussion that we need to make any changes. 22 23 Mr. Hernandez. 24 25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I move that we 26 keep those dates. I believe that will be the time when 27 we'll be asked to weigh in on the Ketchikan rural 28 determination so Ketchikan will probably be a good 29 place to be, if we can take the heat. 30 31 MS. PHILLIPS: Second. 32 33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Is 34 there any discussion. 35 36 (No comments) 37 38 MR. DOUVILLE: Call for the question. 39 40 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Question's been 41 called. It's been moved to -- the motion on the floor 42 is to hold the Southeast Alaska Regional Advisory 43 Council meeting October 22nd, 23rd, 24th, of 2024 in 44 Ketchikan. All in favor signify by saying aye. 45 46 IN UNISON: Aye. 47 48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All opposed, say 49 nay.

0537 1 (No opposing votes) 2 3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carries. 4 And there I said that was going to take us a long time 5 and it didn't, it's the fastest thing we did. 6 7 (Laughter) 8 9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Vickers, you 10 have a question. 11 12 MR. VICKERS: Speaking of the non-rural 13 determination, we brought up that we were going to have 14 a third public hearing for it, time to be determined. 15 Originally we had planned to do that, we were 16 considering the week of Thanksgiving, probably that 17 Monday or Tuesday, it was brought -- the proponents 18 from KIC came to me and suggested that we hold it 19 instead give some people some time to let it kind of 20 stew and hold it sometime between January and March. 21 We're looking for some input from you on what you, if 22 anything, would prefer, what you think subsistence 23 users in that area would prefer. We're holding it 24 virtually, or by phone, however you want to say it, so 25 that not only for people who were able to miss these 26 in-person meetings but to try to reach out to the 27 larger region for people with input from the region as 28 a whole, so if you guys have input on it, if you think 29 it's a good idea to wait to the start of the New Year, 30 or if you think it's better to keep it just while the 31 iron's hot and go for a November date or if there's 32 something else you think is even better, let me know 33 and we can try and schedule that. 34 35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 36 initial thoughts. You want to think on that a minute 37 while we do some other agenda items and if anybody has 38 a burning input to put back. 39 40 (No comments) 41 42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it 43 doesn't sound like anybody's overwhelming interested in 44 providing input at this time. 45 46 MR. VICKERS: Okay, thank you for that.

It's still undetermined so if anyone has a thought you

can share it at any time.

49 50

47

```
0538
 1
                     Thank you.
 2
 3
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yep, thank you
 4
    Mr. Vickers. The next thing on our agenda is the fall
 5
     2023 Council application nomination open season.
 6
    DeAnna.
 7
 8
                     MS. PERRY: I can make this real quick,
 9
    Madame Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council
10
    Coordinator for the Southeast Subsistence Council for
11
    the record. I would like to inform everyone that the
12
     2023 Council application period opened on September
13
    13th and we are currently accepting applications for
14
    the Regional Advisory Council membership.
15
    encouraging all the Council members to spread the word
    in their communities. For the next cycle there will be
16
17
     four vacancies on our Council. For those on the phone
18
     the application packets are available on our website,
19
     and, again, that's www.doi.gov/subsistence.....
20
21
                     (Teleconference interference -
22
    participants not muted)
23
24
                     MS. PERRY: ..../regions, click on the
25
     regions tab on the blue bar at the top and you'll kind
26
     of hover over that, it doesn't actually appear as a
27
     drop down option, you need to hover over the regions
28
     tab. We also have a number of application packets here
29
     at the meeting for those who are present and may be
30
     interested, and the application period is open to
31
     February 21st, 2024 and this will be for those
32
     incumbents whose term expires December 2nd of next
33
     year, 2024.
34
35
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
36
37
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
38
     Perry. Next up on the agenda -- I actually have a
39
     question, do we need to confirm the winter All Council
40
     meeting, that seems like it's a.....
41
42
                     MS. PERRY: No, it's pretty set.
43
44
                     (Laughter)
45
46
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: It's just under
47
     the asterisk.
48
49
                     (Laughter)
50
```

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. Then on that topic, winter 2024 All Council meeting proposed topics of discussion.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair. DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator again.

The last All Council meeting was held back in 2016, it was very well received by all Councils. There was a lot of positive feedback. Council members were eager to learn about subsistence issues in other regions and discuss issues of interest to all or multiple regions. OSM is planning to hold another All Council meeting, which it has been scheduled, we're pretty much set in stone for March 5th through the 8th for a total of four full days in downtown Anchorage. During this time there will be at least one day session where all Councils will meet together. This session will contain a variety of topics of interest to all Councils. Then after that the Councils will break into individual meetings that will run at least a half a day to a full day depending on Council business. There will also be several parallel sessions, lectures, seminars, workshops, talking circles, on a variety of subsistence related topics. While there will be some sessions that will be standard, such as one on Roberts Rules of Order and another one on ANILCA Title VIII, others can be non-standard topics.

So today we're asking for your input. We want all sessions to be as engaging and interactive as possible so OSM is looking to each Council to suggest topics of interest for these other session. While OSM is not able to fulfill all Councils requests we do our best to fit in as many as reasonable.

While this is not an action item, please let me know your thoughts and suggestions so that I can relay them back to the All Council Planning Team. And I thought maybe I could kick this off with just giving a few of the 2016 informational sessions that were offered. We've got several new folks on the Council that might not be aware of that.

But in 2016 Federal Indian Law

Cross cultural communication

0540	
1	Customary and traditional use
2	determinations and the Section .804 prioritization
3	process
4	
5	Council member roles and
6	responsibilities
7	responsibilitates
8	Understanding dual management
9	
10	FRMP and Partners Program
11	
12	Were all offered. And there were also
13	some panel discussions held on public advisory groups
14	for fish and wildlife management, tribal consultation,
15	holistic management and challenges in outreach.
16	
17	So, Madame Chair, if you'd like to lead
18	the Council in making any suggestions I'd be happy to
19	capture those and, again, forward them on to the
20	planning committee.
21	m) l
22	Thank you.
23	
24	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
25	you, DeAnna. Are there any suggestions from Council
26	members of topics that could be presented to OSM.
27	
28	Ms. Phillips.
29	
30	MS. PHILLIPS: Meaningful preference.
31	,
32	ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. Any
33	others.
34	ochero.
35	Mr. Casipit.
36	mi. Casipic.
	MD CACIDIE. Marks this is instance but
37	MR. CASIPIT: Maybe this is just me but
38	I'd really like to hear an update from the Federal
39	attorneys on some of this outstanding litigation that's
40	going on between the Board and State, you know, there's
41	that Kuskokwim River lawsuit, there's the lawsuit over
42	providing for Kake providing moose and deer for Kake
43	during the Covid pandemic thing. I know there's some
44	litigation going on oh sorry.
45	
46	(Laughter)
47	, ,
48	MR. VICKERS: This is Brent Vickers,
49	OSM. I do have updates on ongoing lawsuits if you would
50	oom. I do have apaaces on ongoing lawsuits if you would
$\cup$ $\cup$	

```
0541
 1
    like to hear them. If you would like to hear them now
     let me know.
 2
 3
 4
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I think we'd
 5
     like to finish out making the suggestions and then if
 6
    we'd like to hear....
 7
 8
                     MR. CASIPIT: You can just email me
 9
     that if you want.
10
11
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Us.
12
13
                     MR. CASIPIT: Us.
14
15
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, us, through
     our Coordinator, please.
16
17
18
                     Any other topics.
19
20
                     Mr. Bemis.
21
22
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes. I would like to just
23
     stay on top of that high seas interception thing and
24
     how we're going about it because this thing seems like
25
     it's going to drag out, even though we get a letter
26
     with this, I just see this going as long as -- long
27
    past, so I would like to have that as one of our action
28
     items to stay very in touch with what the high seas
29
    thing is because if it is taking the king salmon from
30
     Southeast and taking the king salmon from the Kuskokwim
31
     and Kenai and Kodiak, and everywhere -- for that
32
     amount of fish being taken out of the water and we're
33
     all suffering, that is not good.
34
35
                     Thank you.
36
37
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: How about
40
     subsistence opportunities for urban tribal members.
41
42
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Others.
43
44
                     (No comments)
45
46
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Now
47
    we are going into agency reports, I believe we have two
48
     that we can do. Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
```

MS. SILL: Thank you, Madame Chair. Members of the Council. For the record my name is Lauren Sill. I'm with the Department of Fish and Game's, Division of Subsistence. I realize it's after 5:00 so I will try to keep this quite brief. I did submit like a one page update that you guys should have in your Council books so I will kind of just briefly touch on some of those things that are in there.

One thing is that we just hired a new lead researcher for Southeast. Her name is Emily Dahl (ph) so you should be seeing her at these meetings in the future. We're excited to have her.

In terms of projects that we're doing in Southeast right now we have Klawock in-season sockeye salmon harvest surveys that we have been doing. The project originally was for a three year data collection. We did the first year, it's a project that was in cooperation with Klawock\*Keenya and Cathy helped out with our training of surveys. Last year we ended up having some staffing capacity problems so at the moment we're looking for a new partner to help out with that project. But it should continue data collection next summer and then the following summer.

We also are part of the KeKwaan\*
Community Forest Partnership and our part in that
project was to do comprehensive harvest surveys in
Kake, which we completed this spring and so now we have
-- we're just getting the data back from those, we're
going to do an internal data review within the
Department and then we'll head back to Kake to present
all the data that we collected so that we can get
feedback from community members before we write a
report that will be published next year sometime.

We have upcoming surveys happening in Pelican and Tenakee and Gustavus, that will go this spring. I was just talking to Cal and hopefully I'll get with Patty as well to talk about community meetings. Before the surveys start we like to go to --we have support from the communities to go but we like to do a meeting beforehand to kind of explain why we're there, what kind of data we're collecting, how the data gets used, to hear any concerns we might be able to incorporate into our survey. Certainly the conversations you guys have had during this meeting, we're looking at ways to incorporate questions or

additional parts of the projects that we could provide data in the future to these sort of topics.

2 3 4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

22

23

There's a new project that I'm a partner in -- I'm not particularly involved in it but it's with the U.S. Forest Service, it's called Food From the Forest, Alaska National Forest Contributions to Wild Food Systems. It's this collaborative project that's being led by Ryan Bellmore who's a fish biologist at Pacific Northwest Research Station and Marie Gutschesel who is an doc fellow and they're basically using long-term data of wild food harvest that's been collected by the Department over the last 40 years to estimate Forest contributions to wild food systems. They're using this food web modeling approach 16 to ask three questions. What proportion of wild food harvest is directly and indirectly supported by 18 National Forests in Alaska. How does harvest vary 19 between communities and through time. And how 20 resilient are wild food systems to changing Forests and watershed conditions. So that project has just got started. Marie has only started working this month but we hope you guys will be hearing more about the project as it moves forward.

24 25 26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

And then the last thing I wanted to talk about was the Alaska Salmon Task Force, which is a task force created by an Act of Congress in response to recent unprecedented shifts in salmon abundance in Alaska. The purpose is to compile science and traditional knowledge to identify what is known about salmon in Alaska, data gaps and needed research. This will be used to develop a coordinated research strategy for sustainable salmon management in Alaska. There is an upcoming two day public meeting November 14 and 15th and the afternoon of those meetings are dedicated to public testimony. Traditional knowledge is a large component of the task force's efforts but it definitely relies partly on people sharing this information. So I just want to put out there that this meeting is happening. I can send the announcement to your Council Coordinator if you guys would like to see it and it would be great to have lots of people call in and provide testimony to the task force.

44 45 46

47

And I think that's all I had for my update so thank you for the time and if there are any questions I'm happy to take them.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are there any questions for Ms. Sill.

Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Lauren, do you routinely provide the results of your survey information to the Council or do we need to request to see them or do they show up in analysis or like I say, do we get all the results from your surveys?

MS. SILL: I don't think that you do. I'm not 100 percent positive. I -- I don't think that we've given the full list of our -- of the whole overview of our data. I believe that in the past when we publish a report that I'll bring it up that it's been published, but I don't believe that sharing all the data has been traditionally something that we've done but certainly can.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I just hear a lot of worthwhile projects there that would be of a lot of interest to the Council and I just -- yeah, now that we know about them, I don't know if we need to request the results or we're going to automatically see them so I guess we'll just keep that in mind. So personal preference is when you do some community surveys like that, that you would just kind of routinely provide them to the Council, I think would be great. So I'll make that comment.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.

Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. Is it okay to share this like No. 2 blurb, like, you know, post something in the community to give them a head's up that this will be happening?

 MS. SILL: Through the Chair. Member Phillips. Absolutely. And usually once we actually start planning and -- planning a community meeting I'll do a whole flier about the surveys and we'll be looking to hire residents to train and survey, administration and so usually there's usually a flier about that too, about what we're doing and pay and all that kind of stuff, which -- yeah.

0545 1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 2 Other questions for Ms. Sill. 4 (No comments) 5 6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank 7 you. 8 9 MS. SILL: Thank you. 10 11 MR. SMITH: Well, just..... 12 13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, we have 14 one more report, do you want to -- okay. 15 16 MR. SMITH: Well, just to remember my 17 first meeting that Mr. Jackson from Kake, because it 18 just came to me about the issue with the crab, and I 19 don't know if that's ever come up or if there was any 20 response or did anybody go to support Kake in that 21 issue. I know there was testimony and he chatted with us. But, yeah, I just -- when she talked about that I 22 23 just remembered about that piece. 24 25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hold 26 on to that. We are under agency reports and we do 27 still have the Forest Service report to go through. 28 29 MR. CROSS: All right, thank you, 30 Madame Chair. For the record my name is Robert Cross. 31 I'm the Subsistence Program Manager for the Tongass and 32 I have whittled this down to all the good stuff so I 33 will try to make it go fast. 34 35 Okay. 36 37 So for this year we've entered into seven Fisheries Resource Monitoring partner agreements 38 39 that have totalled roughly \$878,000 in partner funding. So that provided funds for six local tribal 40 41 organizations as well as agency partners like ADF&G and 42 contributed to funding of roughly 36 jobs. I think 43 that's a pretty low estimate, because I just talked to 44 the Sitka Tribe of Alaska and they said that they had hired on and off about 14 people to work the Klag Bay 45 46 project so I think it's contributing to a lot more 47 seasonal positions. And then we're also partnering

with KIC. I know they were going to give a

presentation but I just want to give them a shout out

48

49

for the work that they've been doing on the Unuk River Monitoring project for eulachon and they're also performing water equality and eDNA work and that's a partnership between KIC and the Forest Service.

So the next one is in response to some concerns that I've heard from the Council since I've taken this position about access to data, you know, specifically Member Douville's recent comment as well, we're working with our GIS shop because I am not a GIS nerd by any means and they're creating an interactive web map so it will be a website and it'll have basically a Google Earth of the Tongass and you can click on any of our FRMP sites and be able to see both the current year escapement for species and then historic escapement for those systems as well. So that's something that is going through the chain of approval right now and then we'll test it out with some of our tribal partners, like Sitka Tribe of Alaska and then we'll also have our biologists Ashley Bolwerk and some other folks look at it to make sure that it meets their needs and then we'll be presenting that at one of the future Council meetings.

Also we partnered with the Sitka Conservation Society to continue the youth engagement course in the Federal Subsistence Program. So as part of that we've been able to bring several students to the fall RAC, the last Board meeting, and then as you saw to this meeting. I'm super happy to announce that we've secured some more funding for that as well so we're going to be expanding that program and Heather can talk to you guys out in the hallway about that but we're super excited about it.

 We've also been serving on the Unit 4 working group and that's in the hopes of increasing sort of the breadth of information we have from traditional, ecological knowledge and just information from the rural communities.

Also Jake Musslewhite and Ashley Bolwerk participated in a super cool event, it's the Angoon's Youth Steward's Youth Sockeye Harvest Event, it's kind of a mouthful but they worked with AYS and went out with some of the local youth from Angoon and they harvested sockeye out in Basket Bay and learned to process the fish from their elders and then what is super cool -- we have a slide show about it but there's

some photos of the youth handing out the sockeye to their community. And I just want to be very specific about this, we were really honored to be invited to that community and play a very small part. It was in no way us teaching folks from Angoon how to subsist but we were able -- you know, we had the gas in the boats and, yeah, so it was very cool to be invited out there and we're looking into other opportunities in other communities.

So if anybody has any ideas on that, again, we have the equipment and so we're happy to just kind of shuttle folks back and forth and be a part of that community harvest event.

And then pretty much last on the list, we've also been working with the Sitka Conservation Society to provide Federal subsistence outreach workshops in rural communities around the Southeast. So we've done eight of these so far. I know some of you have gone to them and, yeah, this is also in response to some concerns that I heard when I first started in this position as far as public engagement and folks, you know, knowing how this process works and being able to be a part of it. So, you know, I pretty much -- we hired Ashley and I just said, you know, you interviewed really well so here's a giant project to work on and she took it and ran with it and she's been doing potlucks and I don't want to leave Heather Bauscher out either, so that pair, they've been living out of suitcases for a couple months, and just really working with the communities and being invited into the communities to try to offer the information that they have.

So, again, that was to specifically address some of the concerns that the Council had as far as folks engaging, you know, whether or not they knew how the process worked.

So for anybody who went through it, I know Harvey Kitka was in the one in Sitka and they go through everything from how to testify to how the Federal Subsistence Board process works, how the Councils, who the Council members are, I mean it's -- I learned stuff in there, so it was really good. So, yeah, so far they've been to Sitka, Petersburg, Wrangell, Kake, Angoon, Gustavus, Tenakee, Pelican and Hoonah, and I'm sorry if I'm leaving any of those out,

```
0548
    but the plan is to continue those in the late spring --
     or I guess late winter, early spring so we'll be going
    to POW, Yakutat so they'll be reaching out to Council
    members. I will just add that I would implore you to
 5
    please, you know, shake the bushes and drag people into
    this, it's really meaningful and the folks that have
 6
 7
    gone have really had great comments about it and have
     learned a lot of information. So, yeah, I would just
 9
     ask that the RAC members, if they see that it's coming
10
    to their town, I'm sure that Ashley and Heather are
11
     going to be reaching out to you and working with you
12
    but I'd really just ask that you help them and get as
13
    many people there as possible. So we've had between a
14
    full room of folks, standing room only to one person in
15
     attendance. So it's kind of hit or miss but there's
     always good food. Ashley makes, you know, pickled kelp
16
17
     and herring egg casserole, and all kinds of good stuff
18
     and the folks from the community do as well.
19
20
                     So that's it, that's all I got time for
21
     so I'll take any questions at this time.
22
23
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for
24
     that. At least your range of attendance wasn't zero
25
     to....
26
27
                     (Laughter)
28
29
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....so that's
30
    great.
31
32
                     (Laughter)
33
34
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any
35
     questions or comments on the Forest Service report.
36
37
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.
38
39
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.
40
                     MS. PHILLIPS: I would just like to
41
42
     thank the Forest Service Tongass Region for a yeoman's
43
     job of, you know, trying to get more engagement in the
44
     work that you do in the communities.
45
46
                     Thank you.
47
48
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
49
     sounds like you summarized all the Forest Service
```

```
0549
     reports because you're the fastest talker, right.
 2
 3
                     (Laughter)
 4
 5
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I'm
 6
    getting signals that maybe.....
 7
 8
                     MS. PERRY: Well, Jake....
 9
10
                     MR. MUSSLEWHITE: I mean at the
11
    pleasure of the Council, I know Ashley has a great
    presentation and a lot of great photos, and also a
12
13
     fisheries summary presentation so if the Council wishes
14
    we've got it all wound up and could go through it
15
     quickly.
16
17
                     (Off record comments regarding
18
    presentation)
19
20
                     MS. PERRY: Could you turn one a
21
    microphone.
22
23
                     REPORTER: Someone needs to turn a
24
    microphone on.
25
26
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: It sounds like
27
     there's an offer to forward the presentation that
28
     Ashley has put together regarding some of the youth and
29
     community engagement, I'm assuming stuff, and so she
30
     can forward that to the Council. We are getting pretty
31
     pressed on time. We'd love to hear those things but we
32
    had a lot of business at this meeting.
33
34
                     So with that are there any other
35
    questions regarding the agency report that Rob Cross
36
    gave us.
37
38
                     (Off record comments regarding
39
    presentation)
40
                     ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: What's the wish
41
42
    of the Council, are you ready to keep going or do you
43
     want to conclude our agency reports.
44
                     MS. BAUSCHER: We can do it at the next
45
46
    meeting.
47
48
                     MS. PERRY: I just feel bad that
49
    because of the blizzard in March we skipped the agency
50
```

reports then and we're going to have an All Council meeting in the spring and probably won't have -- so the Forest Service Staff is just offering if this Council would like to hear it so.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I do understand that. It's been a long meeting, though. I mean I hate to skip the agency reports but when we deliberate so long at the table and we run into 5:30 on our last day I don't know that I'm absorbing any information at this point, that's just my personal opinion.

Mr. Cross.

MR. CROSS: Yeah, Madame Chair. So I'll just add that this project, these workshops are still ongoing, there is still funding for it, so we're happy to -- although it's an amazing presentation, I love the photos I think that we can offer it maybe at the conclusion of the project or whenever possible.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: It can be a presentation at the All Council meeting, the work that they're doing.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: As an agenda item rather than an agency report.

(Laughter)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Any other questions for Mr. Cross while he's here.

Mr. Bemis.

MR. BEMIS: Thank you, Madame Chair. Thank you for your presentation and the struggle for funding and keep things going. I know my community steps up to the plate and helps out as much as it can so if you do come to Yakutat let us know ahead of time. I'm on the Council and we'll definitely get you an audience. Havelah is there working but, you know, if you were to address the Council and kind of tell what you're doing and they get a little better feeling for it because we usually wind up just having annual three month meetings with Havelah because she's always out in the field or doing something. So if you come to

0551 1 Yakutat just get us a short meeting if you could and give us an update and that way we stay on top of this 2 and help you out as much as we can. 4 5 Thank you. 6 7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. 8 9 Ms. Phillips. 10 11 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair. I feel 12 similar to you that, you know, after three days after 13 very intense meeting my brain is like, you know, not 14 really functioning very well right now. 15 16 Thank you. 17 18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any 19 other questions for Mr. Cross. 20 21 (No comments) 22 23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you so 24 much for coming up and providing this brief report to 25 keep us informed of what's been going on. 26 27 I think we are finished with agency 28 reports so I would like to hand the Chair back over to 29 Mr. Hernandez so he can close out our meeting. 30 31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So, Madame Chair, 32 I think we covered all topics, I guess that's why 33 you're handing me back the gavel. So the only final 34 thing on the agenda is closing comments if any of the 35 Council members would like to make any closing comments 36 this is an opportunity to do that now. 37 38 Cal, go ahead. 39 40 MR. CASIPIT: I just wanted to go on the record and thank Staff for the really well prepared 41 42 Staff analysis that we have in our book. They were 43 just excellent and the presentations by Staff, again, 44 was excellent. And I also wanted to thank Mr. Churchwell for hanging with us the whole time, that's 45 46 really cool, doesn't happen a lot for us. 47 48 Thank you.

0552 1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy. 2 3 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 4 I'd like to add to that. Again, thank you to Staff and 5 agency personnel but also to all of the folks that are still here with us in the room that aren't our Staff or 6 7 agency helping us through these proposals but have been listening attentively and smiling and nodding from the 8 9 back of the room, of course, our great program with 10 youth and I see a former Council member that's been 11 with us the whole time and so we really appreciate you 12 guys in attendance. 13 14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Larry, and then 15 Albert. 16 17 MR. BEMIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to say thank you to the Staff and everybody that 18 19 has came here and participated and I am glad to be back 20 on the Council. And hopefully get back up to speed and 21 be a little more involved in the decisions that are 22 being sent to us and thank DeAnna for all the hard work 23 she does in sending that and keeping us abreast, that's 24 a full-time year-round job. Good to see you all. 25 26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Albert, did you 27 want to say something. 28 29 MR. HOWARD: No, thank you, Mr. Chair. 30 31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody 32 else. 33 34 Mike. 35 36 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes, thanks to DeAnna 37 and Staff. It's nice to have Staff here. There have 38 been several meetings where we didn't have that support 39 and it makes it much more difficult. The only other 40 thing I would say is that the tribe had some monies and 41 they bought some fish, sockeyes -- ocean sockeyes from 42 the local boys and distributed 20 per household for the 43 Craig Tribe, which was really nice and well received. 44 My only concern is in the Sarkar System, we don't have -- we have one brown shirt here, I guess, and can't 45

enforce the whole island. Perhaps some Federal help

on above the bridge which is illegal and people are

getting their limits there and it's not okay, we gave

could come about because there's lots of snagging going

49 50

46

47

```
0553
 1
     them sockeye as a free ride when they hit freshwater,
     no nets or anything else. I don't care if they
 2
     sportfish there but it's all -- and it's not okay.
 4
 5
                     That's all I have to say.
 6
 7
                     Thank you.
 8
 9
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
10
     Anybody else.
11
12
                     (No comments)
13
14
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'd just like to
15
     thank, you know, all the organization that went into
16
     this meeting to allow us to come to Klawock. I was
17
     really glad we could come to Klawock this time, we
18
     heard a lot of good public testimony here from local
19
     folks and they took good care of us with food and
20
     transportation and, yeah, it was a really good meeting,
21
     so appreciate all the work that went into it.
22
23
                     John, go ahead.
24
25
                     MR. SMITH:
                                 (In Tlingit)
26
27
                     It's good to see your faces today my
     friends and a lot of positive and good things and good
28
29
     relationships going on.
30
31
                     (In Tlingit)
32
33
                     In our culture we don't say goodbye,
34
     there's no words for it so I can't wait to see you guys
35
     again. My term's coming up. It's real shocking how
36
     quick that was, it just seemed like just the other day.
37
     So I'm hoping the Team can encourage me to hang around.
38
     I surely would like to sit at the table.
39
40
                     Hoorah.
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
43
     Like they say, time flies when you're having fun.
44
45
                     Okay, anybody else.
46
47
                     (No comments)
48
49
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think we can
50
```

```
0554
     call the meeting adjourned.
 2
 3
                      (Applause)
 5
6
                      (Off record)
 7
                        (END OF PROCEEDINGS)
 8
9
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```

0555	CERTIFICATE
2 3 4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
5 6	STATE OF ALASKA )
7 8 9 10	I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
11 12 13 14 15	THAT the foregoing pages numbered through contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III taken electronically on the 26th day of October;
17 18 19 20 21 22	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;
23 24 25	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.
26 27 28 29 30	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 8th day of December 2023.
31	Salena A. Hile
32	Notary Public, State of Alaska
33 34	My Commission Expires: 09/16/26
35	
36	
37 38	
39	
40 41	
42	
43 44	
45	
46	
47 48	
49	
50	