

0001

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

SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME III

TED FERRY CIVIC CENTER
Ketchikan, Alaska
October 24, 2024

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Donald Hernandez, Chair
Cathy Needham
John Smith III
Patricia Phillips
Albert Howard
James Slater
Theodore Sandhofer
Frank Wright
Harvey Kitka
Larry Bemis
Calvin Casipit
Michael Douville
Louie Wagner

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp
787-239-0462
Info.@lighthouseonline.com

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Ketchikan, Alaska - 10/24/24)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you very much. Everybody in the room, Council members if you would find your seats. We'll get started.

Okay. As our Coordinator just mentioned, if there's anybody that does want to do a testimony on a non-agenda item this morning, if hopefully you've been aware of the blue cards that we collect. So, we know who wants to do that. And if you could bring those forward that will be the first item on the agenda this morning. And also, I'll check to see if there's anybody on the telephone line that wants to do a testimony on non-agenda item. Is there anybody on the phone?

MS. PERRY: And folks on the phone, you may want to press star six to unmute your line so that we can hear you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Not hearing anybody on the line. DeAnna Do you have any blue cards turned in yet this morning?

MS. PERRY: I do not have any, Mr. Chair. And I just wanted to take a moment.....

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I see one coming though so.....

MS. PERRY: Okay. And while we're doing that, I just wanted to remind folks to remember to state your name for the record. Just because folks that are getting the recording aren't physically with us in the room and can't see our name tags. So, if we could remember to identify ourselves before we speak, that would be great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay.

(Pause)

Mr. Nelson. Okay.

(Pause)

1 MR. NELSON: Hello. My name is Zeite
2 Nelson. I am a student at Pacific High School. I'm here
3 representing myself. And before I begin, I would like
4 to thank the Board for taking their time to listen. I
5 know this is not a topic that has been discussed, but I
6 feel like it affects me and others personally. I'm here
7 to talk about bycatch and how it is affecting salmon and
8 other ocean wildlife. The way it is affecting ocean
9 wildlife is because the nets drag across the sea floor.
10 This not only affects the salmon and other fish, but
11 also affects other -- the creatures at the bottom of the
12 ocean, including crabs, octopuses, sea lions, and sea
13 otters. Due to bycatch, king salmon are approaching the
14 endangered list. Personally, I would not like that to
15 happen because my family are subsistence fishermen. I
16 remember one time when my uncle, father and I were
17 fishing by the mouth of a river, we were looking for
18 king salmon. I remember we caught the biggest fish I'd
19 ever seen, and we took our fish home and fed not only
20 my whole family, but it kept us full for almost a week.
21 When we think about how, yeah, I think about how just
22 one king salmon getting caught into the bycatch nets is
23 removing dinner for a family I feel is very wasteful as
24 well as it takes away the joys of a good memory. I would
25 like to ask the Board to review bycatch laws and how
26 they affect subsistence users and aim for solutions to
27 keep king salmon off the endangered list. One day I wish
28 to be like my father and see our future children share
29 the same memory. In conclusion, I would like to thank
30 the members of the Board for giving me their time to let
31 me speak and express my concerns.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
34 Zeite. And where did you say you were from again?

35
36 MR. NELSON: Sitka, Alaska.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Sitka. Okay.
39 Yeah, bycatch has been a big issue for this Council --
40 statewide issue. Our Council's been involved in it.
41 We've got a number of letters written in support of
42 putting more caps on the bycatch out there by the trawl
43 fleet. So, thank you for your support of that.

44
45 MR. NELSON: Thank you for letting me
46 speak, sir. Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Is there
49 anybody else?

50

1 (No response)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Okay. There is no -- no one online. And no more blue cards. So, we will proceed with Council deliberations on non-rural determination proposal 25-01. We've gone through all the public testimony, had the staff analysis, asked a lot of questions and now it's time for the Council to take action. So, what's the wish of the Council? Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to support proposal NDP25-01 to rescind non-rural designation for Ketchikan.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. We have a second, Mr. Douville. Okay. So, normally I -- as a Chair, would, you know, start asking Council members how they feel about this proposal, but -- and I would usually weigh in last. But there's a few things that I kind of wanted to get out there to kind of open the discussion. So, I'd like to do that, and then and then we'll go around to the rest of the Council. So, thank you for accommodating me in that. So, I'd like to start off the discussion just with kind of a reminder of our Council's duties and responsibilities. We are part of the process of implementing Title 8 of ANILCA. And as we heard in a lot of testimony yesterday, Title 8 is part of Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act had a intended purpose. And, that purpose was to essentially make amends for what the indigenous populations of Alaska gave up and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. So, when a land conservation bill came into existence, Title 8 was added to it to protect the indigenous rights of Natives in Alaska to continue their customary and traditional way of life. So, to us that is the purpose and intent of Title 8 that we are here to help implement. So, like all legislation, it's always subject to, you know, political calculations and compromises are made. In the case of Title 8, even though the Congressional Record shows that it was to protect a Native way of life, it was written into the law that the priority of the law would go to rural residents. So, that's what we work with, rural residents, Native and non-Native alike. Also, when it comes time to implement a law, all laws are subject to interpretation. And there's always language written into a law that's somewhat ambiguous and needs interpretation. And of course, that's where the role of our court system comes in. The laws are constantly being reevaluated, and Title 8 is certainly -- it certainly happened with Title 8.

1 You know, a number of court cases have changed the way
2 we implement that law. The McDowell decision, the Katie
3 John decision, there's others. So, the law evolves over
4 time. And some people are still not satisfied with
5 everything that's in Title 8 of ANILCA but I don't
6 believe that Title 8 needs to be amended. Certainly,
7 shouldn't be done away with. It's a very important,
8 important law, and it works. And the Council system is
9 what makes it work, and that's what we do. And I think
10 what we're dealing with here at this meeting is one of
11 those ambiguous terms in Title 8 of ANILCA, and that is
12 the word for rural. We are supposed to determine what
13 is rural and what is not rural. And Title 8 does not
14 give us a definition of rural. During the implementation
15 of the rule up to this point, it's changed, it's evolved.
16 It started out with a hard number that we -- everybody
17 worked with, you know, essentially over 7,000 people,
18 you were no longer rural. But now that's been changed
19 through policy and the burden has been placed on the
20 Councils to define, essentially define rural as we see
21 it taking into account a number of factors that were
22 supposed to be familiar with.

23
24 So essentially, it's come down to the
25 to, in my view, is like, what do we feel that rural is.
26 There's no hard -- there's just no hard definition
27 anymore. So that's something we're struggling with. So,
28 with that in mind, I think there's -- I think there's a
29 way through this. And what I am proposing for this
30 Council and the Ketchikan Indian Community is to start
31 a process of redefining rural under Title 8. So, what I
32 think needs to happen is to essentially, the rural term
33 -- rural determination process should essentially remain
34 as it is now under the discretion of the Councils to
35 make that determination. However, for the purpose of
36 Title 8, I think there needs to be essentially what
37 would be a rule change probably that would clarify the
38 definition so that, you know, for the purpose of Title
39 8, this is what I would propose to be under discussion.
40 All identified traditional territory would be considered
41 rural. All tribal citizens residing in traditional
42 territories shall be considered rural residents. And my
43 reasoning behind that is, and it's based on a lot of
44 what I've heard here at this meeting. Indigenous people
45 should not have their traditional practices of the
46 continuation of their subsistence, or the continuation
47 of their subsistence practices determined by colonial
48 boundaries. I don't think that's right, and I think it
49 can be changed. So, after a lot of consideration on
50 this, with a lot of strong arguments, both in favor and

1 against this proposal, I plan to oppose the proposal.
2 And by doing so, and if the Council and the Ketchikan
3 Indian Community would commit to taking on this issue
4 of redefining rural under Title 8, that would
5 essentially guarantee indigenous access to traditional
6 harvesting, I think we could -- I think we have the
7 potential to work together if we if we both commit to
8 it, to making this change. And it would be -- it would
9 be a huge change. It would be -- it would, you know, it
10 would change the way subsistence is practiced throughout
11 the State. And this would just be a continuation in this
12 evolution of the law and the implementation of Title 8
13 of ANILCA. And I think it would better serve what is the
14 intent and the purpose of Title 8.

15
16 So, I mean, I do have a lot of
17 reservations about this. I realize that it would be
18 divisive within communities to have, essentially two
19 groups of people with different rights and accesses
20 [sic] to the resources on Federal public lands, but we
21 have that divisiveness now on a regional -- regional
22 basis, you know, we don't want to see tribe pitted
23 against tribe communities against communities. It would
24 be -- it would be the same divisiveness, in my view, but
25 in a different way. And as part of that, to help
26 alleviate some of that divisiveness, I would strongly
27 recommend that people in non-rural communities would
28 start putting a lot more pressure on the state of Alaska
29 to give them more access to subsistence resources as
30 well. And I think we would support that effort also. So,
31 that's my proposal. And I'll throw it out there for the
32 Council to think about, discuss, shoot it down if you
33 don't think it's even worth talking about or not, don't
34 think it's possible. And, you know, propose some of your
35 own ideas on this. So, okay, that's what I have to say.
36 And it looks like Cathy has something. So, go ahead,
37 Cathy.

38
39 MS. NEEDHAM: All right. Thank you, Mr.
40 Chair. I appreciate you, kind of thinking outside of the
41 box a little bit about what we're trying to set forward
42 to do and really thinking about KIC as a tribal entity
43 and how we can provide the traditional territorial
44 rights to fish and wildlife within their region. But at
45 this point in time, I mean, obviously I'm going to listen
46 to other discussion at this Council, but coming into
47 this meeting or coming into this portion of the -- our
48 deliberations I think that there -- it doesn't have to
49 be one way or another to get at the question. And I
50 think what is still before us is determining what is

1 considered rural in Southeast Alaska. And the Board is
2 asking for that. And this is the first time that -- it's
3 not the first time that it's happened in the State, it
4 has happened in another region when Moose Pass has gone
5 through their rescinding non-rural, but it is the first
6 time that it's happening in our region, and we have the
7 opportunity to help the Board provide that framework.
8 And so, I wrote my position statement that I would
9 actually like to read into the record so that we do
10 have, you know, some of that information available to
11 the Board if at some point they decide that the
12 recommendation to oppose and choose another route in
13 order to provide KIC isn't the tool that they want to
14 use.

15
16 So, in general, I am supportive of
17 rescinding non-rural status for Ketchikan. I want to
18 acknowledge that we've heard a lot of strong opposition
19 to the proposal, and it's -- and more noteworthy, this
20 was organized amongst tribes -- federally recognized
21 tribes within our region. And I appreciate the time that
22 they took in the resources that they expended to come
23 and testify. The strongest case for opposition seems --
24 sorry my -- the strongest case for opposition is
25 specifically related to the competition to resources
26 that the effects that this proposal might have on
27 resources that are within those traditional territories
28 or those rural areas. And I sympathize with that concern.
29 But as staff has pointed out, that is the Boards -- that
30 it is the Board's policy that non-rural determinations
31 should be made so -- solely on the basis of a community
32 or area's rural characteristics or lack thereof. If
33 there is a shortage of a resource population, then non-
34 subsistence users would be restricted first and if
35 further restrictions need to be made then ANILCA section
36 804 is used to reduce eligible users to those that are
37 most dependent or closest in proximity to those
38 resources. So, I think that, you know, we've talked about
39 the fact that there are tools written into ANILCA that
40 addresses this concern that the tribes from other
41 communities have brought together -- brought forward as
42 being a concern, that competition piece. And so, we are
43 not supposed to be defining rural -- helping to define
44 rural characteristics in our region based on the
45 competition for those resources. I believe it was the
46 Borough Mayor that said that we should be looking -- him
47 -- he challenged us to we should be looking for reasons
48 to say that or he's pointed out that we were looking for
49 reasons to say no, and that we should be looking for
50 reasons to say yes, that non-rural should be rescinded

1 for Ketchikan. And that really struck me. I began to
2 make -- after he said that I began to make a list of
3 things that were brought up in testimonies that we heard,
4 and some things in the analysis that I had read that
5 would support rescinding the non-rural determination.
6 So, taking that more positive look at things and trying
7 to help say, well, what are those characteristics that
8 do it? The Federal Subsistence Program currently
9 recognizes a range of communities as being rural. These
10 range from very small villages to somewhat larger
11 villages, to moderate sized communities that have hub-
12 like characteristics, and then to larger hub communities
13 or larger communities that have rural characteristics.
14 And when we think about larger communities that have
15 hub-like characteristics, Ketchikan might fall into
16 that. It is hub-like, and it is a larger community within
17 our region. And so that -- we shouldn't be comparing
18 larger hub like communities that have rural desig [sic]
19 -- rural status already to small communities that aren't
20 hub-like to places like Tenakee Springs and Pelican, we
21 should be comparing them to communities that have
22 similar characteristics that also have rural status and
23 that would be communities like Sitka and communities
24 like Kodiak. Being on an island and unconnected to the
25 road system were examples of factors that contributed
26 to Sitka and Kodiak's rural characteristics, and thus
27 their rural designation. And that is also the case for
28 Ketchikan. They are on an island, and they are
29 unconnected to the road system.

30
31 In 2015, the Secretaries removed
32 specific guidelines and criteria, including the --
33 including the requirements regarding population data,
34 the aggregation of communities, and the review for every
35 ten years. The final rule allowed the Board to make
36 nonrural determinations, using a comprehensive approach
37 that may consider factors such as population size and
38 density, economic indicators, military presence,
39 industrial facilities, use of fish and wildlife, degree
40 of remoteness and isolation, and any other relevant
41 material including information provided by us as a
42 Regional Advisory Council and the public.

43
44 Ketchikan is isolated in that it is on
45 an island and it is without a road system. Residents
46 cannot access other communities that would provide
47 additional economic opportunities for them. Residents
48 have testified that they have food shortages, thus
49 experiencing food insecurity. Ketchikan doesn't have an
50 ANCSA Corporation that other rural communities have in

1 order to boost their longer-term economic opportunities
2 associated with them. There is an ANCSA Corporation
3 close by associated with Saxman, which is designated as
4 rural.

5
6 When I looked out -- when I looked at
7 the analysis and started thinking about Ketchikan as a
8 community as a whole and why it was -- became non-rural
9 and I compare it to a community like Sitka. And I'm not
10 trying to say that Sitka does not deserve the role status
11 that it has. And I'm not trying to, you know, I'm not
12 trying to throw Sitka under the bus, but it is a
13 comparative thing. I look at the analysis and I compare
14 Ketchikan to the information that was provided by --
15 provided for Sitka and also, in thinking about that in
16 terms of a community like Kodiak or other larger hubs
17 type communities, you know, we see some -- we see a lot
18 of similarities between Ketchikan and Sitka in that
19 regard. And you know, the economic -- if you look at
20 just economics, it's only one characteristic. But if you
21 look at economics, Sitka has a better picture than
22 Ketchikan has in terms of the jobs that it has to offer,
23 the poverty rates and stuff. Some of the charts, the
24 numbers looked better in Sitka and Juneau. Those were
25 the only two communities that were kind of doing better
26 than Ketchikan. And yet, Sitka still has that rural
27 designation. And so, I asked myself, well, why doesn't
28 Ketchikan have it if Sitka has a lot of these
29 similarities and things? And I think, you know,
30 obviously there was an -- at the time, there were
31 criteria that were set forth in order to determine
32 whether or not a community was rural or non-rural. At
33 the time it was very much population-based and the --
34 but the populations between the two communities were
35 similar, and they were both above the population
36 threshold at that time. They both were in a completely
37 different economic picture than both of them are now
38 today. But Sitka was afforded the opportunity to provide
39 other rural characteristics that -- and Ketchikan was
40 not. It was it was in some respects kind of judged in -
41 - of that it was going to be a larger community.

42
43 So, what were those things? And I think
44 our -- in -- if you read in the justification that OSM
45 came out with their analysis, some of the things that
46 they highlighted that were rural characteristics which
47 I kind of agree with is Ketchikan is a relatively large
48 but isolated community with limited road access. The
49 local economy has been in decline. Poverty rates in
50 Ketchikan are substantial and have been increasing in

1 recent years, along with housing shortages, rising rent
2 and declining social services. Goods and materials are
3 shipped into Ketchikan, primarily by barge and this
4 supply chain is vulnerable to disruptions. I think those
5 are all things that we should be considering when we
6 think about what are the characteristics for being
7 considered rural in Southeast Alaska in our region. And
8 I feel like there can be a strong case made that
9 Ketchikan fits into those things. And so, if we set
10 aside, you know what -- if we set aside the competition
11 factor and just look at those things, it becomes a little
12 clearer to me that I feel like I can support it, rather
13 than looking for reasons to oppose it.

14
15 I do want to say, regardless of the
16 outcome of this proposal before the Federal Subsistence
17 Program, I would like to encourage Ketchikan Indian
18 Community to work through other means that may provide
19 them with continued access and opportunities to
20 traditional foods in their traditional territory.
21 Options that can include the suggestion for KIC to find
22 other Federal mechanisms to restore tribal territorial
23 rights to fish and wildlife. Even considering the option
24 that Don Hernandez has put before the table that he
25 would like this Council to consider, I think that is an
26 option. I would like to see KIC as a federally recognized
27 tribe, also continue to do that. And another option would
28 be submitting a proposal to the Board of Fish to undo
29 the non-subsistence use area that is around Ketchikan
30 that is limiting residents to fish and wildlife
31 resources. And so, that's my prepared statement for the
32 record, and I really look forward to hearing from the
33 rest of our Council members. But again, I will reiterate,
34 at this point in time, I will be supporting the proposal.
35 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
38 Cathy. Anybody else, anybody ready? Patti, go ahead.

39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41 Because I haven't had time to think about what you
42 brought forward as a future proposal. I'm really not
43 going to focus on it too much. Other than that, I think,
44 like, we supported under the NMFS NOAA program for tribal
45 cards for subsistence halibut that, you know, that's
46 something that should be considered for the subsistence
47 program. So, I too have a prepared statement. I'm going
48 to start with some of the testimony we received while
49 here in Ketchikan. And Mr. Michael Robbins, the
50 superintendent of schools, asked us to support, to

1 reinforce cultural traditions. And as we all know that
2 our cultural traditions have been slowly fading away and
3 it's starting to be revitalized but it's nowhere near
4 the level that it was, you know, centuries ago. You
5 know, some of the opposition focused on outdated
6 criteria adopted from the State system. And the non-
7 rural decision-making criteria is on page 121, which
8 really -- after a Secretarial review the Federal
9 Subsistence Board gave much more broad liberal criteria
10 for -- and with greater emphasis on the subsistence on
11 the Southeast -- on the RACs, in our case the Southeast
12 Regional Advisory Council. For the record, I support the
13 -- taking -- providing rural designation for Ketchikan.
14 The -- on page 109, it says that, and Cathy already
15 reiterated this and, you know, Ketchikan area has a long
16 history of indigenous occupation, subsistence
17 traditions, traditional food practices, and reliance
18 upon natural resources. We heard that in testimony
19 yesterday from tribal and non-tribal members. Ketchikan
20 lies within the traditional territory of the Tlingit and
21 is comparable to the geographical extent and or
22 population size to Alaskan communities like Sitka,
23 Kodiak and Bethel which the Board currently recognizes
24 as rural.

25
26 I'd also like to say that the poverty
27 rates here in Ketchikan are predominantly impacting the
28 Native community of Ketchikan. Please have patience with
29 me, Mr. Chair. On page 117, it says that the southeast
30 -- the Southeast RAC supported a rural designation at
31 that time for Ketchikan. The Southeast Council Chair
32 also -- I'm reading from the analysis -- the Southeast
33 Council Chair also reiterated the Council's support for
34 both Saxman and Ketchikan for -- to be designated rural,
35 noting the recent harvest data provided by a 2005
36 Ketchikan Household Harvest Survey provided an
37 indication of the subsistence orientation of Ketchikan.
38 And you know, in honor and respect of Chairman Emeritus
39 Bill Thomas who's now deceased, he strongly told us to
40 follow the letter of the law of ANILCA.

41
42 Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared
43 statement, and I would also like to give recognition to
44 -- I'm sorry. I've got to look up the names, Mr. Franklin
45 James, Mr. Richard Jackson and Mr. James Llanos. I'm
46 going to bring some of what they discussed in their
47 testimony before us. The 1867 Treaty of Cession between
48 Russia and the United States initiated ongoing
49 congressional actions that have marginalized indigenous
50 tribes. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, ANCSA

1 of 1971 effectively extinguished their aboriginal
2 rights. In response, the Alaska National Interest Lands
3 Claim Act established in December 1980, which is 11 --
4 9 years later, recognized the importance of subsistence
5 for Alaska native and rural communities addressing gaps
6 left by ANCSA. 160 years of governmental dictates does
7 not wipe out the 12,000 to 20,000 years of the indigenous
8 people's presence in Alaska dependent on harvesting fish
9 and wildlife resources. Thereby, local residents are a
10 vital and natural part of the ecosystem, serving as a
11 mainstay consumer in the natural environmental food
12 chain. ANILCA Title 8 mandates the protection of
13 subsistence practices for Alaskan natives and rural
14 residents, emphasizing the -- that subsistence is
15 essential for their physical, economic, social,
16 traditional, and cultural survival. The Ketchikan Indian
17 Community have highlighted their dependence on specific
18 public lands and waters for subsistence, indicating that
19 no practical alternatives exist for their traditional
20 food security. ANILCA section 801C acknowledges threats
21 to subsistence resources due to population growth,
22 declining wildlife populations, increased accessibility
23 to remote areas, and non-sustainable harvesting
24 practices. Public testimonies reveal that non-resident
25 sport harvesting adversely impacts both Native and non-
26 Native harvesting capabilities and traditional areas.
27 Alaska native elders have provided long standing
28 accounts of clan specific land use, asserting the need
29 for priority rights to subsist in traditional harvesting
30 areas. They advocate for sustainable subsistence
31 practices on public lands. Subsequent Federal management
32 initiatives for subsistence hunting and fishing were
33 established in 1998 ANCSA and 1999 ANILCA respectively,
34 following legal developments that emphasize the need for
35 Federal oversight in these areas. With subsistence
36 management comes a stewardship responsibility for the
37 long-term protection of fish and wildlife populations
38 necessary to ensure the continuation of the opportunity
39 for a subsistence way of life thereby subsistence uses
40 on the public lands must be conducted in a manner
41 consistent with the conservation of healthy populations
42 of fish and wildlife. Recreational activities are not
43 prohibited but must be managed to ensure that the non-
44 wasteful subsistence uses shall be given preference on
45 the public lands over other consumptive uses; that's
46 802-2. Alaskan Natives and non-Native residents have
47 testified about the concern for the continued viability
48 of subsistence resources on, and their ability to meet
49 their subsistence needs being threatened by Ketchikan
50 residents. ANILCA Title 8 provides a rule making

1 authority in conjunction with the Southeast Regional
2 Council and must limit subsistence uses to local
3 residents with the most customary and direct dependence
4 on the resource as a mainstay of life and who have the
5 least access to alternative traditional food resources.
6 ANILCA Title 8 is a wide-ranging legislation that
7 requires liberal interpretation and must be construed
8 in favor of protecting subsistence for Alaskan natives
9 and further, for the opportunity for subsistence uses
10 by rural residents of Alaska. Title 8, section 801 A,
11 the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses
12 by rural residents of Alaska, including both Native and
13 non-Native on the public lands and by Natives on Native
14 lands is essential to Native physical, economic,
15 traditional and cultural existence, and to non-native
16 physical, economic, traditional, and social existence.
17 Essential means necessary to the highest degree, that
18 which is required for the continued existence of
19 subsistence. Ketchikan, Alaska natives being unique in
20 that they inform us that there is no practical
21 alternative means available to replace their traditional
22 food supplies, which they are dependent on for
23 subsistence uses, resources which cannot be gotten
24 elsewhere except from the public lands and waters where
25 they harvest their traditional subsistence resources.

26
27 ANILCA Section 801C recognizes the
28 continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses of
29 resources on public lands and other lands is threatened
30 by increasing populations of Alaska, with resultant
31 pressures on subsistence resources by sudden decline in
32 the population of some wildlife species which are
33 crucial subsistence resources by increased accessibility
34 of remote areas containing subsistence resources, and
35 by taking of fish and wildlife in a manner inconsistent
36 with recognized principles and fish and wildlife
37 management. Public testimony informs us that ongoing
38 pressure on the resource from the non-resident sport
39 harvesters and their access in close proximity to
40 traditional community harvest areas, is adversely
41 impacting the Native and non-Native ability to harvest
42 and gather resources for the customary and traditional
43 uses. Over multiple years of testimony, Alaska native
44 elders described long patterns of clan use of lands,
45 traditional use areas identified as necessary for the
46 continuation of the opportunity for subsistence way of
47 life by Native and non-Native residents of Ketchikan.
48 The indigenous people of Ketchikan are seeking a
49 priority or preference to exercise their rights to
50 subsist in their traditional harvest areas, and

00014

1 residents of Ketchikan express the need to engage in the
2 non-wasteful continuation of subsistence uses on the
3 public lands upon which they depend. I think that
4 concludes my remarks, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
7 Patti. Other Council members? Excuse me, Louie. Go
8 ahead.

9

10 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You
11 know, I have been attending these meetings since 2000
12 and applied, I think, three times to get a seat here.
13 And I've watched from the starting in Anchorage at the
14 Federal Board's -- the room would be so full. They're
15 bigger than this here up at the -- it used to be the
16 Egan Center I think we went to. People would be lined
17 wall to wall, hopeful from their villages to get help.
18 And they were refused so much. And they came on their
19 own dime. They stopped coming. Pretty soon it was just
20 government people. Like today, we have KIC and his
21 students. We don't see the people like we used to see.
22 They've given up because I feel we're not protecting the
23 rural communities. And I wasn't expecting to have to
24 make a decision to change the rules in the middle of a
25 proposal here. I oppose the proposal. I know what it's
26 like to live in a rural community and what's going to
27 happen to the rural communities. I didn't hear anything
28 about -- I heard about the cruise ships, they're still
29 running. I passed a bus coming in this morning and
30 nothing about the huge charter fleet here, it's huge.
31 In California, Oregon, Washington, they limited them.
32 So, they all moved up here, now we have them. The
33 commercial fishing, they limited us. I worked hard for
34 my IFQs like Frank here. And the government kept taking
35 them till there was almost nothing left. And the charter
36 fleet came in the backdoor and they wound up with our
37 IFQs. The whole thing has been very unfair. That wasn't
38 easy, especially the derby days when we had to go around
39 the clock, haul gear and set gear. But -- and I don't
40 know if anyone's driven through town here, and you go
41 out, especially around the Clover Pass, these mansions
42 they're building they're over \$1 million and putting in
43 the floats, the ramps. Used to be a few houses, you go
44 around Point Higgins, I go -- I was just up to the canal
45 on the 11th of this this month and I couldn't believe
46 they're still building. There's more. South End --
47 sitting in my house out there in Saxman, and you could
48 hardly hear the TV from the trucks and the buses. When
49 I built there, there was much [sic] traffic but they say
50 it's not growing. No way. Those dump trucks, they're

1 going every day, hauling gravel. The people are moving
2 into Alaska at a rapid rate. I don't know if any of you
3 have been to Myers Chuck, I brought a little boat home
4 from Wrangell that we bought a year ago. I come [sic]
5 through there in July, and it used to -- I had a good
6 friend there that I've known since, like 1960s, Steve
7 Peavey who passed away a couple of years ago now. And
8 it was just him and a couple others there. Now it's full
9 of yachts and north rivers, you -- I couldn't tie up to
10 the float, I had to -- lucky it was late when I got in
11 there, I laid at that little airplane float. But it's
12 changed. There's new houses all over. They're building
13 up on top of these little islands, and it's just ruined
14 that beautiful little Meyers Chuck. And I come through
15 Zimovia at Wrangell Narrows, used to be -- see, maybe
16 three houses along there. Now the road goes the length
17 of it and there's full of houses there. I mean, it's
18 growing. I really feel we need to be careful with our
19 decisions here. We're going to -- our people are going
20 to be hurting in the rural communities. KIC is doing
21 fine, they're buying up land. This is the second plot
22 that I heard of that they're buying, and they have no
23 infrastructure. Where's -- it's got to be just grant
24 money and our government is broke. How long is this
25 grant money going to keep flowing in? Oh, it's just --
26 it's scary and the direction we're going with the
27 increase of people coming to Alaska. That movie they
28 show buying up Alaska, they're buying it up, and it's
29 going to hurt all of us. And on the island there, as
30 soon as the cruise ships start running, the charter boats
31 fish all around the boundary on the island there, and
32 they stopped the halibut. We can't get any halibut in
33 our waters once they start. It's done. They're hunting
34 all over. I have my house and met [sic] there, and it's
35 up on the hill. And I could see all of all of Gravina.
36 And so, I could see the charter boats come out. They
37 come out in the dark or those big north rivers, and you
38 can see them all lined up if you get there too late,
39 like Albert said about Angoon, you can't get into your
40 favorite hunting spot that you've done for years. I've
41 fished and hunted my whole life so, it's just -- and it
42 was mentioned on the Coast Guard to maybe eliminate them
43 from the list. They all fish and hunt. If you drive down
44 and look at the Coast Guard base on the inside of their
45 big float, all their skiffs are lined up there. And I
46 know one of them real well for years now. And they hunt
47 and fish just like we do. So, they can't be excluded
48 from their numbers there. And there's just -- like I
49 say, I've lived here, I see, I've paid attention because
50 being on a boat, you always have to pay attention to

00016

1 what's going on around you. And so, that's where I stand.
2 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
5 Louie. Frank, go ahead.

6

7 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm a
8 Tlingit stuck between two worlds, you know. There was a
9 time when I was -- I'm a (In Native), which is a coho.
10 I am (In Native) who is my father was a (In Native).
11 There was a time when I was able to go into Glacier Bay;
12 I'll tell you a story, this is a true story. At one time
13 I was in Glacier Bay and in Burke Bay, and it was night,
14 dark, the moon was out and I saw this -- the water was
15 so glass calm you can see the reflection of the mountain
16 on the water. You can hear the birds in the distance.
17 You can hear him. And I was sitting on a deck just
18 sitting there listening. And then in the morning I got
19 up and got in my skiff and started dragging a hook. I
20 thought three king salmon swam past me and I caught
21 three king salmon. You know, that was the last time I
22 was able to go into Glacier Bay. Why? I was -- because
23 there was a law made. So, what did that do to me? It
24 changed who I am. My brother who -- my nephew, who was
25 a (In Native). A (In Native) he is from Glacier Bay. He
26 asked after a while he said, what do I care? I can't go
27 up there anymore. So, what did that do? It took something
28 away from a person that he's supposed to be in Glacier
29 Bay. Why? Because the Federal law had said you can't go
30 up there and drag a hook again. You're going to deplete
31 the stock. What?! All of a sudden, here we are. You
32 know, another part of the story was, we were -- I was -
33 - we were South Willoughby Island. And it was still the
34 moon was still out and we were coming down south of
35 Willoughby Island and my brother and my friend
36 (indiscernible), we were in the pilot house on the
37 progress and coming down, and all of a sudden there was
38 this big white thing in front of us and we said, Earth,
39 look at iceberg, iceberg, we're going to hit it! I said,
40 go back, get the skid and skiff get ready to get in the
41 skiffs, we're going to hit it. And it was just a big
42 white cloud. We went through it and we said, what was
43 that? We took the boat out of gear and everything and
44 we were wondering, what was that? And that wasn't the
45 same time. It was the last time I ever went to Glacier
46 Bay to go drag a hook. I used to halibut fish in there.
47 So, what did that do to us? Took part of our life as a
48 Tlingit away. Took it away. We're done. Who did it? The
49 Federal Government. You know, I'm so torn right here, I
50 don't know what to say. I think of the people that we

1 are here to protect. Every time we make a change in the
2 law or anything, it's to protect our resources so that
3 our people, the Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian, the non-
4 Natives, will be able to -- able to keep using subsisting
5 off of that, off of the resources that we're here to
6 protect. Is our Federal law protecting the people that
7 are need to use this resource? I don't know, I don't
8 think so. We're going to take it away from people that
9 really need it? You know, I'm shaking because I'm so
10 emotional about this. You know, one time I got caught a
11 king salmon, it was a little small, but I already killed
12 it because when I caught it, I ripped the gills out. The
13 gills were cooked, torn out by the hook. So, I said, oh,
14 well, I'll -- so I called my wife and I said, I caught
15 a small king salmon. I'll just bring it home. What
16 happened? State trooper walked by and looked at it and
17 said, that's a little small. And I said, yeah, I know,
18 I'm going to take it home and eat it. My law is a Tlingit
19 says you don't waste it. It was dead, going to die. But
20 the other law says no, you can't. So, what did they do?
21 They fine me 250 bucks because it was too small.

22
23 You know, when we decided to take care
24 of the resources, we're taking care for all of Southeast
25 Alaska. ANILCA was there before I even knew anything
26 about it -- anything about it. In 1980, man, that's a
27 long time ago. I was still having too much fun not
28 worrying about anything. You know that -- one of the
29 things that we're here is to protect all species, whether
30 it's a wildlife, I'm species, I'm Tlingit, you're a
31 species. We're here to protect them all, everybody,
32 everything. But here we are talking about a community,
33 a community who is Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian. And
34 they're struggling to maintain who they are. My
35 goodness, what a concept. Struggling to be who they are
36 and who their ancestors were that were and -- struggling
37 to say, I am Tlingit, I am Haida, I am Tsimshian. It's
38 like I said earlier, you see the superintendent came in
39 talking about the culture that's going up in the schools.
40 You know, I'm on the enrollment committee with Lincoln
41 & Haida too, and you got 80 -- near 64%, you're part
42 non-Native. And I look at whenever the young kids go up
43 there where they're blondes or redheads or anything like
44 that, you know why they're there? Because they love of
45 who they are. They say, I'm Tlingit, but I'm a blonde.
46 They love who they are, you know, there was not too long
47 ago I saw one kid, teenage kid. He was never involved
48 with the culture. And I saw him dancing, he was dancing.
49 Having a good time because of who he is. You know, I'm
50 so torn apart about this thing. Because we as a RAC, is

1 [sic] supposed to take care of all the species,
2 everything. You know, there's a U.S. Government that or
3 other governments that try to destroy people, eliminate
4 them. Is this something that we gradually do? Take it
5 away. Take a little bit away. I always say, you take one
6 thing away from me, it diminishes my identity as a
7 Tlingit. Take one thing, you know, my language was --
8 language was not -- I lost my language because my mom
9 went to Sheldon Jackson, and my mom and dad were able
10 to speak the language fluently. But they didn't do it
11 because they thought it was supposed to be not good for
12 us. As a kid, I didn't care, just ran around in the
13 woods, played in the woods. But as I got older, I saw
14 how important that was supposed to be, how important.

15
16 You know, I was up in Anchorage one
17 time, and I was sitting there and there was this Yup'ik
18 and he was sitting there with his friends and stuff, and
19 they were talking their language. And he came up to me,
20 he said, oh, I'm sorry, I talked -- we were talking our
21 language in front of you, and I just -- I just said no,
22 don't do that. Speak your language. Speak it. You know,
23 my wife is -- my wife was teaching the language in
24 school. She taught -- first year as a teacher for 20
25 years and then she retired from the State. Then she woke
26 up one morning and said, what did I do? Then about a
27 year later, she found out there was a Tlingit language
28 offered in the school, and I said, do it. She said, I
29 can't speak it. And I said, do it. And she said, okay,
30 I'll try. And she did it for 20 years. And now she's
31 been able to speak the language and teach the kids. And
32 she didn't want to retire because she didn't want to --
33 didn't want to just leave it where someone comes in and
34 start off with ABC's. She wanted to come in and let the
35 person that come in and start off where she left off.
36 What I'm talking about is the people. ANILCA was there
37 to protect the people. And here we are talking about a
38 people that are swallowed up in a community that just
39 because they're a big community, they're being denied
40 of who they are. How do you do that? Tell the people
41 you're not going to be able to -- you're not going to
42 be able to practice who you really are. It doesn't make
43 sense. I mean, I -- I'm sorry I was speaking too long,
44 but -- how do we stop them from fishing? How do we stop
45 them from hunting? How do they stop them from going on
46 a beach and getting the seaweed, getting the clams and
47 the cockles to say no, you can't go down there. Well,
48 something wrong with that picture. How do you walk up
49 to someone on the street and say, you can't go to that
50 store. Let me see your permit. My permit is right here.

1 This skin right here, for me to go do things.

2

3 My sister had moved out of town for a
4 long time, and she -- she came and we were -- had some
5 seal meat and my daughter was sitting there and she was
6 eating seal meat. My sister said, you eat that? And my
7 daughter Amy just looked at my sister and just kept
8 eating the seal meat. See, my sister moved away from
9 town, moved away so she -- her kids lost what they used
10 to have. Well, I know, ANILCA is pretty complicated, but
11 survival of a people is not complicated. It didn't make
12 -- its getting make -- you're making it more and more
13 complicated by saying no, you can't be a Tlingit; no,
14 you can't be a Haida; you can't be Tsimshian. So, I love
15 who I am, I'm a Tlingit from (In Native) in Sitka. My
16 uncle is Herman Davis, my true uncle. So, gunalchéesh
17 for listening to me.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
20 Frank. Anybody else? Mike.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: I concur with Mr. Wright.
23 This is a difficult situation. We probably wouldn't even
24 have this proposal if we had let Saxman go under the bus
25 years back when they decided to lump them with Ketchikan
26 and take away their rural status. This Council did not
27 like it and dug their heels in and did what was necessary
28 to have Saxman maintain their status, which was finally
29 accomplished but, in the meantime a new definition came
30 out, that population threshold was not the only thing
31 to consider. However, the KIC says, we don't want to
32 come over and get your deer. That's not what we want.
33 They practice their culture, and I think that that's
34 great. And honor cultural practices. And then I just
35 heard four tribes over there say, you can't come to our
36 country. We don't want you to come over here. So, KIC
37 may not honor that cultural practice, but that doesn't
38 speak for the rest of greater Ketchikan. Just to put a
39 restriction or, you know, there was a competition issue
40 on Prince of Wales a few years back which caused the
41 restriction to -- on non-qualified people on Federal
42 land, could only take two deer. And we got an early
43 season but the effort to do that, excuse me, the effort
44 to do that was not easy. It took a pretty good fight for
45 I don't know how many sessions, but it finally was
46 accomplished.

47

48 There is [sic] protections in Title 8,
49 804, but those don't -- and I would certainly see this
50 proposal pass that this this would certainly happen.

1 You'd eventually have a conservation concern. On -- in
2 Unit 2, that things are not that great there right now.
3 So, wolf predation is -- pushed the deer population on
4 a downward direction. Not only that, we have the heaviest
5 logging in Southeast probably of any Unit. So, the
6 geography has changed, and the tribes are really fearful
7 of -- but there is protections but we really have to
8 drive things into where there's a conservation concern
9 before we can use them. I mean, is that really what you
10 want to do? The answer is no. I hate to see that, because
11 once you depress almost any resource, it's very
12 difficult to bring it back. And particularly with the
13 attitude the State has on managing wolves in preference
14 over deer. So, there's a lot of problems here and it's
15 a really difficult decision. But I think the one thing
16 and I'll have to consult further, we're not going to
17 make a decision this morning, Dr. Dolly, when we were
18 having issue with -- in fighting for Saxman to maintain
19 their rural status. Thought Ketchikan should apply at
20 that time for rural status, and I'd have to talk to her
21 and get some of her thoughts, because she's well
22 respected and very smart lady and that was one of her
23 thoughts but it never -- Ketchikan never did pursue it,
24 although it probably was [sic] suggested until now. So,
25 this is kind of a difficult spot to use 804, which I
26 can't remember it being used, although it is there. It's
27 not going to be popular, and it's going to be very
28 difficult because it eliminates all other users with the
29 exception of the rural and then there's protections in
30 there on who has the most need. So, in my mind, not only
31 Ketchikan, but Wrangell and Petersburg would all be
32 affected by an 804 action. They'd have to share that
33 burden, perhaps in mine -- but who knows? But anyway,
34 this proposal does leave a lot of unanswered questions
35 and a lot of difficult situations. And perhaps by the
36 end of the day, we will come up with the solution. But
37 right now, it's very difficult for me to support it. But
38 by the end of the day, who knows? We'll hopefully discuss
39 it long enough to arrive at some solution that we hope
40 will work. Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
43 Ted, I believe you had your hand up.

44

45 MR. SANHOFER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. You
46 know, I've thought about this issue over the last month,
47 over the last weeks, and I'm really struggling with it,
48 you know, this is a tough question. You know, my heart
49 goes out to the members of the Ketchikan Indian
50 Community. You know, I was born and raised in the State,

1 been here my whole life and when somebody is hurting in
2 the State, I hurt and I'm hurting, you know, I know
3 Ketchikan is hurting, the Indian community, and I feel
4 for them. It was said many times, you know, that it's
5 not their fault that the city of Ketchikan grew up around
6 them. The situation that just happened. Here we are. You
7 know, the testimonies from individuals on both sides of
8 the issue, you know, they were passionate, respectful,
9 compelling, and from the heart. And this question, this
10 issue is, is there a right answer? I don't know, I don't
11 know. You know, we also received letters from tribes,
12 individuals across -- across the region on both sides.
13 You know, this is pitting tribe against tribe, user
14 against user. It's one of those -- those questions, you
15 know, that there is maybe no right answer. You know, I
16 like what you said, Don, you know, finding a different
17 tool, but I'm not sure if that can happen quick enough
18 or how long that takes. I think there needs to be some
19 real looking into that, I guess. You know, the question
20 is, is Ketchikan a rural community? You know, the OSM
21 report sterile and helpful, but it wasn't definitive,
22 you know. It left it up -- to the heavy question up
23 well, for us to recommend but to the Board, the Board's
24 not going to have any easier time with this, I'm sure.
25 You know, I think it was in 1990 that Ketchikan was
26 designated as non-rural. You know, I've always said, you
27 know, do you revisit a decision without new information?
28 Is there new information? Probably, I mean I think Jane's
29 [sic] -- things have changed in Ketchikan since 1999.
30 But I think they've changed all over Southeast. You know,
31 populations go up and down, industries change, prices
32 of goods and services, they always go up. Housing,
33 infrastructure, that all changes, I mean, that's what
34 modernization does, it changes things. You know, the
35 definition for ANILCA is wishy washy and I think that's
36 probably by design to give the decision makers some
37 latitude, you know. In this case it's given them some
38 latitude but some really tough questions, you know, some
39 tough, tough things to think about. You know -- so,
40 since I didn't really get a definition from the new
41 interpretation of rural and ANILCA, then I went to the
42 Black's Law Dictionary, and it defines rural as an area
43 that is sparsely populated and located away from a city
44 characterized by open areas, open spaces and vegetation.
45 Is Ketchikan that? You know maybe, maybe not, I don't
46 know, you know. You know, I think that all of those
47 outside of Ketchikan think that's non-rural, all those
48 in Ketchikan think it's rural. That's the conundrum, you
49 know, you got two different sides. You're going, hey,
50 you know, I think it's this and that perception is all

1 within the lenses of the people who see it, I mean,
2 everybody has a different perception. I mean, and our
3 life experiences kind of bring us to who we are, you
4 know. And different people and different opinions,
5 they're not right, they're not wrong, they're not
6 better, they're not worse. They're just different. And
7 I think we all have to respect that. You know, there was
8 another theme that we heard and Mike talked about the
9 impacts of resources on other subsistence users,
10 although that's not the question, is it pertinent or
11 not? You know, I don't know, but I know that's what I
12 hear in central Southeast Alaska, you know, that's what
13 I hear when this comes up. You know, one of my roles on
14 this Council is to protect, enhance, serve the rural
15 residents on the Tongass, you know, make sure their
16 ANILCA rights are maintained, enhanced, better. You
17 know, and right now, you know, I'm not serving the people
18 of Ketchikan. I may be serving those in that same
19 capacity, depending on what the Board says. We'll see.

20
21 You know, if the Subsistence Board does
22 not designate Ketchikan a rural community, I think that
23 we need to find some other tools to make sure KIC gets
24 those rights back that were taken away from them because
25 of modernization of colonization. You know, they had it,
26 you know, listening to Frank, listening to Patti, I mean
27 it's, I mean, this is what they've done forever and all
28 of a sudden say, you can't do this, that's wrong. I
29 mean, it's wrong. I mean, and as a dad, you know, you
30 always want to fix things, you know, I mean, that's --
31 my that's my role. And this one's hard to fix. And how
32 do you fix it without impacting others? You know, one
33 decision leads to something else that has impacts on
34 something else. We need to make sure that they maintain
35 or retain their cultural and traditional -- cultural
36 subsistence rights. And if the Board does not decide
37 that, I think KIC needs to keep fighting. They need to
38 get that, they need to -- they need to retain, they need
39 to get that back. And I hope I'm -- I wish them success,
40 I mean, I'm all behind those. You know, I mean, all that
41 being said, you know, at this time I don't think I can
42 support the proposal but I do want to find some way to
43 get KIC their rights. I think, you know, Don, maybe
44 started some -- down some road that we can do that, but
45 I don't know how long they'll take, you know, I don't
46 know how long that'll take. You know, this difficult,
47 this is tough. This is a I guess that's what we signed
48 up for, but it's putting us in one heck of a of a
49 position. Thanks. That's all I got, Don.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
2 I think I saw Jim's hands up first, then Albert, then
3 John.

4
5 MR. SLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's
6 clear this is a extremely difficult issue, and we're all
7 agonizing over our deliberations. As I've considered
8 this over the last -- during this conference or meeting,
9 I wanted to -- I wrote down some of the points, and I
10 wanted to kind of share my thought process as I've gone
11 along. First, I wanted to state that I have heartfelt
12 sympathy for KIC's position. Their desire to have
13 subsistence rights is real and sincere. I personally
14 feel, and I believe that section 8 intends that the KIC
15 and all Southeast Natives should have an inalienable
16 subsistence rights and I applaud Chairman Hernandez for
17 addressing this earlier. And also, I wanted to say thanks
18 to Council member Phillips for reminding us that while
19 section 8 supports all rural residents, it emphasizes
20 native Alaskans. The historical and legal bureaucratic
21 system we've inherited has resulted in an inconsistent
22 and inflexible classification of rural and non-rural
23 communities across Alaska. This has led to a valid
24 feeling of injustice by the KIC, as other communities
25 similar to Ketchikan are classified as rural and they
26 are not. The single tool that the system we have
27 available to us does not affect the rural versus non-
28 rural, cannot effectively address this situation. The
29 classification makes no distinction between Native and
30 non-Native residents of these communities, but it's the
31 only tool we have available to us so, therein lies our
32 dilemma. Considering all this, we also know in our hearts
33 that the daily realities that Ketchikan residents face
34 are completely different than the daily realities faced
35 by residents of smaller, remote Southeast communities.
36 On the other hand, I also have real empathy for the
37 remote communities neighboring Ketchikan. I would ask
38 my fellow Council members from the -- especially from
39 the smaller remote communities, to envision a situation
40 where the community you represent face a situation
41 similar to what the POW communities face today.

42
43 I believe the testimony of the POW
44 residents, that the current resources are finely
45 balanced, and that any further influx of resource users
46 will dramatically affect their ability to support
47 themselves. If a resource is fully utilized, then it is
48 a zero-sum game. If one party gains, another loses. The
49 hard lessons of the Unit 4 deer proposals are fresh and
50 relevant to this situation. I'm also concerned about the

1 precedent this sets as it puts us on a dangerous
2 trajectory of an ever-increasing rural base with a
3 diminishing ability to effect meaningful change. Like
4 we mentioned, it's an extremely difficult position. If
5 we consider what KIC has to gain versus what the
6 neighboring communities stand to lose, it helps me to
7 evaluate it. As is -- as it has been discussed earlier
8 and in benefitized [sic] by the question Council member
9 Howard has asked, what will KIC residents be able to do
10 that they can't do now? And that's still somewhat vague
11 and hasn't -- we haven't got definitive answers for that,
12 but it seems to me as I've analyzed the situation. It
13 would give increased access to POW deer, it would give
14 us access -- to give them access to Unuk resources,
15 eulachon and moose, and a lot of the other general
16 miscellaneous things that come along with it. But as
17 Council member Needham mentioned to me, it gives them
18 meaningful preference over other non-subsistence users.
19 But that begs the question, who are these other non-
20 subsistence users? I mean, at this point the area -- the
21 users of the area will 90 plus percent be rural. And so,
22 if something happens, what do we do? It immediately goes
23 to section 8. There's no other remedy along the way. And
24 it's been that -- that's been mentioned as a valid
25 vehicle to obtain this, but it's also very slow and
26 cannot adapt very quickly and has all sorts of problems
27 in itself. In the meantime, communities would be
28 suffering.

29
30 On the other hand, identifying potential
31 harm to the neighboring communities surrounding
32 Ketchikan is straightforward; we see -- or other
33 subsistence users. It's clear that there will be
34 increased competition for deer. As we -- as mentioned
35 before, no matter what KIC does for its members, there's
36 a whole nother [sic] group, 50% or more of the residents
37 of Ketchikan who will be free to increase their take of
38 deer on Prince of Wales Island. What will happen to the
39 Unuk River moose? I would guess the current subsistence
40 users from that will have their situation deteriorated
41 quite a bit.

42
43 So additionally, the risk of weakening
44 the efficacy of our RAC is important and our ability to
45 protect subsistence use users and some people said real
46 subsistence users who live in remote communities versus
47 other but to protect all the current subsistence users
48 will be diminished. And I'm still deliberating, but I
49 wanted to share my thoughts with the rest of the Council,
50 And I'm anxious to hear the rest of yours before I make

1 a final decision. Thanks.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Jim.
4 Albert, then John.

5

6 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 Just so you guys know, I'm the former Mayor for the City
8 of Angoon, and I'm also the former Tribal President. So,
9 I've been through a lot of these processes trying to
10 accomplish different things for the community of Angoon.
11 And I've learned State and Federal law. I've also learned
12 Title 8 and how to get what our community members need.
13 I did ask questions yesterday to help you guys get from
14 point A to point B, but the answer I got was pushback.
15 I never got the answer to what is the difference between
16 now and if you get rural status, what's the difference
17 going to be? I didn't get the answer. And what I was
18 looking for is something that this process would help
19 tribal members have access to a resource. One thing I've
20 learned being the Mayor and the President is I'm never
21 going to fight with my own people, I hate that. Because
22 when you -- I spent four years in the army, eight months
23 of it out in the desert because some President thought
24 we belonged there. And in that learning, I missed my
25 people, I missed our food. Also in that process, I made
26 friends from Alabama and Mississippi, and their thought
27 process is definitely different than ours. And the
28 reason I say that is, you heard testimony, there's people
29 moving in from the Lower 48. We heard from 3,000 people
30 of Ketchikan, there's 10,000 people missing in this
31 puzzle that cannot guarantee us they're going to go to
32 Prince of Wales or not go to Prince of Wales. You're
33 speaking for 3,000 people that I care about because
34 you're my people. There's things I hear. I heard
35 Teikweidí, my grandfather's people. Wooshkeetaan is my
36 father's people. In our culture you grow up with your
37 uncle so, you're not weak because parents tend to spoil
38 their kids. My mother didn't have any brothers, I grew
39 up with my grandfather. And boy, was I a pain in his
40 backside. And I grew up with my father because the choice
41 was to stay home and do dishes or go fishing and hunting
42 with my dad. But my dad was an old World War II veteran,
43 and if you ever grew up with a veteran, that's the
44 toughest way to grow up sometimes because he told you
45 no once and the next time you felt his hand.

46

47 So, what I'm getting to is, is the
48 10,000 people that aren't here to say this is what they
49 want. And the reason I mentioned people from the Lower
50 48, they come up here with the idea, uh subsistence, we

1 saw that on TV. We want to go out and do that. And that's
2 what's going to impact our resource. It isn't the Natives
3 here that's going to impact it, because you guys were
4 raised the way I was. And I appreciate Chairman [sic]
5 suggestion. I love that and I would definitely support
6 it. And that's why I asked questions yesterday because
7 the member sitting next to me mentioned we think outside
8 the box. And having been a part of this -- with this
9 group, for as long as I have going on 11 years, I'm
10 beginning to think we don't have a box. We have a
11 toolbox. Which brings us to creative solutions to get
12 KIC members the right to do what they do. I heard from
13 one member talk about sport fishing is a problem. It's
14 a problem in Angoon. Let's talk about that problem and
15 how to fix it together. We're stronger together than we
16 are divided. So, I could support the solution the
17 Chairman brought. I wish he had told me that last night
18 I would have probably slept better. That's how much our
19 people mean to me. You don't want to take something away
20 from somebody because there's enough has been taken away
21 from us already. But the only way we're going to find a
22 solution is to talk about it. And to assume I'm sitting
23 here to say no, could be, convinced me to say yes. Not
24 by kicking me in the shins, that just makes me say, no.
25 My concern, and I'll say it again, is the 10,000 people
26 and I, you know, I could have asked the question
27 yesterday, how many Natives in Ketchikan own the seine
28 boat? Because this is what we came up with, this group
29 sitting up here helped me protect a resource that
30 benefits the residents of Angoon. Now, let me tell you
31 about Angoon because we're trying to compare Ketchikan
32 to Sitka, Bethel. My former in-laws are from Bethel so,
33 I know that area. Kodiak; when I was a commercial
34 fisherman, we fished Picard out of Kodiak for a week and
35 then we -- the boat was too big and we wiped out their
36 quota but that's another story. Kodiak so far [sic] from
37 any other population that, yeah, they maybe they should
38 have that. So, it's -- you're comparing apples and
39 oranges. My fear is, since they decided to use that
40 route, my fear is that Juneau is going to want their
41 rural status. And to get what we got through this process
42 it took us almost three years and it started out as I
43 was trying to protect the whole west side of Admiralty
44 for Angoon hunters. Because we were having an issue with
45 some seine boats, tenders coming down, crab boats coming
46 down from Juneau with 6 or 8 lungs and skiffs towed
47 behind them. So, imagine a boat like that coming out
48 here, parking in the bay and then they just go hunting
49 and then leave. That's what was happening. But we
50 couldn't demonstrate it as a conservation concern so,

1 we use Traditional Ecological Knowledge to make it
2 happen. And I think you could use that same knowledge
3 with the Chair's idea. Create an urban -- rural
4 environment for the tribal members of Ketchikan that
5 allows you access to -- that no one else in Ketchikan -
6 - you're going to push this one up the hill, you're
7 going to fight with the State and I guarantee you, quite
8 possibly the territorial sportsmen of Juneau make it
9 their business as well. But I would support that. But
10 for now, since I have a hard time with the other 10,000
11 people in KIC holding them accountable, making sure
12 they're not going to come up and decimate other people's
13 resources, because there's no guarantee of that. Because
14 if you're -- if there's a gentleman from Arkansas, I
15 guarantee you he's going to get all his tags in one
16 trip, and he doesn't care who it affects because it
17 looks good on social media when you have a boatload of
18 deer and all your friends down south see you posting
19 pictures of it. And that's the world we live in now. We
20 don't live in the world when all of this was created.

21
22 It's human nature for us to do things
23 better and improve the way we do things. And hunters do
24 that as well. I own quota with my dad, and that's
25 something my sons will never do because, you know, that
26 thing kept shrinking and it wasn't anything we did. It
27 was it was a flawed process where the sport fisherman
28 took more than they needed, and they were never accounted
29 for until they finally put them on a limit. Now you've
30 got another issue coming, self-guided. I wish there was
31 more time but for now, based on what was said about
32 similarities between Sitka, Kodiak and Bethel my concern
33 is now you're opening the door for Juneau, and I'm going
34 to have to oppose this based on that. And I, you know,
35 all my questions were to find a way to help you guys get
36 there. So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
39 Albert, I would have told you about this last night, but
40 I was up half the night still thinking about it. So,
41 John, I think you wanted to say something on that.

42
43 MR. SMITH: Gunalchéesh, Don. (In Native)
44 Good morning, my friends. Tlingit (In Native) you know
45 what you see. I'm white as the paper on the table, but
46 I need to connect myself to the land, my grandmother.
47 So, bear with me because of the point of view, I'll
48 share. My mom is Pauline Abbott (In Native), her mom is
49 Edna Fulton, her mom before that is Paulina Lina Paul.
50 And then Martha Sitka Jack, who's married to Sitka Jack

1 and loved my grandfather's people that are here. Frank
2 and Larry, you know, the coho (In Native) people. And
3 also, just to share the love of when Yakutat was taken
4 one time in our history where the groundhog or the
5 Kaagwaantaans got together and went to Berners Bay and
6 prepared and back to Groundhog's Bay. And then we came
7 up and got your country and chased them all the way to
8 the Copper River. So just connecting myself there, but
9 also here in Ketchikan, James, his name that was up here
10 and Jeremy and Richard Jackson, I believe Richard
11 Jackson, he Teikweidi and of course that the history of
12 the 13 -- 16 (In Native) that we brought back because
13 we were relatives, the woman who married the bear, the
14 man who married the bear, connects the history to our
15 stories. But also, Charlie Joseph looking House, our
16 grandpa and I honor Joel Jackson from Ketchikan, I heard
17 his voice on the on the phone and the Fridays and the
18 Jackson family connecting to the Teikewidi and the (In
19 Native) headdress, that is a bear and the dorsal fin.
20 Our family is a bear or some of the spirits that we --
21 are helper spirits, we would call them, that taught us
22 how to live off the land and the respect that we have
23 to them, the bear, the wolf, the killer whale, the eagle.
24 I'm (In Native) Kaagwaantaan. Sitka, we have a house
25 still standing and Klukwan, we still have a house
26 standing. And Joel's family, the looking house, their
27 history is when we first put the eagle onto the pole.
28 And of course, our history of our young auntie where a
29 lot of our family died and our auntie, our -- raised a
30 young eagle that brought back our family. So just sharing
31 a perspective of here in Ketchikan, I want to connect
32 myself here. My grandmother that I shared, that was my
33 mom's mother. My mom was born right here in Ketchikan.
34 Edna -- Edna Fulton was her name. And she fell down the
35 stairs. But my mom was still born, and she was a
36 landowner. Edna Fulton, and she was Larry's family from
37 up in Yakutat. Charles Fulton, he was a clan leader from
38 their house. So, I come from honorable people. And my
39 sister Toisan, is the one carrying the 160 acres that's
40 here in Ketchikan. And my son is here, Nicholas Danger.
41 And my grandson, Leo and his wife. So, just connecting
42 myself here to -- also, Sitka. I'm a lifetime member of
43 the Sitka because of my family. I'm Kaagwaantaan and my
44 big brother over here for the Multiplying Wolf House.

45
46 We have an eagle nest group that we meet
47 every Saturday. I see Naomi came to the table and from
48 Ketchikan here and shared her love. She's [sic]
49 medicinal plants and harvests off the land. And so, you
50 know, in the -- in quite a few years, we we've been

1 holding an open house on Saturdays and Juneau at the
2 elders home there and invite anybody to come there,
3 because we understand that it's not alcohol, it's not
4 being obese, but it's being lonely that's killing our
5 people. And that's why our elders really need us to go
6 pick them up and take them out and get them out fishing,
7 get to bring a seal in. I really believe in what I hear
8 at the table. So, understanding to push your tribe and
9 whatnot to get yourself a, you know, take some of your
10 money and get a grant and get a gillnet boat, get a
11 seine boat, use it as education to teach your kids. Take
12 50% of it to feed the family and the community, but also
13 to put money on the table for the tribe. You know, look
14 for resources and ways to strengthen our family because
15 the history of the box house -- I represent Ch'áak' Kúdi
16 Hit my clan leaders, William Kanak, which is our clan
17 leader, is married to Eloise Deisheetaan. So, I honor
18 Mike Douville over here. He's Deisheetaan. So, I share
19 that piece and and the all the Alaskan native
20 representation that sits on the table and Teikweidi
21 right here next to me. The (indiscernible) people, the
22 Yup'ik and Yupiaq and other families that are sitting
23 up at the table, but also are our other ethnicities up
24 here that that love you guys and care for you. So, I
25 just want to share about Juneau two is, we had a box
26 house and a eagle nest House at the (In Native) with --
27 Louis Shotridge had a house on Douglas side in the
28 village there, there was a box house in the eagle nest
29 house that was in the village. So, our Kaagwaantaan were
30 there. I grew up as a young kid, I was born in Sitka.
31 So, I'm just trying to connect myself to many villages.
32 Albert was talking, and Albert is T'akdeinntaan. I'm a
33 slave to the (In Natives) in a real positive way when I
34 say that because I'm married to Victoria Ann Johnson.
35 Her uncle is John Martin Sr., and he passed away and I
36 was there (In Native), I still am today. And you know,
37 I love them and being a slave is a good thing. I'm there
38 to help and to strengthen the family, but also vice
39 versa. So, I'm trying to connect myself to Angoon. When
40 my grandmother here -- that lived here died, my
41 grandfather married Margaret George, who is Jimmy
42 George. And she became Jimmy George's sister. She was
43 the (In Native) for the (In Native) and she married my
44 grandpa. So, I spent a lot of time harvesting in Angoon
45 and even traveling in Sitka. Harvey -- Herman Kitka his
46 father, I used to come over and we'd harvest a herring
47 eggs and bring a whole load into the community every
48 year until he passed, you know, and getting it to the
49 community. But all over Southeast Alaska, we would haul
50 boxes and boxes up and send them out to other

1 communities. And still, you know, we do that today. I'm
2 not -- I just want to share I live in Juneau, I represent
3 Juneau and it's a non-rural area and my fridge is full
4 and (In Native). You know, I lived in Hoonah for years
5 so, it was pretty easy to harvest subsistence. But when
6 I was a young kid I worked on all the seine boats too.
7 I was a commercial fishing fisherman. I worked on the
8 Indian Queen with Paul Rudolph, and he used to ground
9 line halibut, fish and black cod. And I remember we used
10 to cut behind the fin and, you know, clean the black cod
11 so, I started filling up and salting the tips and
12 bringing those back home. We always brought food home
13 to the community and even the boats -- we would select
14 which boat would bring in a fish load, and we would get
15 a permit so that we can bring food to the community,
16 load the boat up, and people would be going down all day
17 harvesting their fish. So that's why I encourage KIC to
18 get a seine boat.

19
20 Also, want to share a name, Doyle
21 Abbott. And I know the Haida came up here, and I don't
22 know if you know him (In Native) was his name. And I
23 know Joel and the Jacksons and the Fridays from Kake.
24 When he was younger, he was raised there by the Fridays
25 and all my family spoke the language, so -- and they
26 shared how they snuck, you know, of course, they were
27 trying to be discouraged. My mom wouldn't speak it
28 because they beat it out of her, but she would listen
29 to grandma talking and she'd talk back in English. But
30 all my uncles, Doyle, especially Doyle, he spoke the
31 language fluently. My uncle John would be in church
32 singing and, you know connecting to here. He lived here.
33 And I remember listening to the Haida Tribal members
34 speaking so, I thank you for your words and just trying
35 to respond to a lot of the things that were said in the
36 in the last couple of days. But be living in even as a
37 young man, me and my little brother, we were hungry and
38 we used to go to the river, I was only 13 or 14 and he's
39 younger than I am, and we used to go gaff, dog salmon
40 humpies and we'd pack the fish up and we'd give it to
41 the elder Alice, and she would smoke it all up. And what
42 we were doing is half and half, and, you know, we would
43 bring that home for our community. But I was always,
44 even as a young kid, would go down to the dock and jig
45 halibut. I caught some of the biggest halibut right
46 off.....

47
48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John, are you
49 going to get to the -- to the point?
50

1 (Simultaneous speech)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. SMITH: Yeah so, I'm sharing that so, those points of view right there are sharing with you that I was a commercial fisherman. I subsistence for my young people as a young man to put food on the table. And I still do that today. And, you know, even though I live in Juneau that, you know, I still -- my fridge is full because I sports fish. I support the commercial fishermen. And then, of course, I travel to different communities to harvest my subsistence with of course, being respectful and calling on my relatives to see if it's okay. So, you know, getting to the point is, even though that I'm in a rural area I do the best I can to provide for my family. And I know it's a challenge. It's hard. My uncles would say, no, don't say that. It's a challenge. So, try to figure out a different process and a different way of getting the things you need. So, (In Native), you know, I shared all this because, you know, just like everybody else (In Native) that I feel the same. That -- how can we make a good change? And, you know, I wrote down a lot of ideas of some of the things that I've heard when I was talking individually. So, I'm going to defer on making that change until we adjust and figure out just like the others. But I do have some ideas that, you know, of changing some of the laws and the regs and the rules to adjust so that our peo\ple and our Alaska native people get all the preference of the food. So, thank you very much. (Indiscernible)

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, John. I think, Harvey, I think I saw your hand up earlier and then, Cal.

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I -- when this first started, I asked staff if they would help me because I struggle with the community of Ketchikan and KIC. I would like to see some rule changes within the ANILCA, but we were afraid that if we opened that box, a lot of it would go away and we'd be in worse trouble. We need help in trying to figure out how to utilize what is there to save the Native community. When I first started this and it has been mentioned here before that originally it was supposed to be a Native issue that was saving the food for the Native people. Then they threw in rural status, and took away the Native. Made it rural people instead of Native people, which made it doubly difficult. In other words, the kind of a wedge between us again. Well, until we can figure out how to get this done, I just hope that some of our

1 young people that maybe can take up some sort of Native
2 Law, that would really help to figure out how to do this
3 in a respectful way. Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
6 Harvey. Cal.

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
9 apologize for getting up earlier. I have, I have a 64-
10 year-old bladder so, I had to get up. So, I missed some
11 of what you were saying. Anyway I, you know, I heard
12 around the table how folks are struggling with this --
13 with this decision. And I'm right there with y'all. I'm
14 struggling as well. You know, I heard heartfelt
15 testimony, I mean, personal friends of mine for years
16 have, you know, were testifying here. And I know them,
17 I know they're really good people, I understand where
18 they're coming from, and I know exactly what's, you know,
19 what they were asking for and what the concerns was and
20 were. And so, I understand all that. And I have a huge
21 ache in my heart for the people of KIC, the tribal
22 members of KIC, I know what y'all are going through
23 being grown up, having a community grow up around you
24 that don't [sic] necessarily respect you know, the
25 customary and traditional ways. And since ANILCA only
26 applies, you know, applies to rural and according to the
27 analysis, we can only look at, you know, the whole
28 community of Ketchikan, which is what, 13,000 somewhere
29 around there. You know that concerns me. If I could --
30 if we could confine it to the -- confine action on this
31 proposal to just members of KIC, I'd be right there. I'd
32 be there. But it's not. We're -- we have to consider the
33 10,000 other people that live here.

34

35 On the issue of rural character and
36 rural characteristics, you know, we're all familiar with
37 how it started and the criteria that the Board had, you
38 know, the 2,500 and less and 77,000 and more, that sort
39 of thing. Instead, what they -- what the Board,
40 interpreting all the stuff they wrote about when they
41 did that review and changed the direction on rural
42 criteria. My take of that is that they're just they
43 basically just directed the Councils to evaluate
44 ruralness or non-ruralness based on, you know, this
45 holistic look at your region, the Southeast region. Kind
46 of squishy, you don't really know what that means. And
47 you're supposed to take all this stuff together and kind
48 of process it through your mind and come up with whether
49 a place is rural or non-rural. And so, I can do that,
50 you know, I can imagine in my mind what a rural community

1 looks like. I've been to a lot of them. I've lived in a
2 lot of rural communities, Craig, Cordova, where I live
3 now in Gustavus, you know, I can close my eyes and I --
4 and I -- in my mind's eye, I can -- I know what a rural
5 community looks like, you know. There's no traffic
6 lights. There's very little traffic. You get up in the
7 morning, you don't hear traffic or people talking or you
8 know, you walk outside on your porch and all you hear
9 is the birds. You know, in a place like where I live,
10 you might have a rooster crowing here and there. I know
11 in a place like Juneau, you can't have a rooster if you
12 kept chickens. So, I -- you know, and I've lived in a
13 non-rural community, Juneau, for a while. I lived in
14 Ketchikan in my early career. I can close -- again, I
15 can close my eyes and I can imagine what a non-rural
16 community in Southeast looks like. You're going to see
17 traffic. You might see a -- there's going to be traffic.
18 You're going to see a traffic light or two. You walk on
19 your front porch and yeah, you may hear a bird singing,
20 but you're also going to hear, you know, somebody down
21 the street yelling at their dog or, you know, whatever.
22 It -- again, I'm, you know, I'm torn, I'm struggling
23 with all this, but and I really like the Chair's
24 suggestion, and I would do everything in my power to
25 help the tribe petition the Secretary and try to make a
26 change on this because I think that's -- because I think
27 that's what it's going to have to take if we want to add
28 non-rural, tribal -- tribal people to ANILCA. But it's
29 -- I would think it's doable. And I think the idea of
30 couching it in the definition of rural is probably the
31 way to do it rather than trying to change that other
32 part, the other -- title ANILCA as to where it applies,
33 you know, rural communities. Anyway, that's what I had.
34 I -- probably not as -- probably not as -- my thoughts
35 are not as together on this one as is as other proposals,
36 but that's kind of where I'm thinking now. I'd like to
37 hear more from other folks if there's more, but yeah.
38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And thank you,
41 Cal. I think there's only one Council member we haven't
42 heard from. Larry, Go ahead.

43

44 MR. BEMIS: Good morning. My name is
45 Larry Bemis, I'm from Yakutat. My name is (In Native).
46 I'm a (In Native) silver salmon, frog, come from the
47 Boulder house. I haven't experienced something like this
48 until this came across the paperwork in this last year,
49 and I wasn't sure how to look at it, I felt in our last
50 meeting this spring woke up what I didn't know. And what

1 I seen is before decisions were made that people already
2 had their own decisions made. Which in a sense is unfair
3 for both sides to hold that grudge before you get to
4 talk like the meetings we had here today, we finally
5 have both -- or yesterday we had both sides give
6 testimony, very strong on both sides. But in all that
7 testimony, not once did I hear somebody get up and
8 testify on how we get through this. You're all working
9 to fight against each other and somehow the Government
10 allows that and doesn't say what's fair for both of you.
11 You battle it and said, yeah, they left it up to us as
12 the Council to do the final decision. They didn't have
13 a decision decisively of what they felt would be the
14 best. They gave us a broad view and gave us a definition.
15 But did they give us a path forward? No. That's up to
16 you and it's up to us. And it's hard because it's such
17 a short time frame. And as far as things have went [sic],
18 it's gone past that point of trying to bring it back.
19 You look at Saxman in 1992, they fought hard for that,
20 KIC agreed with it. They did not know that if they didn't
21 get something started that they'd be where they are
22 today. Nobody asked all the people to move into Ketchikan
23 and make their economy one of the bigger Southeast Alaska
24 economies, and bring everything with them and take away
25 the resources that you -- that they were accustomed to
26 having. KANA stood back and watched it all happen because
27 there was some good with it. But then in our testimony,
28 we're saying, well, they got a store, they got a ferry,
29 they got airplanes. Every community has the same thing,
30 it's just not the scope of what we have. If you weren't
31 able to go get some food off the land, you have to resort
32 to go to a store so you can't count something -- I don't
33 like all the testimony about the stores and the economy
34 and the ferries and all this. That's [sic] should be
35 excluded. That isn't what this is about. This is about
36 the use of the land. This is about your traditions. You
37 know, the ANB and ANS was set up in 1887 -- March 1887.
38 There was the first organization to get the Natives
39 together to work together from every scope of the country
40 in Indian land. They were setting the boundaries of where
41 we'll be, work together and be strong. And a lot of the
42 ANB and ANS was to deal with the government because laws
43 come, we all get together, we get our officers, we get
44 our Presidents and Secretary both on ANB and ANS, and
45 when we go to see how we can work together to take
46 something that has been put upon us and, and then we go
47 into ANILCA, December 1980. There was a position that
48 the Federal Government had to come up with, along with
49 the money and the land they're giving. They wanted some
50 guidelines. And, you know, it might not have been the

1 best thing they put together, but they had to put
2 something together. And here's why. In -- somewhere in
3 the 1980s, I went to a meeting and I was picked out of
4 Yakutat as a subsistence user or a person using the land
5 and the food. I was very young. I had no idea where I
6 was going or what I was doing. I was asked to go secretly
7 in a sense, to go to Bethel where Rural CAP funded this.
8 And why did Rural CAP? Rural CAP is Rural Alaskan
9 Community Action Program that was established to help
10 communities throughout Alaska. Why did I go there?
11 Because the Federal Government asked each one of these
12 people from different communities secretly to come in
13 and give the definition on camera, on recording, what
14 is you -- what do you think the definition of subsistence
15 is? And, you know, I met people from different parts of
16 Alaska, Shishmaref, Kodiak, Cordova, Unalakleet, Point
17 Hope, I mean, there was just a whole bunch of us. We
18 were there and we didn't really know this town was a
19 non-alcohol town. It was a dry town. The nice thing was
20 is that they just built a new hotel that will be staying
21 in. And I thought the accommodations were unbelievable.
22 It's the first time I've ever went in to another
23 community that was out in the middle of nowhere, in a
24 different way of living. So, as this meeting went on for
25 several days, I'm asking, why are we here? What is the
26 reason behind this? Because the State and the Federal
27 Government were fighting over who would justify the use
28 of the land and who owns what land, and who decides the
29 laws, who decides all the different things that keep us
30 functioning in our hunting and fishing and land use. So,
31 at that time, not knowing and as I look back and I was
32 telling Patti this the other day because a light bulb
33 popped on and I said I was a part of trying to define
34 subsistence and how we were recorded and filmed, every
35 person of each community gave what they thought, or more
36 or less, they weren't even sure what they were asked to
37 do. But what we did tell them, how we live. How we get
38 our food. How we treat each other and how we share. And
39 it gave them maybe the definition they came up with to
40 right some of the things in laws there are today. And
41 then I went down as a follow up meeting down to Juneau
42 to see how things are playing out. And they actually had
43 committees to work on subsistence. I was a part of
44 something that I didn't even know today would be what
45 we were dealing with. So, in Saxman 1992, they fought
46 for getting their rural position. Ketchikan had their
47 chance to do that, but I don't think they realize how
48 far this thing would go and how big their community get
49 to where they had a less and less chance.
50

1 The other thing is celebration. Every
2 two years, all the Indian people get together and they
3 go to Juneau and we celebrate and we dance and we share
4 and we give each other our best in what we are and who
5 we respect. Back in the day, there were potlatches that
6 shared the food and they would hold their food up to a
7 year to prepare to go and share another community. Now
8 those were the things that all the communities did. They
9 don't do it as much today. There was a time in the 1900s
10 that the Government stopped them from having hordes of
11 food. They show pictures of mountain of food, take up a
12 half of a parking lot that people would save. They'd
13 almost go hungry to save, to make sure they showed up
14 at that potlatch. And it would be like giving the last
15 of what they had if that be. We don't see none of that.
16 We have been separated with time and with progression
17 to the point where, where do we slow things down and
18 grasp what we used to have? Once you lose something, you
19 feel it, but you don't ever feel it slipping away. Like
20 what is happening to all of us right now. We can only
21 fix what is available with the tools we have right now,
22 and when something this important has been brought
23 forward to us, how do we come up with a decision
24 overnight or a week or a month? It takes all of us to
25 work together to get this decision. This isn't a win-
26 lose situation. This isn't for the outlying communities
27 that say, yay! They aren't going to get it, or KIC
28 saying, now I know how everybody feels about us, and I
29 don't see us getting anywhere because everybody is
30 against us. So, my thinking is, let's get back to what's
31 real. We are people and we love each other and we respect
32 each other. We do it every day. But somehow there's
33 something in a piece of paper with letters on it that
34 says, you will follow this law, section 8, and you will
35 go through this criteria. You know, in all the laws that
36 are being made, they always can be changed and they can
37 always be adjusted. But it takes a lot. It all starts
38 to where it came from, to where it's going. And I really
39 respect being on this Council. I respect the tasks we
40 are given and each one of us come from a different part
41 of the country and we all share the same beliefs. And
42 we might have, you know, it's like Albert, he is wanting
43 to know, what do we do to fix this? He's not against it.
44 He's not saying he is for it. He wants to see -- give
45 me a path forward. And I'm in that same situation. In
46 Tlingit & Haida they pass out food, they are very strong,
47 65,000 members or 55,000. It looks like to me a lot of
48 work needs to be done on understanding all of us what
49 we do. Because you know what? This ain't going to be the
50 last meeting we have like this. Every community that

1 sits on the borderline of infrastructure, tourism, all
2 the things that are coming are all economically driven.
3 And when we are sitting in a situation where a community
4 isn't doing so good, oh, I don't like the idea of that
5 tour ship coming to the -- to my town, but I don't have
6 much choice, a lot of people have already made the same.
7 You take some of the communities like, I work down in
8 Hoonah back many moons ago, and I worked for the Tlingit
9 & Haida working on houses. I said, my gosh, you ain't
10 going to believe it. I went to a town there's 1,200
11 Indians that are just happy, thriving, and man, I've
12 never been around that before. And I made a lot of
13 friends and I just thought, wow, this is what a real
14 Native town looks like. And as time went on, that town
15 got sold out, moved on, houses were sold, land, and now
16 we got tour ships and everything, and they battle for
17 the resources that they have. And they don't have enough
18 push to keep that big machine that's rolling forward,
19 gobbling things up. And I have that feeling that that
20 machine is going to continue until we don't have
21 anything. We'll be down to who's going to be the last
22 one to eat the fish, the deer, the moose. It is very,
23 very scary to look at it that way. So, in my closing, I
24 asked all of us to look at what we need to redefine, the
25 best way to help each other and not fight each other.
26 Thank you, gunalchéesh.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
29 Larry. We've heard from everybody around the table now.
30 I took the opportunity to go first, but I did want to
31 add a little bit more to what I have to say, because I
32 did kind of want to focus on my sort of out-of-the-box
33 solution and that is that, you know, I really struggled
34 with this. I did announce that I, you know, intend to
35 oppose the proposal. And that's mostly based on just,
36 you know, this feeling of, you know, is Ketchikan rural
37 or non-rural? And I, you know, coming from one of the,
38 well, probably the most smallest and remote community
39 represented on this Board, you know, it just didn't it
40 just I just didn't feel it. I -- during the preliminary,
41 you know, process their last meeting, I made a lot of
42 suggestions that I thought the analysis should cover,
43 that I thought would really, you know, be favorable to
44 KIC's proposal. And, you know, there were good answers
45 there. But, you know, in the final analysis, I say, I
46 just didn't feel it. But I didn't want that to be the
47 end of it, because I really think there is merit to
48 KIC's desire for, you know, a Federal priority. And
49 regardless of how the vote should go, and from what I
50 am hearing, I still don't know how it's going to go. And

1 if the vote should go in favor of Ketchikan's rural
2 determination, you know, I can certainly live with that.
3 There will be impacts, as we heard much about. But you
4 know, this Council will deal with that. That's what we
5 do. We've done it before and we'll do it again, and
6 we'll work with everybody to try and make it right. So,
7 that's not my problem. But if the proposal should fail,
8 I also don't want that to be the end of it, because I
9 don't think it -- I don't think it really resolves the
10 issue. And that's where I pledged, and I heard other
11 Council members pledge that we would work towards a
12 better solution. So, that's where I stand. And I think
13 at this point we need to take a break. Give everybody a
14 chance to think about this a bit more. And when we come
15 back, I'll see if we're ready for a vote or if we need
16 more discussion amongst ourselves. Because I definitely
17 hear some of the members are still undecided. So, that
18 they can come to a decision during the break time or
19 come back for more discussion. We'll find that out. So,
20 we'll come back at I guess it'll be 11:00. So, recess
21 till then.

22

23 (Off record)

24

25 (On record)

26

27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Council
28 members, if you could come back to your seats and we'll
29 get an idea how to move forward here. Okay so, I guess
30 I need to know at this point, Council members need more
31 discussion or I don't know, maybe there's questions they
32 still want to ask? That's one thing I didn't hear was,
33 anybody request any more information from staff or
34 clarifications? But if you need that, I don't know, maybe
35 you're ready for the vote so, give me some kind of
36 indication here. Patti.

37

38 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chair. I was
39 looking for my other notes, and I found it if you don't
40 mind, it's not very long. So, the House Conference Report
41 numbered 92-746 at 24 Reprinted 1971. The conference
42 committee, after careful consideration, believes that
43 all Native interests in subsistence resource lands can
44 and will be protected by the Secretary through the
45 exercise of his existing withdrawal authority. The
46 Secretary could, for example, withdraw appropriate lands
47 and classify them in a manner which would protect Native
48 subsistence needs and requirements by closing
49 appropriate lands to entry by non-residents when the
50 subsistence resources of these lands are in short supply

1 or otherwise threatened. The conference committee
2 expects both the Secretary and the State to take any
3 action necessary to protect the subsistence needs of the
4 Natives. Mr. Chair, I was sort of mulling it over and
5 you know, while we're tasked with the duty to vote and
6 the results will be forwarded on to the -- to the Federal
7 Board is -- as this there's been an underlying 804 issue
8 about that has sort of surfaced and not been really
9 analyzed in the in the final report. So, either way, in
10 the result of the actions of this Council, I think that
11 further analysis of that needs to be presented to the
12 Federal Subsistence Board. Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
15 Patti. And when do you feel that needs to happen? I
16 guess.

17
18 MS. PHILLIPS: Their meet -- their
19 meeting where -- they take it up.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Got it.
22 Thank you. Cathy.

23
24 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So,
25 I gave my testimony early and then listened to a lot of
26 Council members testimony as it went around, and it
27 sparked a few more thoughts that I didn't incorporate
28 originally into my testimony. Just cause [sic], you
29 know, even this is a message to the students, even I get
30 extremely nervous up here and get shaky and I was like,
31 oh, that was in my written comments that I read directly
32 from, but I must have skipped that paragraph. Anyway,
33 some of the things -- one of one of the things that I've
34 been thinking about really is we, again, are in this
35 position that we've never been in. Well, given the new
36 policy, I guess I should say in terms of the definition
37 -- how the definition is going to work for on whether -
38 - on the definition for rural, I guess you could say.
39 And I kind of don't feel like I personally have the
40 guidelines in order to decide, well, if Ketchikan is
41 rural, because what are those characteristics? I think
42 I have them in my mind. I don't know that I've
43 necessarily articulated them very well, and then I don't
44 think our discussion has encapsulated all of the things
45 that could be rural characteristics. And I think that
46 that is what the Federal Subsistence Board is looking
47 for, because this is the first time that those things
48 are needing to be put out there. We have rural
49 characteristics that used to be used, but not
50 necessarily how are we defining it. And the reason why

1 I think this is important is because one thing that I
2 heard is a concern that Juneau is going to apply for --
3 if Ketchikan gets this Juneau could -- what's going to
4 stop Juneau from applying for it? Well, what will stop
5 Juneau from getting it if they apply for it is that we
6 have well defined potential characteristics of what it
7 means to be rural in Southeast Alaska, and I just kind
8 of don't feel that we're completely there in a discussion
9 because I'm like, well, what are our characteristics? I
10 keep going back to that. And so, I wanted to I wanted
11 to put that out there, that that's the kind of homework
12 that I feel like we still potentially need to be doing.
13 I'm still in support of Ketchikan as a community, not,
14 I mean, obviously KIC within the community, but I'm still
15 in support of Ketchikan as a community as a whole, the
16 entire population, as I believe that there are some rural
17 characteristics that show that it Ketchikan is rural.
18 And the one thing that the analysis didn't take into
19 consideration because I asked the question when they
20 were up here, was the research that Ketchikan Indian
21 Community did within the community that was funded by
22 the Bureau of Indian Affairs that actually surveyed
23 people, not just Alaska native people in Ketchikan, but
24 non-Native people were included in that survey and they
25 had some a summary and some, you know, how those kinds
26 of things fit into the rural characteristics. And so,
27 one thing they said was overall, Ketchikan's growth is
28 incredibly low compared to other non-subsistence areas
29 and communities with -- in Alaska. And if you look at
30 the table where they show that the communities that were
31 compared were Valdez, Ketchikan, Juneau and Fairbanks.
32 And so, you compare those communities amongst one
33 another, they're all designated non-rural. Overall,
34 Ketchikan's growth is incredibly low. It's not -- it's
35 at a place where we're not going to just continue to add
36 a lot of people into the population. And I think that
37 that's important to note.

38
39 Another comparison that they had was
40 okay, well, let us look at Ketchikan compared to another
41 community with similar characteristics but -- and
42 possibly similar demographics in our region, which is
43 Sitka. And they gave a -- they gave a population
44 comparison in their report, and it says the Ketchikan
45 Gateway Borough, including the city, has a population
46 of 13,741 people. According to the 2020 census, a
47 majority of the population 8,000 or 59% of those people
48 live within the city limits, 41 live without outside the
49 city limits, which may or may not have the same services,
50 obviously. Compared to Sitka, City of Ketchikan has 330

1 fewer people that's within the city. The Borough has
2 2,734 fewer people than Sitka. The population of the
3 island as a whole, because remember, Ketchikan is on an
4 island, there are people that live outside of the road
5 system on Revillagigedo. It has a total of 5,334 more
6 people than Sitka. So, there's, you know, this breakdown
7 that you can look at population and different things.
8 And this is -- I feel like it's kind of a thing that we
9 get stuck on in these communications that we've been
10 having as we deliberate this proposal is their
11 population. It's such a -- it's -- we're talking about
12 a big influx of people that would now have a subsistence
13 priority as a rural community. And so, then I was like,
14 okay, well so, there is 10,000 other people. So, I heard
15 that message and that that is a concern but then I go
16 back and I look at in our analysis on table three
17 Ketchikan, 14% of the population is listed as Alaska
18 native. We have rural communities in our region that
19 have a lower proportion of Alaska native people. So,
20 they also have non-Alaska native people within their
21 community that are at a higher proportion, and Sitka is
22 one of them. Their percentage of Alaska native people
23 of their population is less than 10%. So, there's 90%
24 of people living in Sitka that are not necessarily Alaska
25 native who have a rural priority, because Sitka is
26 designated rural.

27
28 So, Ketchikan as a community as a whole
29 was not afforded that at the time. It wasn't afforded
30 that when they put in for member Phillips' talked about
31 how they petitioned for rural -- rural determination.
32 It wasn't -- anyway, it wasn't put in for that. So, I
33 wanted to bring that to the attention to that we can be
34 concerned about the ten extra, but we're not applying
35 the same -- we're applying a standard to one community
36 and giving them rural status and then we're not using
37 that standard for another community that's somewhat
38 comparable in applying rural status. We're saying
39 they're not rural, and we're saying they're not rural,
40 because we're afraid that the rest of this population
41 is going to be competing with resources from rural
42 communities and other Alaska native in rural communities
43 as well. And so again, I think we have this opportunity
44 to be giving the Board some -- what our interpretation
45 is for what rural characteristics are. I think that there
46 is a case for Ketchikan, their population, the
47 demographics of their population, the economics of the
48 community that they live in and the challenges that they
49 face. The challenges that they face are some of the same
50 challenges that our rural -- our communities that are

1 already designated rural also face. I don't think Juneau
2 is considered a rural community. I don't know that I
3 will ever think Juneau is considered a rural community.
4 So, what are the characteristics that don't make -- that
5 make Juneau a non-rural community? So, that that
6 definition and those characteristics can be utilized
7 when the Board actually gets this proposal. We're making
8 a recommendation to the Board, the Federal Subsistence
9 Board, we are -- the work that we do is strongly
10 considered by the Federal Subsistence Board. And I
11 really think we need to also incorporate the tools that
12 they're going to have to use to make that decision for
13 our region and so, that they can have that -- have those
14 guidelines. As -- and I was really hoping -- I did say
15 it when I was there, I was like, I wanted to listen to
16 the rest of the Council and what they think rural
17 characteristics are. And I don't necessarily feel like
18 I heard a lot of other ones than some of the few that
19 I've been able to mention in the testimony that I begin.
20 And I think it's worth stating, I don't know if I stated
21 it at the beginning when I turned my mic on just now,
22 but that I still I support Ketchikan proposal to rescind
23 non-rural status and yeah, that will be my vote. Thank
24 you, Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
27 Cathy. Mike, then Albert.

28
29 MR. DOUVILLE: So, going back in the --
30 for the original determinations maybe staff could answer
31 why Sitka met the criteria in Ketchikan did not based
32 on what Cathy just explained.

33
34 (Pause)

35
36 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair, Mr.
37 Douville. I just wanted to go back, it's probably not
38 that important at this point, because Cathy made a lot
39 of good points since that. But we did incorporate the
40 2005 household study done by Ketchikan Indian Community
41 and your analysis there. So that was part of the.....

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Cathy has a
44 question.

45
46 DR. ROBERTS: Okay.

47
48 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you for
49 clarification. I wasn't talking about the 2005 study
50

1 that Ketchikan did. I'm talking about the more
2 recent.....

3

4 DR. ROBERTS: The more -- that we.....

5

6 MS. NEENHAM: The more recent study that
7 they did. And when staff gave the presentation, I asked
8 whether or not it was considered in the.

9

10 DR. ROBERTS: It was, it was considered.
11 It didn't change our conclusion.

12

13 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay, it wasn't
14 incorporated necessarily, the numbers and the
15 information that they had in terms of those
16 characteristics were not put into the analysis OSM had.

17

18 DR. ROBERTS: Yes, we received it pretty,
19 pretty late. So, we tried our best, but yeah. As far as
20 you know, why Sitka was included in Ketchikan was not
21 it appears from looking back at the history -- the
22 regulatory history there. There's a lot more public
23 comment given in Sitka. And the -- there was a statement
24 on the record, essentially, that Sitka possessed at the
25 time characteristics of both a rural and non-rural
26 nature. However, on the strength of the testimony
27 provided by the public, they decided to change that
28 determination to rule for Sitka at that time.

29

30 Sorry, that was Jason Roberts, OSM.

31

32 DR. VICKERS: This is Brent Vickers, OSM.
33 Just to add one little thing to what Jason had said is
34 that in the original policy, they drew that 7,000
35 population limit and more or less said by default, any
36 community with a population above 7,000 is non-rural,
37 and those populations between 7,000 and 2,500 would be
38 considered more based on their own merit that they said
39 that we would look at them more closely because they
40 were believed to have both rural and rural -- non-rural
41 characteristics. And that also might be why they looked
42 more closely at Sitka. And decided again with the
43 testimony, like Jason said, that seems to be one of the
44 deciding factors. And that's what we have based on that
45 -- the history there. Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
48 And Jim and then Harvey.

49

50

1 MR. SLATER: Just to respond to that, I
2 do believe, I looked at the record and it unless I'm
3 mistaken that Sitka was over 7,000 as well as Hoonah. I
4 mean, it was well, as Ketchikan.

5
6 DR. VICKERS: Yes. That's correct. Yeah.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, Harvey.

9
10 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
11 really can't see a comparison between Ketchikan and
12 Sitka, except for the population. And Sitka is right now
13 in the process of losing people faster than they're
14 coming in. We are -- right now the people are leaving.
15 We don't have -- even -- we even lost McDonald's, which
16 is in some parts of our Sitka we kind of chuckle that
17 we lost our subsistence place. No, we don't have a lot
18 of things in Sitka, the population is decreasing at a
19 faster rate and as it decreases the city of Sitka raises
20 our taxes even more. So, as a result, more and more
21 people are leaving because they can't afford to pay the
22 taxes that are coming. Besides the -- with the tourist
23 industry and everything, property values have probably
24 tripled and doubled and quadrupled all over the place.
25 And when they made the new law that came out on the
26 short-term rentals, people that had been trying to move
27 in and buy land and things and come to find out the
28 short-term rentals threw them out in the street. So, a
29 lot of people are leaving. The cost of rent is really
30 out of sight. Besides all that, Sitka got 13 miles of
31 road system. We don't have really the infrastructure and
32 a lot of places do that would make it non-rural. So, the
33 comparison is other than the population is way out of
34 line at this point. Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
37 Harvey. Albert.

38
39 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In
40 2000, the Sitka population -- Native population was 16.8
41 and today it's 9.4. So, when they were allowed to be
42 considered a rural designation, the Native population
43 was probably around 20%. So, you can't compare apples
44 and oranges all day long to make your case on either
45 side. You want a definition of rural? Come to Angoon.
46 Come to Angoon where the price of gas is \$6 a gallon,
47 unemployment rate is 80%, where people with five
48 children in their homes are deciding, should I take my
49 last five gallons of gas to go get wood or should I go
50 get food for the freezer? That's rural. That's -- I

1 believe that's what the elders protected. Our ability
2 to maintain ourselves without coming in and asking the
3 Government, can I please have food stamps? That's my
4 definition of rural, because I live it every day. I've
5 been in that situation, and the only person responsible
6 for what I've created is myself. So, we could argue this
7 all day long, but at the end of the day Ms. Needham
8 can't guarantee me the territorial sportsmen are going
9 to grab an attorney because they have more money than
10 the whole City of Angoon has.

11
12 It's -- I was told that's not
13 appropriate but, Mr. Chairman, it just me being
14 passionate about protecting my way of life and my
15 community. You can't guarantee me that somebody in
16 another community has so much money that they feel like
17 they have the right to do what I do and to come into the
18 area we protected because they feel like they have a
19 right to all the resources I have which Title 8 of ANILCA
20 protected. Our elders sat at the table and thought, how
21 can we protect this for our grandchildren if they choose
22 to live this lifestyle, they're going to be allowed to.
23 And sitting here a part of this process, I ask questions
24 because there are things I need to know and I'm looking
25 forward. And in doing so, I'm afraid we're opening the
26 door for other communities to do the same thing, because
27 it could be argued precedents was set. I never even
28 learned the word precedents in high school. Yeah, 12th
29 grade education, but this lifestyle has brought me to
30 this point where I've got to learn things just to protect
31 my way of life.

32
33 So, you know, come to Angoon, see what
34 rural means to us. It's a different -- it's a totally
35 different animal. And where the whole store thing came
36 from, through this process, we protected an area and my
37 justification was, somebody comes to the island and
38 hunts and competes with Angoon from Juneau, and they're
39 not successful, they can go to Costco. If Angoon is not
40 successful, our children go hungry. Because that's how
41 we are as a people. Our -- you know, if you have so much
42 food left, you feed your children first. We learn that
43 from the Navy. In 1886, the Navy came in. October 26th,
44 in 1886 and bombarded Angoon. All our food supplies put
45 away that summer, decimated, gone. Homes gone, one canoe
46 left. So, this kind of feels like that. So, I'm sitting
47 here trying to find a way to help KIC get what you want.
48 But I'm also sitting here coming from a rural community
49 who understands rural and what it means to us so, I'm
50 going to bring that here. You can do what you want with

1 it, but that's what it means to me to be rural. You can
2 come up with all kinds of definitions that suit your
3 needs, but at the end of the day, I have mine. And
4 sometimes you take care of the weakest link so the chain
5 don't break. And in my mind, given the economics of
6 Angoon and what I see on a daily basis, I'm going to
7 protect our weakest link and that's Angoon and our
8 ability to provide for the children there. I see some
9 hard-working adults with five kids, they go to work and
10 then and right after work, they'll go out and start
11 hunting to get what they can, because the cost of living
12 in Angoon is through the roof. So, in order to provide
13 for their family off a given resource that our ancestors
14 settled on, they have to go hunting after work. I've
15 done that. You go to your normal job and then you go
16 hunting just to keep up. If anyone's had to feed
17 children, by golly those little guys can eat more than
18 adults sometimes. Som that's my definition of rural, Mr.
19 Chair, and I can't let this go without saying anything.
20 You can't blame this process for the issues our people
21 are having. You could use the resource to help heal.
22 I've done it with my son. My father has done it with me.
23 So, you don't -- you don't send a teenager off to war
24 and expect them to come back.

25
26 Okay, it's not about me. It's about how
27 you heal your people. Bring them out. Bring them out in
28 a boat. Bring them out in the environment. You don't
29 have to have rural designation to do that. But don't
30 lose any of our young people because you didn't bring
31 them out. My dad brought me out in the environment and
32 brought me back. So, I don't know what it is. It's a
33 mechanism in my family, I suppose, on how to deal with
34 things, and it seems to be alcohol. So, I told this
35 Council that, and this is -- I like to take what I've
36 learned and share it for our people. You don't need this
37 designation to help our people heal. You need to bring
38 them out and show them what you know. Bring them back
39 to what we are as Alaskans, not necessarily Native but
40 Alaskans. So, my son had a friend pass away from
41 fentanyl. And I almost lost him. So, this is -- I heard
42 this testimony as part of why you wanted your
43 designation. So, I'm using my son's example as how I
44 brought him out in the environment, and I kept him out
45 there every day. It didn't matter, rain, snow, bad
46 weather and we talked. So, don't use this as an excuse
47 not to take care of the next generation with the
48 environment. Get them out there. In the meantime, take
49 the Chair's recommendation and go with that on how to
50 fix the current problem. I have a special place for

1 Sitka because I go over there and camp on their grounds
2 in a tent, and I'm getting too old to do that but I'd
3 do that for herring eggs. We take 18-foot skiffs and
4 have the whole community worried about us, until they
5 hear it from us when we get to Sitka. So, using them as
6 a tool to make this happen, I don't agree with because
7 I learned this at a young age, was my sister, I only
8 have one, she was spoiled. And so, we'll just say Sitka
9 is my sister and Albert's over here, how come I don't
10 have this when my sister does? Turns out my parents
11 thought I was right and took it away from my sister too.
12 So, now she didn't have anything to share with me. But
13 those are -- that was the one thing I forgot that was
14 important to me. But you've got to take the next
15 generation out or whoever it is. Take him out in the
16 environment and bring him back. You may think it doesn't
17 work, but sometimes it does. It could be anything. You
18 could be teaching them how to carve, you could teach
19 them how to make drums. That's bringing them back. When
20 I went over to the desert and came back, I walked into
21 the school and I could hear our songs. I was like, holy
22 smoke, I'm home. Something that simple, our Tlingit
23 songs. Now you heard the gentleman say Indians, and my
24 cousin Harvey just always gave me for no other way to
25 say it, hell about it. Your Tlingit, you're not an
26 Indian. I'm a Haida, I'm not an Indian. Because Columbus
27 called us Indians because he didn't know any better.
28 But, Mr. Chairman, that's my definition of rural, and I
29 hope I accomplished something here today on bringing
30 someone back to remain with us until they're older than
31 I am. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
34 Albert. John, Go ahead.

35
36 MR. HOWARD: (In Native), be of good
37 courage. I just want to add to what Harvey was sharing
38 about the 14 miles in Sitka. I was here for our last
39 adventure as SEARAC and I borrowed my kids car, and I
40 went for a cruise and I just, you know, just counted
41 houses and pretty nice houses, pretty big. And I never
42 even got to the end of the road. And I live in Juneau,
43 and it doesn't take me that long. And there's not many
44 houses when you get a certain point of the view. And a
45 lot straighter roads, actually. So, it didn't take me
46 very long. And that's what 40 miles and realizing here
47 is about 40-50 miles of road. I see a lot more houses
48 so, it almost seems like you know, this is my own
49 perspective, this is on my own -- from my own eyes. And
50 seeing how big the houses are, you figure there's two,

1 three, four people. So, really thinking that the size
2 difference is pretty similar to Juneau. So, even the
3 effect that's going to happen if we do go and make that
4 change in Juneau tries to step in doing that. I know
5 Sitka used to be pretty popular when I was a young kid
6 in the mill was going, you know, I'm a logger from
7 Whitestone, 28 years with them and the pulp mill was
8 going Sitka was very active, but it's not that big of a
9 country. It's not really that huge. And also, just
10 listening at some of the issues that I was listening to
11 earlier from the community was all the charter boats
12 that are out there, you know, of course, that's a State
13 issue. And I really think that, you know, I'm new at
14 this, you know, and I've only been on there for a little
15 while, but how do we address that and get the State to
16 understand our way of life, our traditional ways of life?
17 And even NOAA that some of the issues that I heard
18 earlier too, was the being able to set your 30-hook
19 skate out and you had to go out quite a few miles and
20 it cost a lot of money. I suggest you look into the
21 tribe for now until we find a way. But how do we connect
22 with NOAA and say, how can we get them? They can make
23 their set just right out here somewhere even closer.
24 They don't have to go so far. And I don't know how that's
25 going to work. I know you got to go through a lot of
26 different channels, and I really think, you know, the
27 charter boats are how do we slow that down? I was in
28 Sitka. I had relatives send me photos of the airport,
29 and he just walked and did a video of all the charter
30 families coming in and how many boxes of fish that were.
31 It was -- it was crazy. It just made me really heavy
32 inside seeing that. So, how do we even cut down their
33 numbers of fish that they're actually taking out of
34 Alaska? How do we say, you know, a lot of charter boats
35 they have -- just one business has 4 or 5, 6 boats. How
36 do we cut down a business to just being able to only
37 having 2, you know. You know, trying to hit some ideas
38 on how to change some of the laws and the regs, and I
39 really do think the State needs to understand our way
40 of life and how do we do that? Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
43 Cathy.

44

45 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
46 still want to put characteristics for rural communities
47 onto the record for the Board for consideration, and one
48 that I forgot to add to some of my testimony that I
49 haven't spoken to already would be food security. I think
50 food security is something that our region is completely

1 concerned about, people who live throughout this region,
2 and I think it should be something that the Board
3 considers when they determine whether or not a community
4 is rural or not rural. And when, you know, when I was
5 looking through the analysis, I was like, well, what
6 strikes me about food security and Ketchikan and it comes
7 again from their study where it says Ketchikan's role
8 as a resource hub subjects it to degrees of resource
9 pressures from neighboring islands, as well as
10 significant influxes of tourists in the summer. So,
11 they're saying, you know, that is a factor and does
12 impact their food security here. That -- and that's
13 pressures from other communities in and around their
14 neighboring communities, not just non-residents of
15 Alaska, but they stated that and this comes from, again,
16 interviews that were conducted on behalf of the
17 community -- all of Ketchikan. It was also stated that
18 inordinate prices of market seafood are a significant
19 barrier to accessing healthy and wild foods. Food
20 security in the Ketchikan Gateway Borough is 11.3%,
21 which is a comparable rate to food insecurity in the
22 Haines or sorry in the Hoonah Angoon Borough, which was
23 measured at 11.8%. The prices of local wild cough
24 proteins is much higher than imported proteins. So,
25 those are some of the comparable that we can use when
26 we think about food insecurity. I think the reason why
27 I'm pushing for like, making sure that we have in the
28 record some defining characteristics that the Board can
29 consider when they bring up this proposal is important
30 as these things come along. And that's all I'm trying
31 to do, is provide or help put a definition to it. I 100%
32 wholly believe communities like Angoon, Hoonah, Kake are
33 rural communities, but as the characteristics of those
34 communities, the ones that were defining rural by?
35 Because if it is, then Petersburg, Wrangell and Sitka
36 become non-rural. And so that's the difference, like we
37 look at these -- our communities that are designated
38 rural within our region. And that's what we're supposed
39 to be taking, like what makes them all as a collective,
40 what makes them all rural and then how does Ketchikan
41 fit into that picture? And so, you can't compare
42 Ketchikan to Kake. Kake is -- and then say, well,
43 Ketchikan can't be rural because it doesn't have the
44 same characteristics as Kake. That's comparing apples
45 to oranges. To use an analogy that I heard earlier, you
46 have to compare it to something that has the same like,
47 similar, at least demographics, because we're talking
48 about building characteristics that have kind of a
49 threshold. So where is that threshold? So, we need to
50 know what the characteristics are and then we kind of

1 need to know what those thresholds are and then we need
2 to know how communities fit into them. And so, that's
3 why -- that's the only reason why I was looking at other
4 communities that are of comparable size or have the
5 comparable similarities and challenges that Ketchikan
6 has. And so, that for me to decide whether or not I
7 think Ketchikan fits, what could be the definition or
8 fits into the characteristics of what rural is. So, thank
9 you, Mr. Chair, for letting me to add that. And I promise
10 that's my last thing.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Doesn't have to
13 be, but okay. I just want to comment on that. Cathy is
14 looking for a kind of a very lack of a better term, data
15 driven, you know, rationale for a decision. And I can
16 see the validity to that. However, it kind of baffles
17 me that the staff with all of the data was not able to
18 do that. Instead, they gave it to us for this more
19 holistic interpretation. So, I mean, that's -- it's just
20 the one thing that, you know, when it goes to the Board,
21 you know, I don't know what they're going to be looking
22 for. It seems like, as you state, they might have been
23 looking for what logically their staff might have come
24 to a conclusion on. You know, we're a different body.
25 We look at things differently. And yeah, that's just
26 kind of what kind of baffles me. So, you know, this is
27 a -- this is going to go to the Board and they're going
28 to consider all this and what you're saying is very
29 helpful. I agree. Sure, Cathy.

30
31 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
32 think part of the difference for me too, is that staff
33 can change their decision between now and the Board
34 meeting based on all of the testimony that they heard,
35 just like we did. We can't change our decision. And so,
36 they went neutral, allowing us to help give them some
37 guidance. And we might be able to give them the
38 additional information so that they can take a position.
39 And, then they would be able to do so before the meeting.
40 So, I think it's important to note that when you state
41 that staff couldn't come to a decision based on all of
42 the data and data driven, that's the data that they had,
43 but they did not have the testimony that came before us.
44 They didn't have our deliberations for that. So, I'd
45 like to add that. Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Good
48 point. I think Louie and then Harvey. Louie, go ahead.
49
50

1 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 would just like to say this has been on my mind since
3 we started, what, three years ago in this room? And I
4 knew the people at KIC and I talked to them, it's -- I
5 see what's going on in our area and how it will affect
6 the other areas. And I just told them it was just you
7 folks, it'd be an easy decision. But to allow all this
8 fleet to come in on the other communities is going to
9 be devastating. I really appreciate how Albert explained
10 a lot of it, because I don't explain myself that well.
11 And then when we were in Klawock last year, I talked to
12 them again, shook hands. And it's not against KIC, but
13 against allowing the invasion into our rural communities
14 which is -- even Metlakatla, our gas is, I think, 5.25
15 a gallon. It's, when I got to come to Ketchikan for
16 parts or something, I'll bring Jerry jugs with me and
17 carry him down. And my daughter over there will help me
18 carry him or my granddaughter. But we do these things
19 to try to help and save any way we can. As we go fishing
20 and hunting, you don't always get some. Not anymore. But
21 I talked to the Mayor of Metlakatla early, and I told
22 him my concerns, and he said the same thing I did. If
23 it was just KIC, it would be an easy decision. So, I
24 made sure I talked to him and got his opinion. So, I
25 knew it was going to be a tough day today. And but -- I
26 still have to look out to protect the real rural
27 communities. So, thank you.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
30 Louis. Harvey, go ahead.

31
32 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
33 wanted to -- this is something that I had thought about
34 a long time. Possibly I -- almost from the second term
35 that I was on this Council. I'm glad that KIC, Ketchikan
36 Indian Community put this in. I knew it was going to be
37 hard. I knew we were going to have lots and lots of
38 discussion on it. And some of it will be -- will be
39 pitting against each other at times but it had to come.
40 We have to start this procedure. Ketchikan Indian
41 Community was put in a place where some of our other
42 communities and in Alaska, where the cities have grown
43 up around what was a small Indian community. They lost
44 their rights to do some of the things when they made
45 them non-rural. This was wrong, and I hope that we can
46 get across to the Board or to whoever needs to be told
47 that these Indian communities still need to protect
48 their subsistence rights. Thank you.

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
2 Harvey. Anybody else? Okay, Ted and Patti.

3
4 MR. SANDHOFER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 You know, in all these discussions, it seems like, you
6 know, KIC was trying to fix something that -- a wrong
7 to get back their traditional and cultural uses. And the
8 only tool they had was to say, hey, let's make Ketchikan
9 a rural community. But we're trying to fix that with --
10 that there's no tool to fix it without including another
11 10,000 people, which some of us are struggling with. So,
12 you know, I don't know how to get around that, but I
13 think going down a path like you suggested, Don, might
14 be a way to do that but we're trying to fix a question
15 with the wrong answer. That doesn't make sense. But I
16 mean, I'm not sure if I'm explaining myself correctly,
17 but it's just -- it just doesn't feel right that we're
18 trying to get the rights back to KIC through this
19 process, because it's the only one we have. But it's the
20 wrong -- it's just the wrong path to get there. Thank
21 you.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
24 Patti, go ahead.

25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
27 I indicated on page 121, non-rural decision-making
28 criteria. So, I'm going to follow the recommendation of
29 member Needham. And on page 23 of the supplemental
30 material, which is the survey results provided by
31 Ketchikan Indian Community. So, 59% of the respondents
32 stated they hunt or fish in their area to access their
33 resources. 58% stated they rely on family and friends
34 to share with them. 61% of the households receive
35 resources from others, and those who harvest often share
36 with others, meaning their access is supplemented by
37 another's, 31% of the sample purchases from a store and
38 14% from commercial fishermen. So -- also, I looked up
39 the number of acres for Unit 1, and it's like close to
40 1.5 million acres. And if you look at Unit 2, it's pretty
41 close to the same size. I think we're missing an
42 important component, and that component is that the
43 Ketchikan Indian Community recognizes that there are
44 tools being used by other rural areas that help those
45 rural areas protect their resources. They have 1.5
46 million acres in their Unit that they would like to
47 provide stewardship skills to for the protection of
48 accessing their subsistence -- subsistence resources.
49 I, you know, I've been -- it's been sort of -- I don't
50 know how to say that, insinuated that I'm trying to

1 compare Ketchikan with smaller rural communities. Well,
2 I'm not, as I stated earlier, and what the staff analysis
3 says we've got -- there's 35 communities in Southeast
4 Alaska. We know Juneau is never going to get rural status
5 because they're like 35,000 people. But there isn't --
6 there is a Native community there that really would like
7 to be able to access their subsistence needs, but I'm
8 not going to go there. I mean, that's like, you know,
9 throwing them under the bus. So, what can we do? I mean,
10 without throwing each other under the bus to try to help
11 a community steward its resources so that they can
12 continue to hunt or fish in their area to access their
13 resources. Every one of our communities has million-
14 dollar lodges, several hundred thousand dollar homes. I
15 can't afford a, you know, a \$250,000 north the river. I
16 got a little 18-foot North River with a soft top, I love
17 it. But I'd love a great big one but I can't afford
18 that. But I use my North River to access my resources.
19 Do we have big, you know, million-dollar homes in our
20 inlet? We sure do. We inherited a home in Sitka, but the
21 property tax is, like \$2,000 a year on it, and we're
22 like, oh, boy, where are we going to get that kind of
23 money to pay that? Well, we find it. Why it's, you know,
24 I have to let you know that my mother-in-law, who's now
25 deceased, Nancy Hamilton Phillips, was born in Howkan
26 and raised in Hydaburg. She married a fisherman, they
27 moved to Pelican. But she inherited trust land in
28 Ketchikan, which now my husband has inherited. So, it's
29 like we're all connected in some way. And I have -- I
30 have a granddaughter with blonde hair. Yeah. So -- but
31 I love my granddaughters, and I want them -- I take them
32 out on the skiff. I'm teaching them how to run my
33 outboard. They love it. They think it's fun. I mean,
34 this is -- I learned this from my dad. My dad took me
35 out on the water, you know, I grew up in Sitka, you
36 know, I've been on the water since I was a toddler, you
37 know. But to make an assumption that only certain things
38 can happen a certain way is -- isn't realistic because
39 we all have our own way of doing things in our
40 communities. I'm not saying that your way is any less
41 important than what I do, because it's all valuable.
42 It's [sic] all contributes to who we are as people and
43 a people as a whole. So, you know, we're putting in to
44 the administrative record, you know, the Board is asking
45 us to address some of these, you know, case by case
46 basis. How does this community meet a rural status? And
47 we have a survey result which is very well done and it
48 describes how in the end, people could obtain enough to
49 meet their household dietary needs. The answers to this
50 question is 68% said no and 32% said yes. So roughly a

1 third of the people are meeting their household dietary
2 needs, but two thirds are not. And so, I personally, I'm
3 the kind of person -- I do a food bank and Pelican, I
4 want to make sure people are fed. So, not only are we
5 giving them deer or fish, but we're also bringing in
6 food from Juneau to -- at the food bank for those who
7 have needs, you know, to get that food. So, you know,
8 it's puzzling to me. I will say that I remember when
9 this whole topic of why did Sitka get ruled in
10 determination, and because they had a very strong tribal
11 presence, provide [sic] testimony about their customary
12 and traditional ways. We had that yesterday. We had a
13 very strong customary traditional use testimony. And yet
14 we're putting this fear of, well, that other 10,000.
15 Well, they -- if they got rule status, they could use
16 the tools that we use now. Okay. So, we got a ten-day
17 local resident hunt in Lisianski Inlet; a ten-day hunt,
18 local resident hunt for Hoonah; ten day hunt, local
19 resident only Angoon. That's a tool that we put in so
20 we can meet our needs. The first time around that that
21 proposal went through it was for over two, maybe three
22 month closure. Well, that didn't fly and boy did we ever
23 hear about it at the local level. It just pit community
24 member against community member. And there's still hard
25 feelings to this day. But when we narrowed it down so
26 we could try to really meet subsistence needs, not a
27 single person spoke for or against it. It was each of
28 us regional Council members who spoke for it. And then
29 this RAC -- it was a RAC proposal and it went forward
30 to the board and they supported it. So, we're going to
31 have the benefits of that ten-day hunt November 1st
32 through 10 of this of this year. So, those are tools
33 that Ketchikan could use or they'll determine -- it's a
34 self-determination method that they -- they'll use for
35 their area. It's not for me to say you should do this,
36 Ketchikan. No, you should do this, Angoon. No, this is
37 -- I bring forward what I think would work in my area
38 and or Jim would bring it forward, even for your own
39 area, Mike, you bring stuff forward for your area and
40 we support that. Petersburg is staying on the moose hunt.
41 People, more than just federally designated users
42 harvest moose in Petersburg, but in Yakutat proper only
43 Yakutat can. But that's that works for them. So, on a
44 case-by-case basis, how do you make it work? That's how
45 you make it work. Proposals come forward, an analysis
46 is done, we talk it over, study it, bring forward a
47 recommendation. Sometimes we have to come back to the
48 drawing Board. So, and we've got to trust the process.
49 I trust that Ketchikan is going to bring forward
50 proposals that are going to be meaningful for the

1 community so that they get their food security needs
2 met. That's the type of person I am. I'll take a box of
3 food to your house if I think you're going hungry, and
4 I'll have those people crying because they didn't know
5 I saw their needs weren't being met. And I'm seeing now
6 that some needs aren't being met here in Ketchikan. And
7 I want to bring you a box of groceries. And it's just
8 frustrating to me to deal with this mentality is that
9 they're going to come to my place and they're going to
10 take what I have. That's not how we are. Yeah, we have
11 people in America that are that way, but we have tools
12 in place to remedy that. And so, I'm going to trust the
13 process and I'm answering on a case-by-case basis. And,
14 and you know how I'm going to vote. So, thank you, Mr.
15 Chair.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
18 Patti. So, I want to add something else to my thoughts
19 on this. You, somewhat kind of alluded to it as, you
20 know, protecting the land and resources. We've kind of
21 danced around that a little bit. Protecting the land and
22 resources, it's part of ANILCA. Uses of the public land
23 shall be so to cause the least adverse impacts on
24 subsistence uses. So, I've lived, you know, Point Baker
25 for over 40 years and Point Baker, Port Protection, you
26 know, about 50 people living there. We fought tooth
27 and nail for the protection of Prince of Wales Island for
28 many, many years. We sued the Forest Service. We tried
29 to stop the pulp company. We've been to Congress
30 testifying. I've been there twice myself. My neighbors
31 have been there. We always fought Ketchikan. We never
32 got support from Ketchikan. We didn't even get support
33 from some of our fellow communities on the island. That's
34 very important to us, you know, kind of -- I come from
35 that perspective, you know. During the -- during that
36 fight, you know, where was KIC? I never heard from them.
37 You know, the rest of Ketchikan fought us tooth and
38 nail. So, I think that's, you know, one of the things I
39 still have in my mind and I still see it, and I think
40 it's one of those characteristics that kind of separates
41 rural from non-rural. Ketchikan always has been very
42 pro-development. I don't think that element has gone
43 away. I don't -- in the past they did not have a strong
44 regard for the health of our environment and our forest.
45 I'm not sure that's gone away. Ketchikan is still pro-
46 development. You know, we got a forest plan that we are
47 developing. There is potential in that forest plan for
48 more timber development in southern Southeast, on Prince
49 of Wales Island. I don't know where Ketchikan is going
50 to weigh in on that. I don't have a good feeling about

1 it. I say, you know, there are folks in Ketchikan that,
2 you know, do want to protect the environment. But I also
3 get this sense it's such a, you know, pro-development
4 community that that could also impact us. And I factor
5 that into the difference between a rural and a non-rural
6 community. I didn't really articulate that earlier. I
7 was just kind of more vague about it. But you know,
8 that's what's in my mind as well. So, Mike, go ahead.
9

10 MR. DOUVILLE: Some really strong
11 feelings. I can tell a little bit about myself. Like you
12 know, I've been a commercial fisherman for the last 64
13 years, and I'm still fishing. And I've lived on the
14 island for 75 years. All the trees were standing when I
15 was a young lad. And now take a look at it. When I had
16 an opportunity, you know, what's this thing called Title
17 8? And, I didn't really have a lot of faith in our
18 representation. So, I applied and it took a couple turns
19 up a couple applications to get on here because I wanted
20 to protect our resources and our way of life. So, I'm
21 [sic] expert subsistence person. I know where all the
22 fish live, I know how to get deer, I know how to do
23 everything. I don't have any problem doing that and do
24 well. And I teach other people the same thing.
25

26 We have restrictions on Prince of Wales
27 for all non-rural users. They're restricted to two deer
28 on Federal land. And there's a reason for that. There
29 was a competition issue as well as a conservation issue,
30 and that's why those are in place. I don't like to say
31 no to KIC. I think that you fully should be able to go
32 there, but I don't believe that all of Ketchikan has
33 that qualification. The tribes, and you heard testimony
34 from out there that they're fearful of the deer resource
35 mostly, with good reason, because it is declining and
36 we have plenty of wolf. And it's not going to get any
37 better until we are able to harvest enough wolf to level
38 off the populations on both of them. And then gradually
39 it might build up. But there is rationale to be
40 concerned, and they are concerned. You see, we don't get
41 that much deer from over there. But this says Unit 2,
42 50% of the harvest that Ketchikan does comes from Unit
43 2. So, if we made everybody rural here and let them have
44 five deer, of which one of them could be a doe, just
45 think of what would happen to that number and what would
46 happen on that island. There is [sic] tools to deal with
47 that but they are cumbersome, and it takes time. And
48 like I said earlier, my fear would be -- I fear for the
49 resource. And then we'd all be in bad shape. But anyway,
50 that's -- I do not support the proposal as -- for some

1 of the testimony I heard from Prince of Wales and the
2 tribes. However, I would suggest supporting AFNs
3 proposal that would allow for resolution. Anyway, I
4 don't have all the wording, but it would allow all
5 members of federally recognized tribes to have access
6 to subsistence. So, on the other hand, I don't know if
7 KIC has made the effort to try to deal with NOAA and
8 remove the restriction on halibut so they could have
9 better access with the shark card, or have they lobbied
10 for to change this personal use area to subsistence, you
11 know, those are some things that could be done. Anyway,
12 that's all I have right now. Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
15 Albert, then John.

16

17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
18 not going to apologize for loving my son. You saw that.
19 And helping you find a solution to take care of your
20 people -- when I first got on this Board, I had a tone
21 of voice, and I came out swinging on every issue. And
22 the older I get, it's kind of ironic, because the older
23 I get, I learn to listen but my hearing is going. Go
24 figure. Kind of nature's joke on me, I suppose. But I
25 have a hard time with this. But I struggle with the two
26 worlds things. I hear you when you want access to it.
27 That's why I ask the questions I asked yesterday. What
28 is preventing your access to the resource? Is it
29 something we're doing around the table? And if it is or
30 is it the ANILCA 8 process that's preventing you from
31 being -- access to your resource. And I didn't get an
32 answer, today I got an answer of what was preventing one
33 person from having access to their resource. She's too
34 young to be a part of the proxy system. So, here's the
35 solution to that. Have the State change the language in
36 the proxy system if you're taking care of an elder and
37 you're not able to get out in the environment because
38 the elder needs 24-hour care, and in that instance, you
39 should be allowed to have a proxy hunter. So, keep in
40 mind, while I'm giving you this idea, I'm looking for
41 ideas to get us all to where we need to be. And I agree
42 with the fact that maybe that is the way to go. I don't
43 -- I'm not a fan of AFN because they've never really,
44 truly represented Southeast Alaska. But when they start
45 putting resolutions through and you can look them up
46 online, I've got a sister that seems to think I need to
47 be involved with AFN, but that that's a different story.
48 But she told me you need to look at the resolution. So,
49 I take -- I took a good look at it and he's correct,
50 they're trying to switch the -- so, if you're if you're

1 part of a federally recognized tribe, you have the same
2 subsistence rights as a rural community. And if that's
3 what it is, I think we should all support that. And that
4 gets rid of, you know, I'd love to see you guys out here
5 doing what you do. But the reason I ask what was
6 restricting you from doing it was so I can help you get
7 there. Now this Council, we agree sport fishing has been
8 an issue and we've had that discussion, that sport
9 fishing is having an impact on all of us rural, non-
10 rural, you know, Native, non-Native. And I keep trying
11 to and I'm hopeful that one of our solutions to that is
12 to have them do a -- their self-guide -- put them on a
13 limit. You know, the like, a limited entry for self-
14 guide boats so to speak. That would stop that. And then
15 once you do that then you put a limit on how much they
16 can take. I worked at a sport fishing lodge for 17 years
17 and I look back on that experience, I am older than I
18 look or I am -- because I got a lot of experiences in
19 my life on commercial fishing and everything else. But,
20 in order for us to get a big tip, we had to come in with
21 limits of everything. And that then was my drive to
22 catch more fish so I could provide for my family then.
23 And I believe -- and I've seen the impact of it. So, I
24 could connect every dot together. When there's a lot of
25 hands in the pot currently, you've got all the commercial
26 industry in the pot, and then you've got the sport
27 fishermen from outside their hands are in there, and
28 here we are hitting each other's hands, making each other
29 feel bad and not looking at all the other hands that are
30 in there. I've said this before, in our culture we have
31 a saying that the elder said a long time ago and it's
32 still here today, but I've changed it a little bit. The
33 saying was when the tide's out, the table set. The state
34 of Alaska now takes more chairs and puts it at the same
35 table without due process of asking us, can we put this
36 chair at the table? I'll give you the example I mentioned
37 before about Sitka, the subsistence users were going out
38 and filling up a cooler as big as this table with shrimp,
39 and the commercial guys found out about it so, the State
40 came in and closed the area basically to the subsistence
41 user and gave them a five-gallon bucket. That's what I
42 mean about taking a chair and putting it at our table.
43 And we're allowing it. And then we're stuck fighting
44 over the five-gallon bucket. All of us that were at the
45 original table are sitting here fighting over the five-
46 gallon bucket of shrimp.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Albert.

49

50 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We're starting to talk around in circles here. We're going back to points that we've all made in the past. I don't think that's getting us anywhere. We are going to have to come to a conclusion on this here. You know, we just can't go on forever. So, anything new, John? New thoughts, we're looking for new thoughts.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I just want to echo what Mike was saying about the NOAA and the 13 hooks skate. I don't know how many of you know what a two hooks skate looks like, what they call a traditional bobber. Do you guys know what that is?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John, I don't think that's getting us where we need to go.

(Simultaneous speech)

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We've already had that discussion.

MR. SMITH: Right. And that'll give them a solution. It's a solution.

(Simultaneous speech)

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: It's -- it doesn't have anything to do with the rural determination of Ketchikan. I'm sorry. It's time to focus. Okay, Ted.

MR. SANDHOFER: You know, shall we call for the question?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Are we ready? People shaking their heads. Yes? Okay. Question has been called for. So, the motion was to support non-rural determination proposal 25-01. Frank, are you ready for the roll call? I say the motion is to support. So, yes or no on supporting the resolution.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: The motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Cathy Needham.

MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.

00060

1
2 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.
3
4 MR. SMITH: No.
5
6 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
7
8 MR. KITKA: Yes.
9
10 MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.
11
12 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
13
14 MR. WRIGHT: Louie Wagner.
15
16 MR. WAGNER: Yes -- or no, I mean, I'm
17 sorry.
18
19 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.
20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: No.
22
23 MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
24
25 MR. HOWARD: No.
26
27 MR. WRIGHT: Ted Sandhofer.
28
29 MR. SANDHOFER: No.
30
31 MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.
32
33 MR. SLATER: No.
34
35 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
36
37 MR. DOUVILLE: No.
38
39 MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.
40
41 MR. CASIPIT: No.
42
43 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
44
45 MR. BEMIS: Yes.
46
47 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
48
49 MR. BEMIS: Yes.
50

1 MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright is no. Got 4
2 for and 9 against.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
5 Frank. The motion fails. So, that will be our
6 recommendation going forward to the Board, I guess. You
7 know, I would like to propose that we send a letter with
8 this recommendation essentially with the Board's
9 approval, of course, would we like to send a letter
10 expressing our desires to see more of a solid
11 interpretation of what it is to be rural in regards to,
12 let's say Native occupancy on traditional lands or
13 something to that effect? And how that affects rural
14 determinations and ability of Alaska natives to access
15 resources. We have a bit of a discussion on that. Albert.

16
17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
18 going to try to find the resolution that came out of
19 AFN. Maybe we support that language.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
22 That would be helpful. We could come back to this as we
23 usually do with the proposed letters. Anybody else?
24 Larry.

25
26 MR. BEMIS: Yes. I'd like to make one
27 comment before we leave here as an example of what
28 happened over a period of time. There was a time when
29 you could hunt up to 500 moose in the Yakutat area, and
30 people would put stickers at the airlines that they came
31 in from out of town where they got them. And then it was
32 300 moose and then it was 100 moose and then it was 50
33 moose then it was 25 moose, and it's slightly increased
34 over time to 30. And when this was going on, the State
35 had control of it. And it wasn't until the Federal
36 Subsistence Board got involved and realized the needs
37 aren't getting met. We're going to lose everything for
38 everybody. So, the system does work if you work with it
39 and explain it and get what you need. And I see that 30
40 moose we hunt on first before everybody else gives us
41 the right as a community users to get that. And that has
42 nothing to do with just all Indian, it's the 30 moose
43 for the residents that qualify to go get that. So, I'm
44 looking at this as maybe getting that group of the 3,000
45 to try to get a status on getting what they need, not
46 to let the whole -- if 600 people had the okay to go get
47 that 30 moose, my gosh, I might never even see a moose.
48 I don't have all the tools, I'm going to have to put
49 them together if I want to be in competition. But, this
50 is an example of when you have so much, you don't think

1 about it until you don't. And I could see the protection
2 and the no vote being handed here, but at the same sense
3 I would like to see this Board putting something in
4 writing in supporting the group that needs the resources
5 and the access to what will eventually, when there is
6 not enough to go around, there'll be a percentage of
7 them that will be the last one to get something if the
8 law allows it. So, now's a good time for KIC to start
9 working towards getting a group together that can at
10 least work towards getting something that fits the order
11 of all the other communities of their area. Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
14 Larry. Harvey, did you have your hand up?

15

16 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I go
17 back to before I got on the Board, I was one of the
18 people that worked on the halibut subsistence. When we
19 proposed the number of fish per day, they -- everybody
20 really start [sic] screaming at us. They said we'd abuse
21 it. I said, but the halibut stay better in the ocean
22 when they're alive. We put them in the freezer that
23 don't taste the same. So, when we told them that the
24 number might increase dramatically at the start, but it
25 will fall back to what it has always been traditionally,
26 halibut subsistence use has always been about 1 to 3%
27 of the take, and it went up to about 11 for a while then
28 it just dropped back down to -- because people realized
29 that when you take only what you need, that means it
30 will always be where it always was. Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
33 Harvey. Anybody else? Are we going to write a letter?
34 Send this with a letter, any thoughts on that? Anybody?
35 Ted.

36

37 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Yeah. I fully agree
38 with you. You know, I think we can all see the struggle
39 that this this question has generated amongst us. I just
40 want to make sure, for the record that my vote was to
41 not make the whole community a Ketchikan rural. But I
42 still believe that the Ketchikan Indian Community needs
43 to find something to allow them to have their traditional
44 and cultural uses back. Just for the record. Thanks,
45 Don.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
48 Cal.

49

50

1 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, I couldn't have said
2 it better than Ted. I agree 100%, and I think we should
3 send a letter to the Board, at least with the AFN's
4 resolution that Mr. Howard is looking at, but also just
5 maybe say that, you know, we struggled with this and we
6 you know, I, you know, I think there is consensus around
7 this table that we should provide for KIC's customary
8 and traditional harvests. And to the extent that we can
9 encourage the Board to go to the Secretaries and ask for
10 them to look for something to help them out, whether
11 that's legislation or a change in the definition or
12 changing a policy. Let them decide, but.....

13
14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
15 Cal. Frank.

16
17 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You
18 know, I struggled with this a lot, but, you know, if it
19 was just KIC, it would be simple. But here we are, we're
20 dealing with the whole community -- whole City of
21 Ketchikan. You know, I feel for KIC but there's got to
22 be a way that we could -- we as a Council could do
23 something for the indigenous community of Ketchikan
24 because I -- like I said, I if they took it away from
25 me, then things have stuff -- things have been taken
26 away from me as a Tlingit, you know, but -- I don't know
27 what else to say, I just, I feel for KIC and I feel --
28 I really feel for them.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
31 Frank. Mike, did you have something to say?

32
33 MR. DOUVILLE: I wholeheartedly concur
34 with Cal's statement and certainly would like to do
35 something for KIC or get them on the resolution that AFN
36 had or something similar so, they have full rights.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
39 Jim.

40
41 MR. SLATER: Just to tag on to that
42 thought, I agree with it. And I would ask that we would
43 put it on a future agenda item to make sure that we
44 close the loop and don't just let it drift away, that
45 we revisit this in the status of it.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jim.
48 So, I'm hearing a lot of support for Ketchikan Indian
49 Community, and we can write a letter and I will take
50 that with me, you know, have that with me when I go to

1 the Board. That would be very helpful. I don't want --
2 I didn't -- I don't want to just rely on, you know, me
3 having to try and explain all this testimony that we've
4 gone through to the Board. I think a letter, you know,
5 outlining our support for KIC and proposing a potential
6 solution would be very helpful. But ball's going to be
7 in KIC's court. It's going to be up to you to push this
8 through, find a way to make it happen. I mean, I think
9 it can happen. Nobody's told me it can't happen. Nobody's
10 run up to the front desk there from the staff saying
11 saying, no, no, no, you can't do that. So, I'm going to
12 take that as an open door and, you know, give you the
13 opportunity to push through it. And you know, if you're
14 successful, it will have, you know, huge implications
15 to this system. And, you know, our Council has a record
16 here of taking on the big issues, you know, that really
17 affect the whole program. You know, we came out strong
18 with a position statement on co-management and climate
19 change. And we got heavily involved in the Roadless Rule.
20 And we recently wrote a position paper on the importance
21 of a meaningful preference and what it means when Title
22 8 talks about continuation of subsistence uses as a
23 rationale for closures, and we've had success with that.
24 And I don't know, I think we'd be willing to take this
25 issue on as well, because that's kind of what we've
26 done. So, it's -- but it's up to you to, you know, find
27 a way to make it happen and I think we'd be in support.

28
29 So, I think we should I think break for
30 lunch and take a take a big breather here and come back
31 and try and get through some pretty important stuff on
32 the rest of this agenda here this afternoon. And I think,
33 I probably expect to go a little past 5:00 this evening.
34 So, let's break till 2 o'clock. I know that's going to
35 put a lot of pressure on for the afternoon, but I think
36 we kind of need a little a little respite here.

37
38 (Off record)

39
40 (On record)

41
42 CHAIRPERSON HERNADEZ: Okay. Thank you
43 all for bearing with us here as we got - organize a
44 little bit for our afternoon/evening session. So, we
45 need to pick up on our agenda, essentially where we left
46 off before we went to this time certain on the Rural
47 Determination. And, I think we have three - three
48 essential action items that have to get to today, and
49 then we've got several other items that we want to get
50 too. So, let's start with the ones with have to get to,

1 and the first one on that list would be the Fisheries
2 Resource Monitoring Program Development. And, we'll have
3 a presentation from somebody on the staff, Anthropology,
4 I believe.

5
6 MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the
7 record my name is Robert Cross, I'm the Subsistence
8 Program Manager for the Tongass National Forrest. And
9 then, I have Scott Ayers with me as well from the Office
10 of Subsistence Management. And then we have -- Ms. Perry
11 is, I think, putting up the list of Priority Information
12 Needs. So, I'll go ahead and start then. Priority
13 Information Needs, which might hear refer to as PINs are
14 an important component of the Monitoring Program that
15 identify [sic] issues of local concern and knowledge
16 gaps related to subsistence fisheries. Further Priority
17 Information Needs guide the Monitoring Program funding
18 process by determining what type of projects are
19 submitted for funding and provide a framework for
20 evaluating and selecting project proposals. The
21 Monitoring Program for Southeast Alaska -- for the
22 Southeast Alaska region is directed at information needs
23 identified by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional
24 Advisory Council. The existing Priority Information
25 Needs are listed on the screen, I believe, at some point
26 here. Trying to slow down to let you catch up but.

27
28 Okay so, while Ms. Perry is working on
29 that, we're presenting this list to see if the Regional
30 Advisory Council would like to make any changes to their
31 existing Priority Information Needs. We did receive two
32 letters from the Chilkoot Indian Association and the
33 Sitka Tribe of Alaska regarding the list of Priority
34 Information Needs, and you should have copies of those
35 full letters. But also, I can summarize -- do a very
36 brief summary of the letter, if that's what the Council
37 would like to do.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead and do
40 that if you would, Rob.

41
42 MR. CROSS: Okay. So, the letter from the
43 Chilkoot Indian Association expresses their support for
44 the continued inclusion of population estimates for
45 hooligan for northern Southeast Alaska, the Unuk River
46 and Yakutat Forelands to continue the ongoing Chilkoot
47 Indian Association Hooligan Monitoring work in the face
48 of declining hooligan stocks. So, this wouldn't be
49 necessarily an amendment to the current regional -- or
50 the current Priority Information Needs. But the way that

1 they have it worded, it could -- you guys could choose
2 to merge the third and fourth Priority Information Needs
3 together. And that would essentially be what they've
4 stated in their letter.

5
6 So, the third-party information need
7 now that they're up on the screen is escapement indices
8 or population estimates for hooligan at the Unuk River
9 in Yakutat Forelands. And then the fourth one would be
10 population estimates for hooligan for northern Southeast
11 Alaska. And so, the letter from the Chilkoot Indian
12 Association, although not expressly asking to merge
13 those two, essentially their request is the merger of
14 those two points. And then the letter from the Sitka
15 Tribe of Alaska is requesting the addition of Redoubt
16 Lake to the Priority Information Needs as the most
17 important source of sockeye for the community of Sitka.
18 And this would likely be an amendment to the first
19 priority information need by adding Redoubt Lake to the
20 list of other sockeye systems for reliable estimates of
21 sockeye salmon escapement and in-season harvest, and
22 escapements of stream discharge in the following
23 systems, and then again amending that to say, Readout
24 Lake. So, yeah, it was a very lengthy letter and very
25 well written from both organizations. But that's the
26 short summary of them.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
29 So, any questions from the Council?

30
31 (No response)

32
33 Okay. And as I understand it, that list
34 is not prioritized in any way, right? That's just a
35 list. Correct?

36
37 MR. CROSS: Correct, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah, we
40 could approve all of it or some of it. Correct?

41
42 MR. AYERS: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 That's exactly right. You have the option as a Council
44 to decide what you want on the list. And that's
45 effectively the starting point. Any proposals that get
46 submitted, have to be within the bounds of what's on
47 that list if they want to move forward in the process.
48 So, although you don't prioritize specific items on that
49 list, the longer the list is, the less likely it is that
50 A particular priority need is going to be necessarily

1 applied for and researched.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
4 Ayers. So, Council discussion. My recollection, DeAnna.
5 This doesn't take a motion, does it? It's just a
6 discussion or is it a motion?

7

8 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is an action
9 item.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. So, we
12 would need a motion to, I guess, approve or change this
13 list. So, then we'll put it under discussion. Cal.

14

15 MR. CASIPIT: I move that the Council
16 approve this Priority Information Needs list.

17

18 MR. SLATER: I'll second that. James
19 Slater.

20

21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Now, any
22 other thoughts on the list? Cal. Ted. Ted, first. Okay.
23 Go ahead, Ted.

24

25 MR. SANDHOFER: Thank you, Chairman. Hey,
26 out of curiosity, you know so, I know there's limited
27 funds and personnel to do all these maybe -- is there a
28 estimate of, you know, if we say, hey, we want them all
29 A to Z. Can that be accomplished?

30

31 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair, member
32 Sandhofer. So, I think, if I understand your question
33 correctly, it -- yeah. If somebody put a proposal in for
34 every single one of these Priority Information Needs,
35 could we fund that? Is that the question? No. Absolutely
36 not. Not with our current funding level.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, sorry, I
39 was having a discussion there. Cal, did you have a
40 comment?

41

42 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 You know, I realize this is a big, long list, and we
44 probably don't have the money for it all, but you know,
45 maybe we -- maybe some of these won't even have a
46 project. You know, if there's a partner out there that's
47 not interested in working through this, you know, we
48 won't see a proposal for them. So, I -- I'm comfortable
49 with this list and the length of it I do have -- I would
50 like to add Redoubt, the issue of Redoubt. And I guess

1 we can combine those two points together, but that one's
2 not as I don't know, pressing for me because, you know,
3 the language is there where we put them together in one
4 bullet or two. It doesn't matter to me, but I do see the
5 need to add Redoubt to that, and in addition to that, I
6 hope that the message can come across that you know,
7 there's some shared responsibility there, you know, not
8 only does the Federal program have a responsibility
9 there to monitor the run, but you know, Fish and Game
10 might want to kick in some bucks too. Because it is
11 their management plan that we're working under. And if
12 you don't have the escapement info going for that year,
13 that management plan is -- you can't implement that
14 management plan without the escapement. So, I'm -- I
15 guess at this point I'd like to provide an amendment to
16 this list to add Redoubt to the Sockeye Salmon escapement
17 bullet.

18
19 MS. NEEDHAM: I'll second.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
22 Cathy, second.

23
24 MS. NEEDHAM: I'll second the amendment
25 -- motion for the amendment.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, we have a
28 motion to amend the list to add Redoubt Lake. Any
29 discussion on that? Are we ready for the question? Okay.
30 Thank you. So, all in favor of amending the motion to
31 add Redoubt Lake sockeye escapement assessment to this
32 list of Priority Information Needs, say aye.

33
34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
37 Say nay. Okay. We can add that to the list. Other
38 discussion now on the main motion of approving this list.
39 Cathy.

40
41 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do
42 have a question about the sort of second topic of merging
43 the two. Is that -- like, can somebody looking at this
44 list only if they decide they want to put in a proposal,
45 can they merge the two in their proposal, as long as
46 both items are on the list in some fashion?

47
48 MR. CROSS: Yeah, through the Chair,
49 member Needham. So, really the purpose of this list is
50 that in order to apply for fisheries resource monitoring

1 funding you know, there needs to be certain
2 requirements, like there's a partnership and capacity
3 building within communities. It also needs to address a
4 Priority Information Need and so, you know, back to the
5 question from member Sandhofer, you know, we're never
6 going to be able to fund all of these. I think the tact
7 that the Council has taken in the past is to be very
8 inclusive. So, the -- I think the concern has been that
9 if you're -- if you make very specific Priority
10 Information Needs then it could cut out projects that
11 would be very helpful to informing in-season management
12 and things that we don't even know that we need to know.
13 But then the opposite would -- could potentially be true,
14 where these aren't actually filtering out projects
15 specifically for things that the Regional Advisory
16 Council is concerned about. So, to the original
17 question, they can be -- those two can be merged. It's
18 really more of a clerical -- it just makes less Priority
19 Information Needs while still having the exact same
20 information in there. There's also some repeated
21 information in there as well. So, it would just be a
22 matter of kind of cleaning it up, but it wouldn't change
23 any effect, or it wouldn't have any sort of effect on
24 folks ability to apply for that funding.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Cathy has
27 something else. Go ahead, Cathy.

28
29 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 Is that the -- is the bullet item that says incorporate
31 the use of indigenous co-management, is that one the
32 last bullet item because it is cut off a little bit? So,
33 it's -- I want to make sure that I read the whole list
34 No? Okay, thanks.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, Louie.

37
38 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have
39 a question on the hooligan when we get to it so, I don't
40 miss it, if we go by it on the escapement estimates.

41
42 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: You can ask a
43 question on that now. Yeah.

44
45 MR. WAGNER: Okay. On the escapement
46 population estimates. What is the plan on that? I heard
47 Ketchikan Community mentioned their non-rule, and they
48 were up there again this spring. And I have to say a
49 little bit more of what happened while I was there. I'd
50 rather not.

1

2 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair, member
3 Wagner. So, this isn't specifically KIC work up on the
4 Unuk or KIC work on the Unuk. This is just a list of
5 possible project ideas that could be or the list of
6 issues that the Regional Advisory Council would like to
7 see addressed through potential projects. So, it's
8 weeding out what types of projects can be applied for.
9 So, it doesn't specifically address any, any one
10 organization's activities.

11

12 MR. WAGNER: Okay. Mr. Chair. Thank you.
13 For me, you know, if I could just see if Mr. Haines
14 comes up again and whoever comes with him, that's enough
15 for to just, you know, for what they look for the observe
16 the spawn. I don't think we need any more people than
17 that to take an assessment of it. And with money getting
18 tighter and shorter, that's the -- flight trip up there
19 is \$2,000 and the same to return and then they rent a
20 cabin. So, to me that's the concern of going to spend a
21 bunch of the money that Forest Service is budgeted with.
22 That would be, I think it would be unnecessary. There's
23 more important ways of using that money. Thank you. Thank
24 you, Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
27 Louie. Kathy again.

28

29 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When
30 I read the list, I see that it says population assessment
31 for hooligan for northern Southeast Alaska. Are you --
32 and I'm wondering if your comments are specific about
33 the Unuk? I kind of don't see the Unuk up there but I'm
34 also at an angle. Oh, there it is. Okay. Okay. I just
35 didn't want that comment to say that there wasn't a data
36 information need for other systems, and I didn't -- it's
37 hard to read at an angle. So, I wanted to make sure that
38 we weren't potentially talking about taking something
39 off of the list that would impact data needs for other
40 systems. I'm also not necessarily in favor of taking
41 anything off of the list at this point in time, because
42 what happens is this list then gets published, and
43 entities throughout the region have an opportunity to
44 apply for funding. And if a project isn't on the list,
45 then there are projects not really going to get
46 considered for funding but if there is, they want to
47 actually identify information needs. They can go to this
48 list and say, well, this is in my area and I have
49 resources and I want to potentially help meet these
50 stated need that the Regional Advisory Council says is

1 needed for the region. So, I think we've always kind
2 of, in the past taken an inclusive approach on trying
3 to get as many potential options out there so that
4 entities -- tribal entities, as well as government
5 entities across the region can work together on projects
6 to be funded that collect data that we need in order to
7 make decisions -- the decisions that we have to make at
8 this table. So, I support this list. I -- if there's
9 something that we're missing, I would support including
10 it. But if there's -- I really wouldn't want to take
11 anything that's currently on the list off of the list.
12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
15 Cathy. Jim.

16
17 MR. SLATER: Council Member Phillips and
18 I have been talking. We have a concern about Lisianski
19 River with the advent of bareboat charters and other
20 increased pressure on Lisianski River and the coho run
21 there. We were wondering if our number six mentions
22 reliable estimates of salmon populations and harvests
23 in the sport and subsistence fisheries Kah Sheets and
24 Alex creeks. If we could include Lisianski River onto
25 that?

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, is it --
28 it's okay to add things to the list at this point, right?
29 Okay. That may have to be added as another amendment,
30 though, as we did vote to approve this.

31
32 MR. SLATER: Should I state it as a
33 motion?

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

36
37 MR. SLATER: I move that we add Lisianski
38 River to bullet item number six, which is states reliable
39 estimates of salmon populations and harvests in the
40 sport and subsistence fisheries at Kah Sheets and Alex
41 Creek, that we add Lisianski River to that list of
42 rivers.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Moved and
45 seconded. Any other council members with a comment on
46 that addition amendment?

47
48 MS. NEEDHAM: Question.

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Question has
2 been called for. All in favor of amending to include
3 Lisianski River assessment on this list say aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
8 opposed? Say nay. Okay. Back to the main motion. Any
9 further discussion? Patti.

10
11 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What
12 about genetic sampling, is that a part of any of these
13 bullet points? Working list?

14
15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Patti.

16
17 MS. PHILLIPS: Is there is that something
18 done on already existing projects?

19
20 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member --
21 oh, sorry, Phillips. Yeah. So, I thought that it was in
22 there. I thought that we had eDNA in there, but that
23 might have been the previous list. So, yes, eDNA is
24 being used for hooligan monitoring for one example. And
25 just the fact that it may not say eDNA on here, there's
26 many possible ways to get reliable estimates of sockeye
27 or reliable estimates of hooligan. And this doesn't
28 necessarily restrict what types of studies can be done.
29 It's just that the overall goal of this priority
30 information need is to get reliable estimates, however
31 the researcher sees best fit.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Patti.

34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, but
36 can we request that they do genetic sampling as a part
37 of the study? I mean, do we need to add that into the
38 into the bullet point or is it just already a given?

39
40 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
41 Phillips I think that's totally up to this Council as
42 to whether they would like to see that be a metric for
43 how a project gets ranked or not, or -- yeah, I guess
44 that would -- It's kind of interesting how this list
45 gets used, because if a project, let's say, doesn't use
46 eDNA to get the reliable estimate of sockeye, they're
47 still on this list. It says reliable estimates of
48 sockeye. So, they would meet that requirement to fulfill
49 one of the Priority Information Needs. That being said,
50 putting, you know, using or studying the use of eDNA as

1 a metric or an index for sockeye salmon on systems in
2 Southeast Alaska, that alone being on the list might
3 invite a tribe or a partner to see that and look into
4 that as a possibility for getting a reliable estimate.
5 So, it can kind of -- it's your guy's list to kind of
6 use however you will. But yeah, putting that on there
7 won't limit projects to just using eDNA, but it not
8 having it on there won't discourage folks from using it.
9 Yeah. That's right.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. John.

12

13 MR. SMITH: In the Chilkoot Indian
14 Association, I think in the middle of the first
15 paragraph, it actually it identifies that I believe, if
16 you want to see that, it's right in the middle.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
19 Cal.

20

21 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
22 asked for some direction on this but, Ms. Phillips was
23 asking about genetic sampling on sockeye systems and I
24 -- correct me if I'm wrong, Patti. I think you're talking
25 about the genetic samples that have already been
26 collected from our projects that haven't been analyzed
27 yet, so they can't be, you know -- I think -- isn't that
28 what you're asking about? I mean, that's what I'm curious
29 about is that apparently, somewhere in a freezer,
30 somewhere there's genetic samples from our sockeye
31 systems that we've been looking at for years that haven't
32 been analyzed yet. So, maybe if we can -- I don't know
33 if I'm being off base. I -- to me, that be something we
34 might be interested in, but I leave it open to the rest
35 of the Council.

36

37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Well, Cathy has
38 something to add to that. Go ahead, Cathy.

39

40 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
41 Chairman. When Patti asked the question I was wondering
42 the exact same thing but having been involved in a number
43 of FRMP projects in the region in the past, if you apply
44 for a fish handling permit, you have to take genetic
45 samples from those fish. If they do not currently have
46 a baseline for each river system in the -- and then that
47 -- those genetic samples are actually analyzed by the
48 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. So, they now have
49 this like baseline database that includes that. But what
50 they don't have and maybe this might be getting at what

1 Patti and you are trying to tease out that we could do
2 is genetic sampling within the commercial fishery in
3 order to understand where fish -- where sockeye salmon
4 are destined to go back to, to match back to the
5 baseline. And so, I don't know if that's outside the
6 purview of our FRMP, but it definitely is an information
7 need when it comes to genetics for sockeye. And I think
8 I brought it up at some point in time in this meeting
9 that a project like that was done in District 3 for
10 Klawock, when they were looking at whether or not those
11 fish were intercepted. And I had suggested that since
12 those fish had already been sampled, that the assessment
13 could be done for fish destined for Cordova Bay, because
14 they already have that, they just need to actually take
15 those genetics and match it back up to the header base
16 line. As far as I know, that's kind of the -- that was
17 a pilot project, and it was kind of the first of its
18 kind in the region to determine whether or not it would
19 be an -- a successful way to match it back to the genetic
20 baseline that exists for each stream system. And if
21 that's the case, if it's something that we could -- if
22 it's something that a proponent could put a proposal
23 into, then that would be meeting an information need.
24 So, is that what you're getting at? Is the mixed-up
25 fishery issue?

26
27 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Patti.

30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: So, yeah how is it already
32 a given -- my question is it already a given in the in
33 this list, or do we need to specify it?

34
35 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair, member
36 Phillips. Sorry, I'm just rapidly reading through these.
37 It might fall -- you know, I don't think so, really. I
38 mean, there's a couple spots where it says reliable
39 estimates of sockeye harvest. And so, I think what I'm
40 hearing is just the use of DNA or analyzing DNA to assess
41 the contribution of certain sockeye systems to the mixed
42 stock fishery. Is that correct? Okay. Yeah, I don't and
43 maybe Scott will disagree with me, but I don't think
44 that it's out of the question to put that on the Priority
45 Information Needs list. So, me of the projects that might
46 be put in under that Priority Information Need might
47 later get weeded out because it needs to have a federal
48 subsistence nexus. But that's something that the
49 technical review committee can handle. Just trying to
50 figure out what that nexus is or how that project will

1 help improve Federal management or things like that. But
2 putting it in the list of Priority Information Needs
3 would at least allow the researchers to put that project
4 in and then maybe later have it weeded out instead of
5 just leaving it off the list of PINs would ensure that
6 it would get weeded out.

7

8

CHAIRPERSON: Patti.

9

10 MS. PHILLIPS: So, two questions is how
11 would -- what would we say to add it to the list? And
12 specifically, you know, we were discussing Eek and Eek
13 was like the -- they had more harvests than escapement
14 and then there was a possibility that perhaps because
15 of the -- because of openings or we don't know what you
16 know why is there a less of a return there? So, if we
17 did, you know, maybe we could find out, are they being
18 caught or what?

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, Patti.

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

MS. PHILLIPS: And then to further address what Cal, you know, so clearly stated is that if we do have genetic sampling that needs to be analyzed as well, and is there a list of what has been genetic sampled? Because Harvey asked me, has Kanalku had genetic sampling done? I mean, thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. CROSS: Member Phillips, I don't have that list in front of me. I'm sure that we can find that information. But, yeah, I think that the way that this is worded right now, use of DNA to determine the contribution of sockeye in the mixed stock fishery, I think that's pretty open ended. As to what exactly that -- what that entails. So, I think somebody could write a proposal to use existing DNA samples and fund that to be analyzed. I think it's broad enough to where it would be inclusive. I don't believe so. I can send it to Ms. Perry and have her put it up there.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti, again.

MS. PHILLIPS: Could I make the motion?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Sure.

MS. PHILLIPS: I move to use -- to add the use of DNA to determine the contribution of sockeye to mixed stock -- mixed stock what? Fisheries. Yeah.

MR. CASIPIT: Well, I'll second that. This is Cal.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Got a motion to add DNA analysis on mixed stock fisheries to the list. Any further discussion? Okay. Question has been called for. All in favor of adding that to the list say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody opposed? Say nay. Okay, we'll add that to the list. Back to more discussion on the main motion. But if we're ready for the question yet, there is somebody on the phone that wanted to talk to us. Can I go there just to make sure we don't go to a vote before -- Mr. Rosendale, are you still there? Did you have something you wanted to bring to the attention of the Council?

1

2 MR. ROSENDALE: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
3 Kyle Rosendale with Sitka Tribe of Alaska. Can you hear
4 me okay?

5

6

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Go ahead.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. CROSS: Through the Chair, member
Wagner. You are voting for the bullet point that says

1 that there will be a -- that researchers can potentially
2 put in projects and receive funding to assess hooligan
3 populations in northern Southeast Alaska, the Unuk River
4 and I don't see the other one. Yakutat Forelands. So,
5 it's just the existence of that being a potential set
6 of project ideas. So, it's -- not you're not voting
7 necessarily in favor of CIA [sic] going up there and
8 doing eDNA monitoring or water quality or anything like
9 that. It's just that if that's on the list, that is a
10 potential project idea that can be funded.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Louie.

13
14 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just
15 -- I'm concerned, Mr. Cross. I seen -- I didn't want to
16 say this, but I watched them -- we got there early in
17 the morning, and we were waiting for the tide to come
18 in. And there's my three children on board and we had a
19 reporter and a journalist on board, but that's just who
20 was on board my boat. And while we were kind of waiting
21 for the tide to come in, we've seen the skiff bring them
22 down the KIC people with four igloos again, and they've
23 been taken hooligan and if that's going to continue, I
24 got to be careful how I vote here. So, that's my concern.
25 I'm for all the rest of it but, I just need to know so
26 I can vote. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27
28 MR. CROSS: Member Wagner. Yeah, I don't
29 -- that's a really difficult situation. I really -- the
30 -- again, the vote here is -- these are a list of things
31 that that folks can apply for funding for and without
32 being incredibly specific on this list -- yeah, yeah.
33 I'm sorry. I don't know how to answer that.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, Patti. Go
36 ahead.

37
38 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah, I'm just going to
39 insert this in here. Jill Weitz from the Juneau Tlingit
40 and Haida Central Council says that U.S. Geological
41 Survey does water quality monitoring in the Unuk and
42 there is a stream gauge at the international border,
43 just so you know. Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
46 Patti. Are you ready for the vote? Question has been
47 called for. So, all in favor of approving the Fisheries
48 Resource Monitoring Project list that we have before us,
49 please say aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
4 opposed? Say nay.

5

6 MR. WAGNER: Can I oppose as I still
7 don't know what I'm voting for here. I mean, if I vote
8 and put that in. Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. One nay
11 vote. Okay. So, the motion passes. That concludes our
12 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Project list. Next action
13 item that we need to get to is identifying issues for
14 the Annual Report, and DeAnna will start us off on that
15 discussion.

16

17 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
18 is DeAnna Perry, Acting Council Coordinator. Moving on
19 to the Board's replies to this Council's Annual Report.
20 You can see the draft response in your supplementals,
21 behind tab three or online, the document is listed below
22 supplemental materials, Annual Report reply. I didn't
23 know if the Council wanted to briefly have an overview
24 of that before they then proceed to identify the next
25 set of Annual Report item or we can go right into
26 identifying report items.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think it would
29 be helpful to know what's already been addressed here.
30 So, if you could kind of briefly run us through a
31 summation there.

32

33 MS. PERRY: I can make that pretty quick.
34 Again, that your supplemental materials should be behind
35 tab three. So, a quick summary of the items that this
36 Council put before the Board. The first was meaningful
37 priority and the interpretation of sections in ANILCA.
38 The Board said that this document is useful in
39 understanding the Council's approach to its duties and
40 responsibilities, and they are grateful for the
41 Council's thoughtful evaluation of Title 8 and the
42 functions of the Federal Subsistence Management Program.
43 Item number two was the bycatch issue, letting the Board
44 know that the bycatch issues still remain a concern. In
45 this topic, you ask the Board to elevate your letter
46 regarding bycatch concerns and they have done so as
47 requested. That package is in your meeting books
48 starting on page 303. Invasive European green crab was
49 the third issue. The Board provided some references to
50 resources that are useful in understanding this issue,

1 and also some of the partnership efforts to monitor for
2 presence of European green crab in the area. And I am
3 hoping that maybe we can have a presentation on this
4 issue, perhaps at our winter meeting. The fourth issue
5 was the Tongass National Forest plan revision. The Board
6 provided references to the plan revision website, in
7 response to the Council's request for an additional
8 meeting to draft and submit public comments during a
9 public comment period if that falls outside the
10 Council's meeting cycle, they did respond that an
11 additional meeting could not be supported at this time
12 and suggested that the Council communicate its thoughts
13 via letter. And of course, at this meeting we've heard
14 some more conversation on that on a way forward. We
15 should be getting an update also on the forest plan,
16 details on the timeline a little bit later this
17 afternoon. Lastly, the Board thanked the Council for its
18 informational topics, which included support for
19 indigenous co-management agreement for the management
20 of northern sea otter populations, concern for
21 aquaculture farming impacts on subsistence resources in
22 Southeast Alaska. Continuing concern regarding unguided
23 or self-guided sports fisherman impacts on subsistence
24 fisheries. Continuing interest in examining and
25 providing their interpretation of various sections of
26 ANILCA Title 8 and sharing the current reported status
27 of fish and wildlife resources in Southeast. So, those
28 -- that's just a brief summary of what was included in
29 our Annual Report. And as you can see, the Board's
30 responses which will kind of set us up for the next --
31 next year's Annual Report, Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
34 DeAnna. So, this is opportunity for the Council members
35 to decide whether or not some of these previous Annual
36 Report items were dealt with to your satisfaction. And
37 also, to start a new list of concerns or reports we want
38 to send to the Board. So, I'll open for discussion to
39 see if anybody wants to start. Start a new list or add
40 to this list, I guess. Frank.

41
42 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, would the KIC
43 issue be put in this report?

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That's a good
46 question, Frank. I think -- I'm thinking that is best
47 dealt with in a separate letter direct to the Board. And
48 DeAnna and I have been, you know, working on the wording
49 for such a letter. So, that would just be my
50 recommendation. But yeah, thanks for bringing that up.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wrote a couple of things down in terms of ideas to go into this year's Annual Report. One of them was the issue of scheduling Federal Subsistence Board meetings dates at the same time that the Board of Fish or North Pacific Fisheries Management Council during the times of -- the burden that that puts on residents and users in our region when they're scheduled at the exact same time, and people can't be in two places at once on important issues that deal with their community. And I think that that's a good Annual Report item, even if it's a letter later, it could be both. It is an issue. And kind of along the same lines, I don't know if it's a separate thing, but just the time -- the comment timing period, I think we just need to continue to keep that issue alive. I know it was talked about in the Tongass plan revision for the last time we did it, but it's still just continuing, and we see it. And I think that we need to keep the issue kind of raised at that level. And then I'd like a placeholder for, you know, if we're going to be getting a briefing on the assessment to the Tongass plan revision and eventually the Tongass plan revision, that's probably an Annual Report item topic that probably will stay in our Annual Report every year until the process is done. So, making sure that that placeholder is in there. And then we can incorporate whatever discussion we have later after this agenda item. Those are the few things that I wrote down. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy. Any other Council members have something they want to put on the list?

(No response)

Okay, and DeAnna we do have an opportunity to add to this list at our winter meeting. Is that correct?

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, no, there won't be time to turn that back around. Given that our meeting is going to be in the middle of March by the time that the staff need to assist with the responses. So, we do need to make sure that we are identifying all items when

1 the draft is done and comes back before this Council in
2 its March meeting. If there are additional details under
3 the existing topics, we can certainly add those, but we
4 wouldn't be able to add any additional topics. And also,
5 we need to be clear about what we would like to write a
6 letter on and what we would like to put in the Annual
7 Report. The Council can consider whether it really wants
8 to duplicate those efforts.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you
11 DeAnna. So, I'll give a little more time. Jim.

12
13 MR. SLATER: Considering the earlier
14 events of the week and kind of the vagueness that we
15 inherited on the KIC proposal. I know we're planning on
16 addressing it as a -- in a different way and approaching
17 them via a letter, but would a request for a definition
18 of -- either a definition of a rural community -- a
19 better definition of a rural community or guidelines in
20 which we -- specific guidelines how we could evaluate
21 if they want us to do it -- a rural community in case
22 this comes up again.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I don't
25 know if I can make a recommendation on that.

26
27 MR. SLATER: Yeah, I'm not sure. It's
28 just a thought that, you know, this is an open issue,
29 that vagueness and that definition. So, I thought maybe
30 at least raising the question would make them somehow
31 address it further.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay.

34
35 MR. SLATER: But I'll leave it to the
36 judgment. It's just a thought that I wanted to get some
37 comments on.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right. Okay so,
40 let's just see if any other Council members have an
41 opinion on that. And while you're thinking about that I
42 just want to be clear, when -- as we come up with this
43 list, I don't believe that we go through it item by
44 item. I mean, this is an action item. So, we have to
45 vote on this. Don't we just essentially have a discussion
46 and then vote on the entire list, is that how we usually
47 do the procedure here?

48
49 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, we just need
50 to identify the item, give us a little bit of detail,

00083

1 and we'll draft up a draft letter that you'll then
2 approve.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm not
5 hearing any other discussion so, maybe we should just
6 ask for a clarification on how the Board sees the
7 definition of rural. I guess that's what you're asking,
8 right? Clarification on.....

9
10 MR. SLATER: That's correct.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. We can add
13 that. Cal.

14
15 MR. CASIPIT: Isn't it -- I hate to
16 question a fellow Council member, but don't you mean
17 non-rural criteria? I mean, that's what the issue here
18 is, whether or not.....

19
20 MR. SLATER: Maybe the distinction
21 between rural and non-rural.

22
23 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah or something like
24 that. Because it's pretty for me I'm pretty easy on
25 defining what rural is. I think I can figure that one
26 out.

27
28 MR. SLATER: Yeah. The criteria I guess,
29 would have to be the distinction between rural and non-
30 rural to help us through -- guide us through any issues
31 similar to what we've just gone through.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think
34 that is -- oh maybe we're getting a comment from the
35 staff. Go ahead.

36
37 DR. VICKERS: Thank you. Through the
38 Chair. This is Brent Vickers, OSM. And just something
39 that mig*ht help you inthinking about this. That is the
40 Board's policy that all communities are rural unless
41 determined non-rural. So, maybe that would help you
42 frame what you're asking for.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Probably does
45 but I don't know how so.

46
47 MR. SLATER: I guess we might say that -
48 - I guess it would still stand the asking for the
49 distinction between rural and non-rural, which still
50 stand for the even though you're, they're innocent until

1 proven guilty. Kind of -- all right. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
4 Brent, but yeah, I feel good about that. Okay. Any other
5 items? Larry, go ahead.

6

7 MR. BEMIS: Okay. Through the Chair. You
8 know, as we go through this, and I'm really a lot of you
9 know, getting baseline data, it would be nice to know
10 what the subsistent user or the non-subsistent user --
11 species about what we take in the area. I don't know,
12 where do we get that information, but it would be nice
13 to have to see the distinction of what is creating over
14 time, what we're taking and who's getting it, and at
15 what level do we recognize the problem? I mean, it seems
16 like we're always running into an issue of resource
17 depletion. We're lucky a few places have an increase.
18 I'm not sure if I'm stating exactly what I'm trying to
19 say, but what I'm getting at is a distinction between
20 subsistence using and non-subsisting using when you're
21 working on the same species in the same area. It seems
22 like if we had a little better line of what we were
23 harvesting, would we be able to see something instead
24 of waiting to get the report that we might have to close
25 this because it ain't looking good? Would we be able to
26 see this as a gradual graph of something going on, or
27 do we wait till we get to that point where the State's
28 going to step in or the Federal subsistence going to
29 step in, and we start making the rules to try to
30 alleviate the problem? It seemed like if we had better
31 information on actually pressing the records to specify
32 actually each area, what they're taking and get a good
33 graph going, that maybe we could pre-adjust things
34 before it gets down too low.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think I can
37 address that. It's not really stressed all that much in
38 our Annual Report, but you will notice -- you will notice
39 though this is kind of important. On each of our Annual
40 Reports, for a number of years now, we have been
41 including a current status of -- and it's in the Annual
42 Report response -- we are including a current status of
43 fish and wildlife resources in Southeast Alaska. And
44 like I say, that's something we include with each of our
45 Annual Reports. And it is kind of the summation of
46 harvest, essentially, I think is what you're talking
47 about. So, the idea of that is to kind of have this
48 record over time of -- I think pretty much what you're
49 getting at there of -- you know, what are the harvests,
50 are they increasing, are they declining, what areas? So,

1 I think we have that covered. It's not stressed all that
2 much because it's kind of a standard thing in the Annual
3 Report.

4
5 MR. BEMIS: Thank you. The main thing was
6 -- is that I think we should emphasize it because this
7 affects everybody. And the more people we got using and
8 the more influx of people, I just think that we always
9 wait till the end of the season to see something that
10 is, oh yeah, next year we're going to do something about
11 this. And I think there has to be a little more action
12 taken about certain things. That's all. Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah.
15 Maybe we can try and incorporate that idea into our
16 status reports in some way. Yeah, we'll take a note of
17 that and try and add that into the into the status
18 reports, I guess. Got that, DeAnna? Okay. Anybody else?

19
20 (No response)

21
22 Are we ready to vote? We're still
23 thinking. As I said, I think -- right, we do have to
24 have a motion to accept this list, right? And a vote,
25 correct, DeAnna? Yes. So, yeah. Cal.

26
27 MR. CASIPIT: I move that we approve this
28 list as we -- we've worked on here and as you guys have
29 kept your notes.

30
31 MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
34 That's probably the easiest way to say it, because we -
35 - yeah. Do you want me to go through the list or? I know
36 DeAnna's been taking notes. I haven't, but just maybe
37 for the record.

38
39 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the
40 record, this is DeAnna Perry. The listed items for the
41 next Annual Report from the Council would include: item
42 one, addressing how the Board meetings and other
43 meetings throughout OSM are scheduled during the same
44 time of Board of Fish Meeting, Board of Game meetings,
45 possibly North Pacific Fishery Management meetings and
46 how can we allow for full participation. And I do have
47 noted here that you guys might decide to do a letter on
48 that as well. The second item is, comment on the comment
49 timing period. We need to make sure that this is
50 something that stays in our Annual Report, especially

1 as it pertains to Tongass Forest Plan. And then it sounds
2 like we're just going to have a rolling topic on the
3 assessment and forest plan revision for each Annual
4 Report from here until that's finalized. The fourth item
5 was to ask for clarification on how the Board sees the
6 distinction between non-rural and rural. And number five
7 would be incorporating some additional emphasis
8 regarding the knowledge contained in our status reports.
9 We always do an informational PowerPoint for wildlife
10 and fish as to the status of those species in Southeast
11 and we will look to emphasize that more in future
12 reports. Those are the five items that I had. Does anyone
13 want to clarify any of those, or did I miss any?

14

15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Albert.

16

17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
18 lunch is wearing off so, I'm waking up now. How do we -
19 so, one of the conversations we've been having is the
20 process the State uses to add user groups and how do we
21 put that in this report, or concerns with maybe being a
22 part of that process where they come and ask us, how
23 does this affect what you guys are doing before they --
24 a good example is the unguided boats that are going to
25 be leaving docks. Not sure what we call, self-guided
26 boats, that the population seems to be growing on the
27 same resource that being restricted to everyone else.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, your item is
30 essentially asking how the Council can have more
31 influence over State management, does that -- I mean
32 everything you mentioned there was kind of under the
33 state management, so.

34

35 MR. HOWARD: Better have a seat at the
36 table, Mr. Chair. I mean, whether that be sending you
37 there to present our position or something, but
38 something has to be done different. Because if we allow
39 these self-guided boats population to grow, we're going
40 to have another problem. So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you,
43 Albert. We presently do have -- I don't know what --
44 participation from this Council to go to the Board of
45 Fish meetings. I don't know if that's something that we
46 have to request before the Board of Fish meetings, or I
47 think we already have authorization and funding to do
48 that for this meeting. Is that correct, DeAnna?

49

50

1 MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair, that would be
2 part of your Board of Fish discussion when you're talking
3 about the comments and the letter that you want to send,
4 you would do also a motion to appoint a member to be
5 physically at the meeting, which we've done in the past.
6 Ms. Needham has gone to a Board of Fish meeting. Mr.
7 Smith has attended a Board of Game meeting. Along with
8 that, however, you also need to request funding from OSM
9 for the travel funds. That is something that's routinely
10 done, and I understand that in this particular Board of
11 Fish working group this week, that they were
12 specifically looking at guided and unguided. In 2022,
13 we did a rather lengthy paragraph about all of the
14 efforts that this Council has done in recent years with
15 the Board of Fish on unguided, but we can certainly put
16 that back in here if we -- if the Council chooses to.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think given
19 that this is a Board of Fish year, and we do have that
20 on the agenda that we are going to comment on proposals,
21 and we will at that time -- in this meeting will request
22 the funding to make that happen, to send a Council member
23 to the meeting. Putting it in the Annual Report wouldn't
24 do any good at this point because that Board of Fish
25 meeting is going to happen before, you know, the Board
26 would have its chance to respond to an Annual Report
27 item. So, it will be covered, but it'll be covered at
28 this meeting, we'll make the request. And as DeAnna has
29 said, it's usually a -- it's usually granted so, wouldn't
30 do any good to put it in their Annual Report at this
31 year. Maybe next time, but for future Board of Fish
32 meetings. But yeah, go ahead Albert.

33
34 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, that wasn't
35 specific to that. I guess what I was getting at was
36 maybe having one of the -- one of us on the Board of
37 Fish. Where we actually sit there when the meeting is
38 happening. I -- I'm not saying me, I'm just saying --
39 see, because they start -- they come up with fisheries
40 without us having any say in it. And I'm trying not to
41 repeat myself, but they've done that to Sitka with the
42 shrimp and you guys all know that. So, what I'm getting
43 at in trying to make the point I'm trying to make is
44 that we should be there before they do it so, we don't
45 have to have a conversation about it afterwards. And we
46 have enough conversations about different fisheries and
47 resource management ideas that when you're already there
48 at the table you can give that opinion then when they're
49 creating a new fisheries. It's just a thought. And part
50 of what this group does is takes an idea and makes it

00088

1 better. So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. We can
4 generate proposals, we can comment on proposals, but we
5 don't decide on proposals. So, we don't sit on the --
6 we don't have that much influence with the Board of
7 Fish. Just another user group representing Subsistence
8 use. So, it's just kind of the way it works. Anybody
9 else? Larry.

10

11 MR. BEMIS: I've just been reminded that
12 I missed something for the wish list in that it concerns
13 Yakutat if it's too late to bring up. But I just want
14 to, for the record, that I did want to bring up about
15 the Yakutat survey for the moose is going into its sixth
16 year or something not able to get an accurate count on
17 the moose in our area. And I would like to just say that
18 I know we're limited resources for pilots to go up there
19 and do this, but I want to know if we can -- I mean,
20 that I'm wanting to put in there, that we stress that
21 we need it really bad to know what everything's doing
22 up there and that we want to stress on getting a survey
23 done whenever it can be possible.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That can be added
26 to the list. We haven't voted on it yet.

27

28 MR. BEMIS: Yes. Thank you

29

30 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti.

31

32 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33 Did you bring it up in your Chairman report that some
34 sort of monitoring has to be done about the Unit 4 deer
35 closures?

36

37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes, I did. Yeah.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, I don't know what
40 that's going to involve -- does that mean funding that
41 we have to request, or is that just something they'll
42 automatically do or how is that going to work? I mean,
43 because right, we had Hoonah Indian Association doing
44 the surveys in our communities so, is that something we
45 need to ask that the department do or what?

46

47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
48 Patti. Yes that -- it might be a good idea to put in a
49 request that that remain funded. I -- a little, little
50 sketchy. I don't know if anybody here can answer the

1 question, but I believe it is funded now. But I don't
2 know how long that funding lasts, which is a good point,
3 because, you know, it'll have to carry on for at least
4 four years now probably. So, that probably is good to
5 add that to the annual list that we support that and
6 want to see it funded. Thank you.

7

8

Okay. Anything else?

9

10

MR. CASIPIT: Question.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Questions
for -- been called for. And the motion was to approve
the list of items to go on our Annual Report, which
DeAnna read to us and then we added a couple more. So,
our -- all in favor of that list say aye.

18

19

IN UNISON: Aye.

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And anybody
opposed say nay. Okay. Got an Annual Report. One more
action item taken care of. I only see one more action
item on the list. Probably won't take too long. Let's
go to that, take a break and then when we come back --
Cathy remind me that there are two, one of them we can
deal with pretty quickly. The second one is going to
take some time. So, the two action items last left are
the future meeting dates. We can usually get through
that pretty quick. Second one is the Board of Fish
proposals. We have to review our working group's reports
on what they -- where they think the Council ought to
go on that. And then we do have to have a vote to approve
those as proposals that the Council would want to
advocate for or against at the Board of Fish meeting.
And then, very importantly, we have to request funding
and support to send a Council member to that meeting.
So, let's do that after the break. For right now, let's
go to future meeting dates. And DeAnna, I think you can
take care of that one.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
were updated calendars that were placed in all of the
Council members' folders. There have been a few Regional
Advisory Council meetings before us, and there have been
just a few changes to those. So, I wanted to make sure
you had the latest and greatest calendar. And if you'll
give me just a moment, I can try to pull that up as
well. Yeah. So, as I'm pulling this up on the screen Kim
is going to hand out those calendars to you. I had forgot
we were holding on to those because we already had so

00090

1 much already in your folders. We thought it might get
2 lost. And for those online, I'm getting ready to pull
3 up the calendar and we'll show that on Teams in just a
4 moment. Okay. So, what you have before you that Kim is
5 starting to bring around to you. The first one that we
6 will look at are the spring or winter meeting dates.
7 Currently, this Council has picked March 18th through
8 the 20th for their meeting. And of course, as is typical,
9 the travel days are on Monday and Friday. The Council's
10 also designated Sitka as the location. As you know, we
11 have three hub communities Juneau, Ketchikan and Sitka.
12 We may be able to meet in other locations, we would just
13 have to put in a special request for the Office of
14 Subsistence Management to consider, do a cost comparison
15 and do a little bit of paperwork and see if we could do
16 a non-hub community. So, I don't want you to think we
17 can't meet anywhere else. We just need to go through a
18 few extra hoops. But we can certainly try to do that.
19 So, online folks are looking at the winter meeting and
20 the Council, we would just need a motion to either accept
21 the dates and location or change them. Thank you, Mr.
22 Chair.

23

24 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
25 DeAnna. Council's wishes on this, any discussion?

26

27 (No response)

28

29 March 18th, 2025, this winter.

30

31 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Frank.

34

35 MR. WRIGHT: Make a motion for March
36 18th, Sitka.

37

38 MR. HOWARD: Second.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Motions
41 second. Any other discussion? What?

42

43 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry. Alberts making a
44 motion.

45

46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Oh, sorry,
47 Albert.

48

49 MR. HOWARD: I just seconded, Mr. Chair.

50

00091

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Oh, okay. Second
2 by Albert. Discussion.

3
4 MR. SLATER: Call for the question.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Question
7 has been called for to hold our next winter RAC meeting
8 starting Tuesday, March 18th, 19th and 20th in Sitka.
9 All in favor, say aye.

10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
14 Say nay. Okay. DeAnna. Next up.

15
16 MS. PERRY: I'm pulling up the fall
17 meeting schedule. And that should have also been passed
18 out to you, I think. All right. I know that's really
19 tiny for folks online, I apologize for that. So,
20 currently the Southeast Council has designated September
21 30th through October 2nd. Again, it's usually Tuesday,
22 Wednesday and Thursday with a travel day book-ins. I
23 would just like to bring to the Council's attention that
24 this will straddle the fiscal year and if there's a
25 continuing resolution or there is a furlough that would
26 significantly impact support at the meeting. So, I would
27 ask you to just consider whether you would like to keep
28 the meeting that week. You can see that there are other
29 weeks to choose from. You could move up to the week of
30 September 22nd or the week of October 20th or the week
31 of October 22nd. We can have two meetings per week and
32 still be able to staff everyone at those meetings. And
33 we were also going to need to choose a location. This
34 was something that we chose the dates, but not the
35 location. So, I'll leave that to you, Mr. Chair, to
36 start the discussion.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
39 DeAnna. First, maybe we should start the discussion with
40 are you recommending, DeAnna, that we don't straddle
41 that fiscal year or if the Council feels like that's the
42 best week, that that's still an option?

43
44 MS. PERRY: It's still an option. But
45 there are risks associated with that. So, I don't think
46 I can say I suggest you do that, but I would encourage
47 you to consider those reasons to maybe look at another
48 week. But it is your decision.

49
50 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Ted.

00092

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

MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Just make a motion to do that. The -- hold that meeting the week before September 23rd through the 25th, just one week earlier. Doesn't affect me...

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, that's been put forward. Discussion. Larry.

MR. BEMIS: That's a commercial fishing and riding the moose hunting. So, that would be out for me. I kind of like the end of the month when you get a chance to put everything away, like October 20th. Things have come down pretty good. And because I finished fishing on Friday the - I mean somewhere like the 26th, and then moose hunting on the eighth. So, you got to have your stuff put away. And that's just me personally.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Larry. I would say that's more common that Council members are busier in that time of September than they are later in October. So, any Council member's comments on that? So, we're talking about October, the week of October 20th, then is being maybe a preferred date. Any comments on that? Yes.

Oh, sorry. Yeah. Ted, I guess you made that as a motion, correct? Yeah.

MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah, I can withdraw that. I'm retired.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I guess so. So, sorry I went into discussion, but I guess we're still waiting for a second. And I don't know if we don't get a second.

MR. SLATER: Maybe I'll second that. James Slater.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. I think that motion's been withdrawn. So, do we want -- do we have a new motion? John.

MR. SMITH: I make a motion October 21st to October 23rd for our SEARAC meeting.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John. And now, do we have a second?

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

MR. SANDHOFER: Second

MR. SMITH: Las Vegas?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. SMITH: No. I'm just kidding.

(Simultaneous speech)

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, now we have a motion and a second for October 21st to the 23rd. We don't have a place yet. Would you like to have that discussion before we vote on it? Patti.

MS. PHILLIPS: Will that be a wildlife cycle?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes. Yes, it will. Correct. Yep. Yes. By that time, we'll have proposals before us to discuss. And, John, you have a question?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, just an idea. I think going to Glacier Bay or Gustavus would be pretty cool. Go to our homeland, (indiscernible).

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. If it -- Cal, go ahead.

MR. CASIPIT: Yeah. My friend here -- I had suggested Gustavus if it was going to be September 30th, just because I know there's probably some still some lodges open and some eating -- restaurant opportunities open. But you know, then still, our season has been going a little bit longer every year. But getting down to October 21st, I'm not so sure I can guarantee that there would be a place for everybody to stay and a lot of the lodges are winterized by then, and it's easier, you know, on the original dates. I'd be happy to host then, but it's a little bit tougher later in October. But --

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I can understand that. And I like the idea, but I can see the problems there. Cathy.

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's
2 kind of funny that I'm weighing in on this, but don't
3 limit -- you guys haven't been to Petersburg and Wrangell
4 for a while, and I know they're not considered hub, but
5 they do have jet service and it's pretty easy to get in
6 and out of there. And they do have -- well, sometimes
7 they have accommodations. But anyway, you should
8 potentially think about this if you haven't -- I don't
9 think the council's been there for some time.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yep. You're
12 correct. We haven't been there for a number of years.
13 Any other Council comments? Do we want to make it a
14 request for one of those communities or...?

15
16 And so, these are pretty preliminary. I
17 mean, we have options to, you know, change places or
18 dates at a later time, but -- Albert.

19
20 MR. HOWARD: I was going to ask what
21 John's definition of cool was, Mr. Chairman. Gustavus
22 is his definition of cool. Mr. Chairman, I it seems like
23 we've been alternating north and south. I could be wrong,
24 but it seems like we would have a meeting up north and
25 then we'd have one down south. Just so, I guess Wrangell
26 makes sense to me since Cal doesn't want to cook us
27 dinner one night. So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

28
29 MR. BEMIS: I agree with that, Wrangell.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, there we have
32 a suggestion for Wrangell. Any other further
33 discussions? We haven't voted on this yet so, we will
34 vote on the week and the place at -- all at once in one
35 vote is -- I lost track. Yeah, that -- I guess that was
36 my intention to do them both together. But we have a
37 motion on the dates. John made the motion. John, go
38 ahead.

39
40 MR. SMITH: I'll reamend it here. I'll
41 make a motion that we will -- October 21st through the
42 October 23rd that we would reside in Wrangell. Is -- put
43 the motion on the table.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you very
46 much, John.

47
48 MR. CASIPIT: Second that.

00095

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And Cal seconds.
2 Okay. Because he doesn't want us in Gustavus, obviously.
3 So, any other discussion? Questions been called for. So,
4 all in favor of holding our fall 2025 meeting in Wrangell
5 on the week of 21st -- week of October 21st, 22nd, 23rd.
6 All in favor, say aye.

7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9
10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
11 Say nay. Okay, got that done. Definitely, time for a
12 break. Yeah. Come back at 3 -- 3:40 would be good. 3:40.

13
14 (Off record)

15
16 (On record)

17
18 MS. PERRY: (Distortion) information on
19 our program website. That's www.doi.gov/Subsistence and
20 then southeast regions tab and then under meeting
21 materials. We're just waiting for a few folks to get
22 back in their seats and we'll be starting up shortly.
23 Thank you.

24
25 (Pause)

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you
28 everybody for coming back to the table. And, DeAnna said
29 we're going to get our reports back from our working
30 groups dealing with Board of Fish proposals, of which
31 we had two working groups, I believe, and this will have
32 to be an action item for the Council. We will -- any
33 recommendations they make to the Council or information
34 they bring to the Council, we'll have to discuss and
35 then take action on. And we'll also be looking for
36 permission and funding to send a Council member to the
37 meeting. So, I'm not totally aware of who's going to
38 lead the discussion on the work group. So, it looks like
39 Patti? Patti, are you one of the work group people?

40
41 MS. PHILLIPS: Can Ashley read the study?

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Or staff if you
44 have help from staff, that'd be fine.

45
46 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

47
48 MS. BOLWERK: For the record, this is
49 Ashley Bolwerk. Yeah, I'm happy to help you guys. Do you
50 just want me to walk through it Don, is that your

00096

1 thought?

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think so. I
4 just need to inform the rest of the Council of what your
5 discussions were. Any recommendations you have for the
6 work groups came up for the Council to take action on.
7 Yeah.

8

9 MS. BOLWERK: Okay. So, just to be clear,
10 what you have in front of you is combined from the two
11 working groups on the Board of Fish proposal. So, those
12 of you who worked with Jake his comments that you all
13 shared are in here, too. So, they're in order by proposal
14 number, and maybe we'll just go down the list here. So,
15 the first one, proposal 104, is what we've been talking
16 about as the King Salmon Subsistence Fishery. So, this
17 is the one that Jake's group primarily worked on. So,
18 he provided a variety of justification there but I
19 believe this is the only king salmon proposal. Oh,
20 there's one other one, but this is the primary one that
21 the Council wanted to comment on. This is your proposal,
22 again.....

23

24 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, 104 is our
25 proposal.

26

27 MS. BOLWERK: Yes.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, we will
30 obviously be advocating for that one. Yeah.

31

32 MS. BOLWERK: Yeah. Okay. Do we feel good
33 moving on then if that.....

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

36

37 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. Could you read
38 it?

39

40 MS. BOLWERK: Oh, sure, yeah. All right.
41 So, currently, it says the Southeast Alaska Regional
42 Advisory Council to the Federal Subsistence Management
43 Program submitted and supports this proposal. The
44 Council recognizes the difficulty in adding an
45 apparently new category of king salmon allocation in the
46 midst of a contentious debate over an already fully
47 allocated resource. However, king salmon have been used
48 for subsistence purposes for millennia. The subsistence
49 use of king salmon throughout Southeast Alaskan
50 communities is well documented in household survey data

1 collected by ADF&G. From the earliest surveys conducted
2 in the 1980s to the most recent ones conducted, king
3 salmon have consistently been reported being used in the
4 majority of households. For example, 73% of Hoonah
5 households reported using king salmon in 1996, 70% in
6 2012, and 82% in 2016. However, over that same period
7 of time, the sources of king salmon have shifted. In
8 1996, 21% of Hoonah households used king salmon retained
9 from commercial fisheries, but in 2016 that number was
10 only 1.5%, with the other 80% coming from rod and reel
11 harvest. This shift reflects the loss of limited entry
12 permits and their associated harvesting opportunities
13 from many Southeast Alaska communities. Along with that
14 shift has come an increasing dependence on rod and reel
15 harvest of king salmon under sport fishing regulations,
16 despite the harvest occurring under sport fishing
17 regulations, that rod and reel harvest essentially
18 functions as a subsistence practice. That dependence on
19 rod and reel harvest for traditional household use of
20 king salmon is now being threatened by allocation
21 battles stemming from a growing non-resident charter
22 industry. The Council recognizes the difficulty in
23 allocating a scarce resource amongst competing users.
24 However, residents of Southeast Alaska communities that
25 have depended on king salmon for generations should not
26 be caught in the middle of an allocation battle between
27 the commercial troll and guided angler industries. We
28 encourage the Board to consider our suggestions to
29 modify the king salmon management plan to provide for a
30 subsistence king salmon fishery. We understand that the
31 Board has to balance many competing interests on this
32 issue. As the Board develops the plan, the Council stands
33 prepared to work with the Board and others to incorporate
34 the long existing subsistence king salmon fishery into
35 the new management framework.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Is
38 there any other discussion from the Council on our
39 proposal and any other topics come up in the work group?
40 Larry.

41
42 MR. BEMIS: Through the Chair. Would
43 these 5,000 fish be coming from the whole state of the
44 Subsistence user or what area would be talking about
45 this fish being allocated to?

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, the
48 allocation -- I think the wording is that it would come
49 off the top of the total allocation that the Pacific
50 Salmon Commission recommends for Southeast Alaska. The

1 Commission will set a quota essentially for king salmon
2 to be caught by all user groups. So, we will be
3 requesting that 5,000 fish or the percentage off the top
4 of that list and every user group, you know, will ask
5 for their allocation. And that's what a lot of these
6 proposals, you know, deal with different user groups
7 requesting an allocation. So, yes. So, that will be our
8 request. Okay. Thank you. Cal.

9
10 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
11 think I was on the king salmon management plan stuff.
12 That was the group I was in, and I noticed we had -- and
13 the write up for 104 is great. I don't have any problems
14 with that. It looks really good. I noticed that Jake
15 used some of the words I wrote down. And then one eight
16 -- I'm getting ahead here, but then 118 we've got a
17 comment prepared for that. But the one thing that somehow
18 we missed as far as the king -- since we're kind of in
19 the king salmon management plan area. One of the things
20 we just discussed; there was a proposal that the guided
21 charter boat industry would -- there has to be in-season
22 management on that sector because the CPUE effort thing
23 that they've been using the last couple of years is
24 obviously not working. I don't I guess I don't know how
25 to say that, but.....

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there a
28 specific proposal to deal with that or is that just a -
29 - I'm unclear.

30
31 MR. CASIPIT: Go ahead, Ashley.

32
33 MS. BOLWERK: I don't have the full
34 proposals in front of me if anybody has the book, but
35 perhaps proposal 110. The title given here is that that
36 one is about management of the sport fishery in-season
37 to achieve the annual king salmon allocation to the sport
38 fishery as follows. Is that the one? Okay. Thanks, Patti.

39
40 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I --
41 the way -- I think there's some other one -- other
42 proposals that may allude to something similar, you
43 know, there's all 30 of them in here. I think on that
44 one is that maybe we just modify -- I'm not sure how to
45 do this, but just somehow say in there that we're -- we
46 agree that, you know, management of the guided sport
47 fishery needs in-season management to keep them within
48 their allocation or words like that, and it doesn't have
49 to be anything major for that one, quick sentence would
50 probably cover our concerns.

1

2 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. So, I mean
3 our process here is to comment on proposals essentially
4 whether or not we -- this Council would want to endorse
5 such and such a proposal. So, I think you're saying that
6 there is a proposal in the book that comes close to what
7 we would like to see. So, maybe we would like to endorse
8 that proposal, but maybe add some language to it as a
9 suggestion. Is that what you're saying?

10

11

12 MR. CASIPIT: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Not that
13 I'm -- you look at 110 and it's goes on for -- goes on
14 forever. But it's not like I want to adopt 110. It's
15 just that 110 talks about in-season management for
16 charter boat fishing and that's something we felt needs
17 to be done and how they accomplish it through whichever
18 proposal, I guess, is -- I'm not that concerned about
19 it. I'm concerned about in-season -- the ability to do
20 in-season management.

21

22

23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think I see
24 what you're saying it's.....

25

26

27 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah

28

29

30 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: It's a lengthy
31 proposal covering many aspects of the king salmon
32 management plan, one of which is in-season management.
33 And you would like to pick that out as a topic of
34 particular concern to the Council. Would that be a good
35 way to put it?

36

37

38 MR. CASIPIT: Right, that would be a good
39 way to put it.

40

41

42 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That could.....

43

44

45 (Pause)

46

47

48 Are -- so, are we -- for DeAnna's sake,
49 I guess we need to clarify that we are speaking about a
50 king salmon management plan proposal that we want to
emphasize that the Council is particularly interested
in the in-season management portion of that proposal.
Would that be a good way to put it? Proposal 110,
apparently.

47

48

49

50 MR. CASIPIT: Right. And for the purposes
of keeping the guided sportfish within their guideline
harvest level or whatever they're calling it.

000100

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll take note of that. Sounds like a good one. I don't know if we want to discuss these individually or just kind of get a list of what you guys talked about and then go back and have discussion. Would that be the best way to go about it? It can be hard, I know. Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: I didn't hear the last bit of what you said or didn't understand it.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I was asking do we want to go through your whole list of recommendations and then discuss the whole list, or do we want to discuss each item as it comes up? I guess is my question.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I guess my next question would be was -- is this a list right here that I have in front of me? Advisory Council Meeting Calendar. Oh. Excuse me. Action item list?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Correct. Yeah. Action Item list. That's what Ashley's going through for us. So, DeAnna has been taking notes, I believe. Do you want to just go on to the next discussion of a proposal? I think it's proposal 118 that you talked about. The group talked about.

MS. BOLWERK: Sure. I can do that for you. Proposal 118, the title reads, the non-resident annual limit for king salmon shall not exceed three, and non-resident annual limits will not apply in terminal harvest areas. The folks who are on this working group decided to support this proposal sort of with the rationale that this would encourage charter guides to take their customers to hatchery terminal harvest areas and to target those fish.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Any discussion from the rest of the Council on that recommendation from the working group? Frank.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, this says not to exceed three and non-residents annual limit. It's hard to give a non-resident three fish. I mean when we're in Hoonah -- end up running from Hoonah to Gull Cove, which is 25 miles in icy straits when they do open it for us. So, it's kind of -- and that's a longways if you're running an Icy Straits and all of a sudden -- I remember two years ago as I was fishing and crab fishing

000101

1 in Pleasant island, and we had big boats flying out of
2 the water trying to -- so, what -- where did you get the
3 three?

4
5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I don't know.
6 These are proposals that, you know, came to the Board
7 of Fish. We really don't have. you know, it wasn't our
8 proposal, so we're just discussing whether or not we
9 should.....

10
11 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.
12

13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ:we should
14 approve it or not. Have somebody in the audience that
15 might want to weigh in on this. I don't know. Somebody
16 from KIC, I believe. Tribal organization.
17

18 MR. SANDERSON: Good afternoon. My name
19 is Keenan Sanderson. For the purposes of this
20 conversation, I'm -- well, I don't want to say
21 representing, but I'm a staff member for the Ketchikan
22 Indian Community, and this is actually the proposal that
23 the tribe submitted for the Alaska Board of Fisheries.
24 And I don't want to take too much time because I have a
25 lot to say about the king salmon management plan that I
26 would love for you guys to hear, but I know you guys are
27 on limited time, but for the purposes of this proposal
28 is and it's going to have to be coupled in with a ton
29 of other aspects of other proposals to make this work.
30 But -- this basically would only give the Alaska
31 Department of Fish and Game the authority to set the
32 maximum limit of king salmon to three per year for non-
33 residents. However, this -- and I don't know if we
34 necessarily explain this super well within the
35 description of our proposal. But we would hope that in-
36 season management would be included to determine what
37 the annual limit would be on a year-to-year basis. This
38 just sets the cap so that, you know, even if there is a
39 relatively high year for king salmon, where in years
40 past there has been annual limits for non-residents to
41 be over three king salmon this would cap it at three,
42 even if they were in the higher tiers of allocation to
43 the state of Alaska. Certainly, if there's less fish to
44 go around, we would expect that the Department of Fish
45 and Game to set the annual limit to either two or even
46 one or close it altogether. We definitely don't want
47 three king salmon to be given to non-residents per year
48 and years of low abundance and would certainly want to
49 prioritize our local Southeast people.
50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
2 Keenan. That was helpful from the proponent of the
3 proposal. Any other discussion from the Council on what
4 the purpose of this proposal is? Okay so, the working
5 group's recommendation was to endorse this proposal. Is
6 that correct? Okay. No further discussion? Okay. Give
7 us the next one on the list, Ashley.

8
9 MS. BOLWERK: All right. The next one is
10 proposal 135. The title reads only allow for the use of
11 seine gear in the redoubt Bay subsistence fishery when
12 the escapement is projected to be greater than 40,000
13 sockeye salmon. So, again, this is a proposal that the
14 RAC submitted. But I'm -- we sort of use the
15 justification from conversations you all have had
16 before, if you'd like further summary. I'm happy to do
17 that.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think we're all
20 familiar with that one. That will certainly be endorsed
21 by the Council. And the next one as well, 136 was our
22 proposal. So, increasing possession limits in Basket
23 Bay. Previously was 15 and 30 and possession and annual
24 limit. We wanted to increase that from 20 and 40. So, I
25 think that's a given that the Council -- we already put
26 that proposal forward. So, we want to endorse that. Like
27 I say, I think it's worth noting that I mean, at this
28 point we can't modify them. I mean, they're in the book
29 and we're on record as being our proposal so, there is
30 no opportunity to change it now. That's what we go with.
31 And also, you know, of note that whatever the Council
32 decides here on approving or if there's a proposal that
33 we want rejected once the designated Council member goes
34 to the meetings, they're not authorized to, you know,
35 negotiate on these and get into any bargaining amongst
36 the user groups on modifying and changing proposals. If
37 the Council makes a statement on it here today, that's
38 what our representative has to bring to the Board and
39 just advocate for that and nothing else. So, that applies
40 to our other proposal 137. Is also -- I thought one of
41 these proposals came from an individual and one of them
42 came from us. They both deal with Basket Bay.

43
44 MS. BOLWERK: Correct, yeah. For the
45 record, this is Ashley Bolwerk. Proposal 137 was
46 submitted by the Hoonah Indian Association. But you're
47 correct, it also deals with Basket Bay. That one is
48 different in that it requests essentially to go from,
49 you know, the limits where 15 and 30 and it wants to go
50 straight to 30, where you could get all 30 fish in one

000103

1 trip instead of splitting it up essentially between two
2 or more trips.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. So, the
5 working group would also like to endorse that, is that
6 -- like as an alternative if the board would reject our
7 proposal. Is that -- or vice versa, is that kind of the
8 idea there?

9
10 MS. BOLWERK: Yes. The members of the
11 working group liked both proposals and thought that by
12 supporting them that they would be in support of either
13 one that went through.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, that makes
16 sense. Any other discussion on those proposals? Basket
17 Bay. Okay. How about proposal 143? You want to give the
18 recommendation on that one?

19
20 MS. BOLWERK: Sure. The proposal 143,
21 title reads increase the bag and possession limit for
22 trout in Southeast Alaska. The working group chose to
23 support this proposal and just wanted to -- most of our
24 notes there are just that federally qualified
25 subsistence users can already fish more liberally than
26 this request under Federal permit.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any
29 discussion on that one? Sounds fairly straightforward.
30 Jim.

31
32 MR. SLATER: I think during the working
33 group meeting, the intent of that or would with the
34 intent of the original proposer, was that the decreasing
35 the amount of trout will decrease the amount of predation
36 on salmon fry. I think, is that the root of this one? I
37 just wanted to declare that in case anyone was interested
38 in what the motivation was behind it.

39
40 MS. BOLWERK: For the record, this is
41 Ashley Bulwark. Yes, that was the justification given
42 in the book. There are a number of proposals, one after
43 another. We're going to go through here that all were
44 submitted I believe all by the Klawock AC, but certainly
45 from Prince Wales requesting more trout fishing for that
46 reason.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
49 questions or comments on that proposal recommendation?
50 Okay. Thank you. Proposal 144, sounds similar.

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

MS. BOLWERK: Yes, that's correct. Proposals 144, 145, 146 and 147, oh and 148, sorry. All are similar trout adjustments, but for various different systems. And we provided the same comments as this 143 about already being able to fish more liberally under federally qualified or Federal permit.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions or comments on those proposals? Don't see any. How about proposal 178?

MS. BOLWERK: All right. The title of proposal 178 is to expand waters close to commercial sac roe herring fishery to include the majority of waters herring have historically spawned in and the fishery has historically occurred. And the working group did discuss that they thought they would be in opposition to this one but wanted to open up this for greater conversation with others on the Council. And sort of the justification they had provided was the Council's in support of conserving existing areas that are closed to commercial harvest within Sitka Sound but does not support the increase in that area.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, so we'll need some discussion on this one. Who was the proponent of that proposal?

MS. BOLWERK: I believe this was when -- mostly it was Patti and Larry, and I am having conversations.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: No, I mean who put in the proposal?

MS. BOLWERK: Let me look. Sorry about that. Oh, yes. Thank you. The herring protectors put this one in.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: There is a similar proposal somewhere in the book that says the same thing, only it refers to herring pounding in the Craig area. The proposal would expand it to all historical spotting areas. I don't know. I mean, it's not on our list, but I thought I'd mention it.

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: This is a
2 consensus of opinion by the Council to support this
3 proposal. Any more discussion? I guess my comment is
4 it's a little bit vague in one aspect. It says water is
5 closed to commercial sac roe herring fishing would
6 include the majority of waters herring have historically
7 spawned in and that the majority of waters, that's a
8 little bit I don't know, not too specific. So, I don't
9 know if there was any discussion on that. Cal.

10
11 MR. CASIPIT: Oh, I just noticed that
12 under that proposal, they have metes and bounds
13 boundaries. They're going from point to point based on
14 latitude and longitude. So, there is -- they do describe
15 the area. It's just somebody's going to have to spend
16 some time with a GIS system.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah.
19 Thank you, Cal, that's in the proposal in the book.
20 Okay, that helps. Any comments on whether the Council
21 thinks that's a reasonable expansion there of closed
22 areas?

23
24 MR. SLATER: I guess -- oh, sorry.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Jim, go ahead.

27
28 MR. SLATER: I'd be interested in hearing
29 the rationale of why we oppose it. I guess it was -- I
30 missed that part of the meeting. And it says here that
31 because of the damage to the commercial fishery.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti, go ahead.

34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah, so, because there
36 are -- there's the two federally -- the Makhnati area,
37 the two closed areas, and then there's the two closed
38 areas already in place under the State system. So, we
39 wanted to protect those closed areas and didn't want to
40 have to muddy it with -- and that -- and the other
41 justification is that it should be through more of a
42 stakeholder process if there are more areas added.

43
44 MR. SLATER: I understand. Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
47 Patti. And because I do need to note that the
48 recommendation was to oppose this proposal. So, that --
49 your explanation speaks to that. So, thank you. Any other
50 discussion? Okay, thank you. Proposal 190.

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

MS. BOLWERK: Proposal 190. Title reads provide for co-management of herring fisheries with tribal governments. The working group chose to support this proposal with the request that co-management be developed through a stakeholder meeting process and not just with one entity.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any discussion by the rest of the Council on that proposal? Questions? Okay, sounds like we stand with the work group's recommendation. Proposal 203.

MS. BOLWERK: Proposal 203 title reads establish unguided non-resident lingcod regulations. The working group thought the RAC would like to oppose this proposal. And so, they basically said, I mentioned your comments about concerns about unguided, non-resident lingcod and that you would like for the regulations to match guided anglers, and therefore a liberalization of unguided non-resident lingcod regulations would not be something that I would support.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Other Council members have any questions or comments on this proposal which the working group recommends to oppose? Jim.

MR. SLATER: I just want to say I think that rationale is very sound. We want to really push for an alignment between regular guided charters and unguided charters.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Very good. Thank you, Jim. How about proposal 206?

MS. BOLWERK: The title for proposal 206 is to reopen Yelloweye sport fishery for residents. The working group thought the RAC would like to support that proposal due to its beliefs that the proposal will provide additional opportunities for Alaska residents and have no impact to the resource.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any questions or comments from the rest of the Council? Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: In some assistance areas you can go catch yelloweye with a hand line. I wouldn't support this one, you know, it just would. You know, it still is a diminished resource, but it is open to

1 subsistence.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. So, you're
4 recommending that we do not support this because
5 subsistence users are already allowed to fish for
6 yelloweye. Is that kind of your rationale?

7

8 MR. DOUVILLE: That is my rationale. Yes.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Further
11 discussion, this is kind of contrary to what the working
12 group recommended. So, Patti.

13

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, when we made
15 this recommendation, we didn't know there were already
16 subsistence zones for yelloweye.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. So, you
19 agree with Mike now that maybe we should oppose it.

20

21 MS. PHILLIPS: But it was brought to our
22 attention that Mr. Tad Fujioka does do his homework. So,
23 he has a very thorough justification.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Jim, I'm a little
26 confused here. Go ahead.

27

28 MR. SLATER: I think the discussion that
29 night centered around the fact that the -- whether or
30 not the yelloweye was diminished or not, where the
31 proposer has some documentation that claims the
32 yelloweyes aren't as diminished as the State thinks.
33 That was, I think, the route behind it.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I see. Okay. So,
36 any further discussion? So, you're you want to stand --
37 the working group wants to stand in support. Stay in
38 support of this. Is that correct?

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

41

42 MR. SLATER: I'm not necessarily saying
43 that I don't -- I haven't reviewed the -- I don't know
44 if I understand the evidence on that. So, it would be
45 worth a discussion to see what the group thinks.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. You
48 weren't on that group. Sorry.

49

50

000108

1 MR. SLATER: I sat in on it, but we just
2 said -- the guy said it did his homework, but we didn't
3 get a chance to ever review it.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I see. Patti,
6 something to add?

7
8 MS. PHILLIPS: So, on proposal 206, What
9 is the issue you want the Board to address and why?
10 Starting in 2020, the department closed all directed
11 harvests of yelloweye rockfish in Southeast, citing a
12 sharp decline that had occurred 20 years prior. This
13 closure occurred despite the population having been
14 stable for several years prior to the closure. Since
15 2015, yelloweye abundance has been increasing, yet all
16 the directed harvests remains closed. The increasing
17 biomass, combined with the recent closures, have
18 combined to leave the majority of the already highly
19 conservative TAC unharvested in several of the past
20 years. It is time to reopen the resident sport yelloweye
21 fishery, which prior to the closure was a long-
22 established fishery with a small and consistent harvest
23 for locals to enjoy and occasional fresh yelloweye. The
24 resident sport fishery has historically accounted for
25 only about 2% of the TAC, with over 25 to 50% of the TAC
26 consistently going unharvested. It is fully appropriate
27 for resident sport fishermen to again be given access
28 to this underutilized resource. Contrary to
29 sensationalized accounts, the December 2020 NOAA
30 assessment of the DSR stock complex in Southeast outside
31 subdistrict of the GOA shows that Southeast yelloweye
32 population was healthy prior to the 2020 closure and
33 continued to be healthy. Specifically, all three NOAA
34 models show a consistent upward trend in yelloweye
35 biomass since at least 2013. Average length of both male
36 and female yelloweye has been increasing in all
37 Southeast subdistricts; East Yakutat, Northern,
38 Southeast Outside, Central Southeast Outside and
39 Southern Southeast Outside since at least 2010. The
40 yelloweye catch has been consistently managed to a level
41 well below the overfishing limits for over two decades,
42 with a typical year's catch being only about 50% of this
43 threshold. The yelloweye CPUE in the 2021 IPHC longline
44 survey was up in all Southeast subdistricts; East
45 Yakutat, North and Southeast Outside, Central Southeast
46 Outside, and Southern Southeast Outside compared to
47 2016. The Sitka AC supported proposal 230 in 2022, which
48 was very similar.

49
50 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,

000109

1 Patti. Yeah, that was helpful. I can see the rationale
2 now. And I think I would agree that you know, yelloweye
3 are a popular subsistence fish that are quite often,
4 well, mostly essentially caught with rod and reel sport
5 fishing so, I could see the benefit to subsistence users
6 if it potential to not do any damage to the stocks. I
7 can see the rationale there. So, I would be in favor of
8 your recommendation. Anybody else? Okay. I think we can
9 support that one. How about 207?

10

11 MS. BOLWERK: The title for proposal 207
12 is to allow retention of demersal shelf rockfish by non-
13 residents. The working group thought the RAC would like
14 to oppose this proposal. Essentially, I cited the same
15 concerns about unguided anglers that you all have been
16 talking about.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
19 Any other Council discussion on recommendations from the
20 working group on this proposal? Okay. I think we can
21 move on to 208.

22

23 MS. BOLWERK: 208 is a very similar
24 proposal. Again, the title reads allow retention of
25 demersal shelf rockfish by non-residents, and the
26 working group thought the RAC would like to oppose this
27 for the same reasons.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any
30 further discussion? Council agrees with that
31 recommendation? Okay. Next one.

32

33 MS. BOLWERK: Proposal 209 is to
34 establish provisions for resident priority within
35 emergency order authority for pelagic rockfish. The
36 working group thought the RAC would like to support this
37 proposal. They explain this would provide meaningful
38 preference for Alaska residents over non-resident
39 anglers. And it provides for in-season management
40 opportunity but only with the non-resident harvesters.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
43 comments from the Council on the work group's
44 recommendation to support this proposal? Thank you,
45 Patti. As you know, this is from the Sitka Advisory
46 Committee. Okay. I think we can move on.

47

48 MS. BOLWERK: Proposal 210 was to reduce
49 the bag and possession limit for pelagic rockfish in
50 southeast Alaska. The working group thought that the RAC

000110

1 would like to oppose this proposal and mentions that if
2 the department is concerned over the conservation of
3 these species, then the Southeast Council does not want
4 to see increased harvests through inclusion of non-
5 residents in this fishery, and then again mentioning the
6 unguided angler concerns.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any other
9 discussion from the Council on this one? Jim.

10

11 MR. SLATER: I guess in reading it, I'm
12 not sure I understand it. It's for a reduction in bag
13 and possession limit, and we're worried about concerns
14 over undocumented harvest by unguided anglers. And we
15 don't want to see an increased harvest through the
16 inclusion of non-residents in this fishery. I don't see
17 how this included non-residents. So, this was a bit
18 unclear to me.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any
21 clarification on that from the working group on this?
22 The wording of the proposal doesn't seem like it address
23 non-resident fishermen. That's why I don't see the
24 justification. Anybody?

25

26 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, I think we were
27 getting tired by that time.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Due to the
30 confusion. I mean, we have to direct you know, one of
31 our Council members to speak to these. I don't know if
32 there's confusion, maybe it should be taken off the list.

33

34 MR. SLATER: Either that, or if we have
35 a -- we could just clarify it by looking at if someone
36 has the book, we could look at it and see what the --
37 maybe there's just something missing in the description
38 here.

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. Ashley, could
41 you read the.....

42

43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS:what's the issue?

46

47

48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, if you
49 have it there.

50

000111

1 MS. BOLWERK: This is Ashley Bolwerk. So,
2 on this one, what is the issue you would like the Board
3 to address and why? The sport harvest of pelagic rockfish
4 has been on an increasing trend in Southeast Alaska
5 region and is assumed to be associated with shifting
6 patterns of effort by charter or guided anglers, as
7 restrictions on Pacific halibut and king salmon have
8 been in effect. The department is currently working to
9 develop a stock assessment for black rockfish in
10 Southeast Alaska through the Statewide Rockfish
11 Initiative. The anticipated continued increase in
12 harvest and the potential for overexploitation of
13 pelagic rockfishes warrants a precautionary management
14 approach. The harvest of pelagic rockfish has increased
15 in Southeast Alaska despite recent actions to reduce
16 harvest opportunity in the Sitka area, where the
17 majority of pelagic rockfish have historically been
18 harvested. Rockfish harvest in the vicinity of Prince
19 of Wales Island, and Ketchikan areas have continued to
20 increase and are now nearing the levels of pelagic
21 rockfish harvest observed in Sitka area before
22 management action was taken, and this was proposed by
23 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any
26 further discussion on that?

27
28 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, we should
29 probably support this proposal.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: It kind of
32 sounded like to me, Jim.

33
34 MR. SLATER: I concur. I think we should
35 support it.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Mike.

38
39 MR. DOUVILLE: I don't know how much you
40 guys understand about the life cycle of shrimp, but a
41 lot of us like to eat the eggs, too. What?

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, we're
44 still on rockfish. One above that. Yeah.

45
46 MR. WRIGHT: Well I asked you and you
47 just told me the wrong one.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We have somebody
50 in the audience from the Sitka Advisory Committee. Is

1 that who put in this proposal a Sitka Advisory Committee?
2 No, but you have some discussion on it. It'd be helpful.
3 Mr. Ramp.

4
5 MR. RAMP: Thank you, Chair. I'm Steve
6 Ramp of the Sitka AC. This proposal reduces the bag
7 limits on pelagic rockfish for both residents and non-
8 residents. You might not have been aware of that in the
9 reading of the why was it submitted. I know that in the
10 past, the department has reduced bag limits for both
11 non-residents and non-residents by EO the last several
12 years. Reducing the bag limits less for residents than
13 non-residents. So, they only get two a day and residents
14 get four. Originally the regulation calls for five. So,
15 that's -- I think you were correct in opposing this
16 because it does reduce the bag limits for residents.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Good
19 explanation. Okay. Any other any other discussion from
20 Council members on that. Okay. We'll stick with that
21 recommendation then. You know, I might like to jump ahead
22 here a little bit because Mr. Ramp, who just came up and
23 clarified that proposal. He's also on the Sitka Advisory
24 Committee who put in this rather detailed proposal
25 dealing with unguided charters, which is of particular
26 interest to us. And he does have to fly back to Sitka
27 tonight, catch a plane. So, before he leaves, we might
28 want to discuss this on the last page of the document
29 here, it says a letter of support for potentially
30 unguided charter proposals to the Board of Fish. Let's
31 move to that one. It might require a little bit of
32 action. Actually, it will require some specific action
33 from the Council on this one. And well, he's here to
34 help us work through. That might be pretty important.
35 So, does everybody understand here that we're on the
36 last page now? Ashley, you want to introduce that to us?

37
38 MS. BOLWERK: Sure. So, what you're
39 looking at could be one potential action you all could
40 take. That was the goal of the working group, was to
41 write a letter of support that they could send in to the
42 Board of Fish with the understanding that this would be
43 -- if this becomes a proposal in the book after the work
44 session. So, it's not currently a proposal so, you can't
45 write a comment about it at this point. So, we decided
46 to write a letter of support on the topic instead. So,
47 with that, do you want me to read it? Okay. The Southeast
48 Alaska Regional Advisory Council to the Federal
49 Subsistence Management Program supports the Sitka
50 Advisory Committee's proposal to address unguided or

1 bareboat charter fishing concerns. The Southeast Council
2 supports the following changes; one, requiring the
3 department to accept vessels whose Alaska State DMV
4 registration lists rental as their primary use as
5 satisfactory evidence of that particular use for
6 documented vessels, except the presence of a bareboat
7 charter agreement as such evidence. Two, require the
8 Department to amend both their dockside creel census and
9 off season mail out survey processes to provide a rental
10 vessel or bareboat charter category so, that the harvest
11 data for this group can be broken out and shared with
12 the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Make a
13 formal request to the North Pacific Fisheries Management
14 Council, asking them to start treating unguided angler
15 fishing from a rental vessel as a separate user group
16 when making management decisions for the sport halibut
17 harvest. Start requiring log keeping for Halibut
18 harvests from unguided rental vessels, similar to the
19 logs required of charter vessels. Require anglers sport
20 fishing for halibut from unguided rental vessels to
21 follow the same daily bag possession limit and size
22 limits and day closures as those prescribed for guided
23 anglers. The Southeast Council has spent many years
24 hearing concerns from subsistence users regarding the
25 undocumented harvest by unguided anglers in the sport
26 fisheries throughout Southeast Alaska and Yakutat. Many
27 of the rural communities represented by the Southeast
28 Council have seen unguided charter fishing lodges open
29 or grow in or near their remote communities, which do
30 not have regular creel sampling and enforcement
31 coverage. Unguided anglers deplete local resources and
32 are often in direct competition with subsistence users,
33 decreasing food security and resource sustainability.
34 The Southeast Council has worked to submit several
35 proposals to address these concerns with no success.
36 They believe that this proposal addresses many of the
37 lingering concerns expressed by both the Department and
38 the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, upon
39 their opposition of previous Southeast Council
40 proposals. And I'll just note that the one through three
41 and A, B, C are all directly from the AC -- the Sitka
42 AC proposal.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
45 Ashley. So, as was noted, this is not currently a
46 proposal to the Board of Fish because they didn't accept
47 it. However, you know, they have a work session meeting
48 coming up here shortly. I can't remember what the time
49 frame is. Can you remind us again, Mr. Ramp?
50

1 MR. RAMP: Sure. Steve Ramp, again. That
2 work session is October 29th and 30th, in which we've
3 submitted a request to that work session to reconsider
4 the Board's support it's action decision to not accept
5 the proposal due to authority issues between the
6 Commissioner and the Board of Fisheries.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right. So, the
9 recommendation is for this Council to write a letter to
10 the Board in support of this proposal and urge them to
11 accept it as a proposal. And we essentially have about
12 a week to make that happen. Hopefully that's possible.
13 I don't know if we have any constraints on our ability
14 to put out a letter within a week, but that's pretty
15 important. I don't know if staff can inform us on that.

16
17 MR. RAMP: We can save you the work on
18 that letter because comment period is closed for that
19 meeting. But what you can do is attend or Zoom in to
20 express your verbal support as a RAC to reconsider the
21 decision to not include the proposal. It should be on
22 their agenda because we already met the deadline with
23 the request.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
26 So, we have to actually authorize somebody to virtually
27 attend that meeting. Okay. That's probably easier than
28 a letter, actually, so.

29
30 MR. RAMP: The other letter could be to
31 the Board of Fisheries or whoever represents your body
32 to the Board in January can speak to that proposal when
33 it comes up. If it becomes a proposal.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right. We also
36 have to preemptively approve that. Yes, good point.
37 Okay.

38
39 MS. BOLWERK: If I could really quick,
40 Mr. Chair. On the first page, I know these requests and
41 opportunities all got really confusing in our working
42 group. So, I just wrote out what those potential avenues
43 are and for you all to consider. And so, the things Mr.
44 Ramp mentioned in the meeting the other day, and for
45 opportunities for you all to weigh in, in what version,
46 whether that's you know, virtually providing oral
47 comments or written opportunities. Those are outlined
48 on that first page for you all.

000115

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Very good. I see
2 that now right on top of it. Thanks.

3
4 MR. RAMP: And as the author of this
5 proposal for the Sitka AC, I very much appreciate and
6 support you guys. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
9 Okay. Maybe a little bit of discussion on this one.
10 Obviously, we know we're in support of this, but we do
11 have to have a little procedure here to make our support
12 known. Getting authorization to have a Council member
13 represent the Council at the Board of Fish work session.
14 Is that something we can do on short notice or at this
15 meeting, I guess? You need a staff -- answer to that
16 question?

17
18 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, we could draft it
19 up, but I would look to the folks at OSM on how we could
20 maybe expedite the review through the review
21 correspondence review process.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: No, this is not
24 correspondence. This is Council representation at a
25 Board of Fish work session. It's not a letter.

26
27 MS. PERRY: So, there wouldn't be a
28 drafted document for them to read into the record.
29 They're just calling in.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Well, there
32 would -- yeah, that might be wise to have a prepared
33 statement. That's true. But I wouldn't call it a letter,
34 necessarily. Fine points. Katya Wessels might answer
35 that.

36
37 MS. WESSELS: I mean, if the Council
38 agrees in this meeting, your position on that proposal
39 or even like on the wording of the statement that you
40 want the Council member to convey at the Board meeting
41 and vote who that member of your Council is going to
42 represent the Council, that's fine.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That's what
45 we're proposing to do.

46
47 MS. WESSELS: Yeah.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Just need to --
50 So, -- but we will need to prepare -- Larry, go ahead,

000116

1 way in.

2

3 MR. BEMIS: Through the Chair. I just
4 wanted to make a comment about this. I sat with the
5 committee on this, and I wanted to verify that it was
6 thought to be better to add Yakutat because I was
7 thinking 3A because it's coming out of 2C. But then
8 again, we didn't want to involve the other communities.
9 And I just wanted to say that being on the AC Board up
10 in Yakutat that we would -- they said we could put this
11 in Yakutat rather than area 3A to keep other communities
12 for not being aware of what we're doing here. So, this
13 is kind of a joint venture between us and Sitka at this
14 point.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay.

17

18 MR. BEMIS: On this letter of
19 recommendation. Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you
22 for that. So, we can certainly authorize somebody to
23 attend that Board of Fish work session. It also requests
24 the recommendation is to approve a letter of support for
25 unguided charter issue so that does require a letter.
26 Point of clarification here. If the Board were to decide
27 that it is a valid proposal and then take it up at their
28 Board of Fish meeting, then the letter would not be
29 necessary, because then we can just authorize our
30 Council member to support the proposal at the meeting.
31 We don't need a letter or am I mistaken?

32

33 MR. RAMP: They're pretty much on. Mr.
34 Chairman. You don't need to travel to the Board of
35 Fisheries work session. It's in Anchorage in two weeks
36 -- one week. But you could Zoom in to express your
37 support for the request to reconsider. If it becomes a
38 proposal, then you're going to have somebody at the Board
39 of Fisheries meeting anyway. And they could just add
40 this to their list of proposals that your body is in
41 support of versus oppose.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right. But are
44 you recommending that if they don't accept it as a
45 proposal, that we should write a letter in support still?
46 No, not at all.

47

48 MR. RAMP: If they don't accept it, I
49 revert back to the North Pacific Fishery Management
50 Council at their June meeting. And, you know, we're like

000117

1 a ping pong ball going back and forth between the State
2 and the feds on this. We're kind of used to it now, but
3 if it doesn't make it as a proposal, then no further
4 action is going to be able to be taken until the next
5 cycle.

6
7 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Okay.
8 Patti.

9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: I see Heather Bauscher
11 sort of wondering -- she's familiar with both North
12 Pacific. No?

13
14 MS. BAUSCHER: Given -- Heather Bauscher,
15 for the record, former Sitka AC and just talking as a
16 resident of Southeast Alaska. I think given the problems
17 with the timing of things like we've talked about before,
18 that if there is a way to write a letter, additionally,
19 that would just be a good document to have so that that
20 could be utilized regardless of the Board of Fish or the
21 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council space, if
22 that makes sense. I mean, if you can get more easily
23 [sic] approval to do the work session, great. But the
24 other thing I've learned with the Board of Fish is that
25 this stuff morphs as things go, and having some sort of
26 letter would help whoever has to go speak to things,
27 because then regardless of what is morphed, you can still
28 like point to those items perhaps. But that's just my
29 thoughts.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Yeah.
32 Jim.

33
34 MR. SLATER: I think in our discussions
35 with Mr. Ramp, before you or he commented that they came
36 back with a couple of suggestions or items that they
37 wanted clarification on, like who was responsible for
38 submitting logs and things like that. Should we try to
39 address those in any kind of response or what we support
40 so that it's more complete and addresses the issues they
41 raised?

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll get
44 a response.

45
46 MR. RAMP: Through the Chair. Mr. Ramp,
47 again. I don't think so. I think based on our discussion
48 with the Commissioner, if it becomes a proposal, our AC
49 is going to recommend our support of it with some
50 amendments based on our discussion with the

000118

1 Commissioner. And those will go on the record before the
2 Board of Fisheries meetings. And everybody will have
3 access to those at the meeting. But I think it would be
4 too preemptive for your body to address those at this
5 point.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

8

9 MR. RAMP: We can't even share those
10 amendments yet because it's not a proposal. So, we can't
11 amend a non-proposal. So, that would have to wait.

12

13 MR. SLATER: Alrighty. Thanks.

14

15 MR. RAMP: Sorry, I wish I had a better
16 answer.

17

18 MR. SLATER: No. That's okay. It's a good
19 one.

20

21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: It's a logical
22 answer. So, I get it. Yeah. Okay. Any other discussion
23 on what we may want to do here? I'm beginning to get the
24 picture. Any other discussion? Okay, so we will -- good
25 discussion on that. Clarified a lot of things. We'll
26 just deal with this when we get to the action part of
27 this report here. So, let's go back, because I know Mr.
28 Ramp has to leave probably about ten minutes. So, thank
29 you very much for helping us out on that. Where are we?
30 Proposal 222. This one deals with the personal use
31 shrimp. Go ahead, Ashley.

32

33 MS. BOLWERK: The title for proposal 222
34 is to adopt seasonal closures for subsistence, sport and
35 personal use shrimp fisheries. The working group thought
36 that the RAC would want to support this proposal. The
37 closure here is during the spawning portion of the shrimp
38 life cycle. And so, folks on the working group thought
39 that they have heard over the years of reports of
40 overharvest in some areas in shrimp fisheries and
41 thought that this would be a good way to practice
42 sustainable harvest and management practices due to the
43 increase in productivity through reproduction that this
44 would provide.

45

46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, any
47 Council discussion on the work group's recommendation
48 to support this proposal? Mike.

49

50

1 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm a neutral person on
2 this, but I'd like to tell you something about shrimp.
3 Right after they spawn, a lot of them molt, and they're
4 soft and mushy. They're really poor quality. But at the
5 same time, the new generation of eggs are up in their
6 head. So, when you peel them like this, you can see that
7 little orange spot there, and then they transfer them
8 to underneath. So, you're really not saving much in any
9 case during their life cycle. You know what I mean? It's
10 a -- but if you don't allow when they're hard shelled
11 and stuff in the fall time through the winter, in the
12 springtime, that's when they molt and then start the new
13 cycle of eggs. And anyway, it's neither here nor there,
14 I guess. Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thanks for the
17 explanation, Mike. So, does [sic] the Council okay [with
18 the work group's recommendation to support this? Patti.
19

20 MS. PHILLIPS: I just wanted to say that
21 it's Alaska Department of Fish and Game, that proposal.
22

23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
24 Patti. So, we'll stick with our support on this one
25 sounds like. Okay. Proposal 250.
26

27 MS. BOLWERK: Proposal 250 is to reduce
28 the minimum size limit for male Dungeness -- sorry
29 Dungeness crab from six and one half inches to six and
30 one quarter inches in registration and a subsistence and
31 personal use fisheries. The working group wanted to
32 oppose this proposal stating that the Council supports
33 sustainable management of subsistence resources, and
34 believes that the current size restriction to Dungeness
35 crab harvests are biologically sound benchmarks for
36 reproductive success which help maintain sustainable
37 fishery.
38

39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
40 Council discussion on this recommendation to oppose
41 lowering the size limit on Dungeness. Any discussion?
42 Jim.
43

44 MR. SLATER: Who is the proposer of this?
45

46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti.
47

48 MS. PHILLIPS: Derek Thynes.
49

50 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. An

000120

1 individual, it sounds like. Okay, proposal 258, Ashley.

2

3 MS. BOLWERK: The title of the proposal
4 258 is to open some or all areas closed to commercial
5 Dungeness fishing in Registration Area A. The working
6 group wanted to oppose this proposal. They mentioned
7 that they oppose opening subsistence and personal use
8 crab areas to commercial harvest. That -- mentioning
9 that commercial harvest drastically reduces local crab
10 availability when it's open to those subsistence users.
11 And that there's also inadequate stock assessment for
12 crab fisheries in Southeast Alaska, and that the CPUE
13 has been declining in crab fisheries. And so, they
14 thought that opening additional commercial fisheries
15 without localized data would reflect irresponsible
16 management of this resource and create undue competition
17 for subsistence users.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
20 Discussion on this one. Ted.

21

22 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Just a question.
23 Where is Registration Area A? I'm just kind of curious.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody have
26 that information? I don't know.

27

28 MS. BOLWERK: Mr. Chair, I can read
29 what's in the proposal, if you'd like.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Sure. If that
32 would answer that question, that'd be helpful.

33

34 MS. BOLWERK: Okay. It says close waters
35 in Registration Area A. In Registration Area A, the
36 following waters are closed to the taking of Dungeness
37 crab. Waters of section 11-A that are north of a line
38 from Marmion Island Light [sic] to the eastmost tip of
39 Point Salisbury, and east of a line extending from the
40 northernmost tip of Outer Point to the southernmost tip
41 of Portland Island and to the southernmost tip of Point
42 Louisa. Another one is off the mainland shore, enclosed
43 by a line from the northernmost tip of the peninsula at
44 the Shrine of Saint Therese to Gull Island and extending
45 to Sentinel Island Light [sic]. Another one includes the
46 waters of Tenakee Inlet west of Corner Bay point to Crab
47 Bay log transfer facility. Another one includes the
48 waters of Port Althorp, enclosed by a line from Point
49 Lukin, and there's some GPS coordinates there. Another
50 one includes the waters of Merrifield Bay and Port

000121

1 Protection, enclosed by a line extending west from Port
2 Protection head, and then south to the point on Prince
3 of Wales Island. Again, there's multiple GPS coordinates
4 included there, and actually the list goes on and on.
5 If you want me to keep reading. Okay, thanks.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. A lot of
8 areas. So, it's just some.....

9

10 MS. BOLWERK: Yeah. There's a total of
11 looks like 21 areas.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Any
14 other discussion? Okay. The recommendation was to oppose
15 that opening -- reopening those areas. Proposal 259
16 looks similar, but maybe with the opening and closing
17 dates, apparently. Ashley.

18

19 MS. BOLWERK: That's correct. The title
20 reads open all waters closed to commercial Dungeness
21 fishing in Registration Area A between October 1st and
22 November 30th annually, and the working group thought
23 the act would want to oppose this and stated the exact
24 same rationale for that.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any
27 discussion on that one? Jim.

28

29 MR. SLATER: Who's the proposer again?
30 Is this the same person?

31

32 MS. BOLWERK: Proposal 259 was proposed
33 by Todd Bailey, a different individual.

34

35 MR. SLATER: Okay. Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any other
38 discussion? Patti.

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, I just would
41 like to thank Jackson Comb for helping us at our
42 committee meeting, because he brought some of these to
43 our attention.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
46 So, that concludes the Working Group's report. There's
47 a lot of -- they did a lot of work there. That's a lot
48 of proposals. So, now comes the action part of the item
49 which is kind of outlined on the first page there, which
50 is helpful. First item would be to approve -- for the

000122

1 Council to approve the recommendations from the working
2 group and make it a work of the entire Council. So,
3 we'll need a motion to do that.

4

5 MR. SLATER: I move that we and approve
6 the Board of Fish proposal comments made by the Southeast
7 RAC Board -- BOF working group.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
10 Jim.

11

12 MR. HOWARD: Second.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
15 Albert, for second. Okay. Any further discussion on the
16 motion? Now that we've heard the list. Thank you, Patti,
17 questions been called for. All in favor of accepting the
18 recommendations from the working group by the entire
19 Council, say aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
24 opposed? Say nay. Okay. Motions approved. Let's go to
25 nominating somebody from the Council to attend the Board
26 of Fish meeting and advocate on our behalf on these
27 proposals that we just approved, and for that, we -- I'd
28 need a volunteer.

29

30 No, this -- first I'm going to the
31 approval to go to the Board of Fish meeting itself. I've
32 seen a hand. Cal.

33

34 MR. CASIPIT: I was asked earlier if I
35 would be willing to do this, and I said I would if the
36 Council decided that would be the right person to do it.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I definitely
39 think you'd be the right person to do it. As a retired
40 fisheries biologist who's had a lot of interactions with
41 the Board of Fish in the past. No doubt. So, if you're
42 volunteering, then we can make -- somebody would make
43 it motion, I guess, to appoint you in that capacity. Ted

44

45 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. I make a motion to
46 appoint Cal Casipit to go to the Board of Fish meeting.

47

48 MS: PHILLIPS: Second.

49

50

000123

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
2 Patti, for a second. Any discussion on that? Cathy.

3
4 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 think it's just important to note for the record that
6 this is probably becoming one of our more important
7 functions for the Council to be represented at the Board
8 of Fish meeting, not necessarily just calling in or
9 sending letters. It's an opportunity to advocate for the
10 proposals that the Council has put forward and be
11 available to, you know, let other folks know what the
12 intent was behind it. The proposals that were put in
13 there, and then also the opportunity to comment on other
14 Board of proposal -- Board of Fish proposals that may
15 affect subsistence uses in our region, and continued
16 allocation of funds to be able to send somebody there
17 to represent the work that this Council has done is
18 extremely important. And I think that that justification
19 probably needs to be on the record. I don't want staff
20 to just think we're voting to do that. We need that. We
21 need the funding to continue to be able to do that for
22 not just Board of Fish, but our Board of Game as well.
23 So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
26 Cathy. Any other discussion?

27
28 (Question called by unknown)

29
30 Okay. Questions have been called for all
31 in favor of nominating Cal Casipit to represent the
32 council at the Board of Fish meeting, say aye.

33
34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
37 Say nay. Okay. There's something that goes along with
38 this. We also have to actually request the funding to
39 send somebody -- pay for travel and expenses. So, excuse
40 me, DeAnna, that's just a request from the Council for
41 that we have to vote on.

42
43 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, so, yes, we
46 will need a motion to make that request. It's not
47 automatic. Cal.

48
49 MR. CASIPIT: I move that we request the
50 necessary funding to send me to Ketchikan in January for

000124

1 the Board of Fish meeting. And I would ask staff to help
2 me identify the best time, you know, the most efficient
3
4 -- best time to be there to -- for the most amount of
5 efficiency for my time is all.

6
7

MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

8
9

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Second. Maybe a
10 little bit of discussion on this. We probably -- maybe
11 in the past we've had staff support as well. Should that
12 be a part of this request, DeAnna? Actually, at the
13 meeting, I don't know if we've done that in the past.
14 Seems like we have.

15
16

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I think we have
17 requested staff attend. I'm thinking of the Board of
18 Fish is going to conflict with the Board of Game meeting,
19 and I'm not sure how many staff would be available.
20 Because you'll need support at your Board meeting as
21 well. So.

22
23

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I forgot
24 about that. But we probably do have an official answer
25 to that question, Mr. Ayers.

26
27

MR. AYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
28 is Scott Ayers. Awesome. I was just going to note that
29 OSM does typically have a staff member, George Pappas,
30 that attends as many of the Board of Fish and Board of
31 Game meetings as is possible. And I'm hopeful that he'll
32 be at this meeting to help out with anyone from the
33 Council that wants assistance there, and if not, we can
34 look at other options.

35
36

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Do we need to
37 make that request or is that something that the -- OSM
38 already kind of has in their plans?

39
40

MR. AYERS: I think you could do either.
41 I think OSM intends to have staff -- I mean, it's --
42 George just attends all the meetings. And so, adding
43 that to the letter won't hurt anything, but I don't know
44 that it's necessarily a necessity.

45
46

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

47
48

Doesn't sound like it's a necessity. I
49 forgot about, yeah, Mr. Pappas, that's kind of part of
50 his job, so. Perfect. You'll be in good hands. Cal. You

000125

1 know George? Yeah. Patti.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Could we send Mr. Pappas
4 a copy of our comments?

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: He'll probably
7 see those, but he should definitely have them. You're
8 right. We need to specifically send them to him. That's
9 fine. So, the motion was to request funding, got a little
10 sidetracked there. Is there any other discussion?

11

12 MS. CASIPIT: Question.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Questions
15 been called for, for this Council to request funding to
16 support a Council member going to the Board of Fish
17 meeting in January. All in favor say aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
22 Say nay. Okay. And let's see. Cal, you had -- oh, yes.
23 Timing of the meeting, their long meetings, I know. And
24 it would be good to have an idea of when it's most
25 important for you to be there. Correct?

26

27 MR. CASIPIT: Correct. And I was just
28 asking for staff to help me identify the best time. I
29 can just work through staff as I work out my travel, and
30 we'll figure out the right time for me to be there. I
31 want to be most effective.

32

33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Very good. Okay.
34 I don't think the Council needs to do anything there.
35 Okay. Larry.

36

37 MR. BEMIS: Usually on the Board of Fish
38 meeting, you find out who the people are that have the
39 most influence and start getting buddy with them. You
40 go meet them at the coffee, you talk whatever you need
41 to do. Because if they know you, when you finally come
42 up to do something, they're a little more aware of what's
43 going on, because things just moved so fast that
44 everybody don't remember anybody, and that's been one
45 of my tactics that I was taught. Okay. Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I got
48 experience with that. You bet. Probably anybody's been
49 there probably can relate to that. Okay. Next thing we
50 need to do is to nominate a Southeast Council member to

1 speak for us at the Sitka Advisory Committee meeting
2 virtually. Advisory -- Sitka AC will be discussing our
3 Council's subsistence king salmon proposal to the Board
4 of Fish, and they have requested that somebody from the
5 council virtually attend their meeting to help explain
6 and answer questions about that proposal. Apparently,
7 we probably do need to have permission to do that and
8 maybe somebody to volunteer to do that. And that would
9 be about a week from now. So, volunteer, Cal you
10 volunteer for that as well?

11
12 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah. This one is easier
13 for me to volunteer for because it's a Zoom meeting, so.
14 Yeah, I'd be happy to do this.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Very good.

17
18 MR. CASIPIT: And if I can get staff
19 again to kind of keep me in line, that'd be great.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. I don't
22 believe any funding would be required for this. So, as
23 long as you have Zoom capabilities and don't have to
24 travel anywhere to do it so. Okay. So, let's have a
25 motion to do that and nominate Cal to represent us at
26 the Sitka Advisory Committee meeting.

27
28 MR. SLATER: I move that we ask Cal
29 Casipit to represent the Southeast RAC at the Sitka AC
30 meeting to discuss the substance -- subsistence use king
31 salmon proposal.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Do you have a
34 second? Okay a second. Any other discussion?

35
36 MR. CASIPIT: Question.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Question. All in
39 favor of having Cal represent us to the Sitka Advisory
40 Council, say aye.

41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
45 Say nay. Okay. Next item is we also need somebody to
46 virtually represent the Southeast Council at the Board
47 of Fish Work Session to advocate for Sitka Advisory
48 Committee's proposal being accepted as a proposal for
49 their January meeting. That work session takes place on
50 29th and the 30th of this month. So, volunteer for that

000127

1 one, and I would volunteer for that one. If it's -- take
2 a little pressure off of Cal because he might be anxious
3 to raise his hand again over there. But he's got a lot
4 of volunteering. You want to do it, Cathy?

5
6 MS. NEEDHAM: No, I'm not even on the
7 Council.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes, you are.
10 You're still on the Council?

11
12 (Off record conversation)

13
14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Okay. So,
15 Patti, did you want to volunteer? No. Okay. Go ahead.

16
17 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, I move to
18 nominate our Chairman to attend and represent the
19 Southeast Council at the Board of Fish working session
20 virtually October 29th and 30th, to support inclusion
21 of the unguided charter proposal from the Sitka AC and
22 to the Board of Fish proposal list for this spring's
23 Board of Fish meeting.

24
25 MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We have a second.
28 Any other discussion?

29
30 MR. SMITH: Question.

31
32 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: All in favor --
33 Patti.

34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: I mean, if any of you
36 other council members can dial in and, you know, show
37 support as an individual they would appreciate it. I'm
38 going to try to dial in myself. So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
41 Patti. Jim.

42
43 MR. SLATER: Likewise. I'd like to be
44 able to dial in. Do we have any -- I'll be traveling
45 some on those days. I don't know if we can narrow the
46 time down at all. Do we have an idea of when it would
47 be?

48
49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I don't know when
50 they meet. I'll have to get that information, but I will

000128

1 be checking with Sitka Advisory Committee on that.

2

3

MR. SLATER: Okay. Thanks.

4

5

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Find that out. Okay. We're ready for the question. All in favor of nominating me to represent the Council at the Board of Fish Work Session to advocate for them to accept the Sitka Advisory Committee's unguided sportfish proposal say aye.

10

11

12

IN UNNISON: Aye.

13

14

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed? Say nay. Okay. Taken care of that item. And I think that concludes all of the actions required in regards to the State Board of Fish is -- Patti.

18

19

MS. PHILLIPS: What about the letter of support for the unguided charter issue? Did we decide not to do that?

22

23

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think the recommendation was that that would not be necessary. That if it doesn't become a proposal, then there's no issue. So, that was my understanding. John.

27

28

MR. SMITH: I thought we were going to do one anyway. Just to have one on standby. I don't know. I thought that's what we were talking about. Heather came up right.

32

33

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Oh. That's right. It might be useful for -- yeah. For any other, I guess, for any other proposals that might -- yeah or amendments that could be put forward. It kind of makes it a tricky letter to write. But I see the concept there. That's true. Well, Council discussion.

39

40

MS. CASIPIT: Maybe we can just keep that verbiage in our back pocket. So, if the proposal does get put -- gets put back into the cycle or back into the Board of Fish cycle, we would already have discussed some comments that we could provide to the Board. So, if we can just keep that handy and then, you know, we could always use that to use that same language to send a letter to NOAA -- North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, if that's necessary. So, I don't think we should necessarily just, you know, put it in the round file, but I think we should keep it on hand. And I think we

50

1 all -- we approved that along with the BOF comments, I
2 thought. So, since that's approved that, that'd be a
3 good, you know, one pager for us to have in front of the
4 Board.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah.
7 There is a North Pacific Council meeting this winter as
8 well. We take it up that same issue so. Okay. I guess
9 it's -- we'll want a motion on this as well.

10
11 MR. SLATER: I move that we vote or that
12 we prepare a letter to have in hand for the upcoming
13 Board of Fish meeting and other meetings deemed as
14 necessary.

15
16 MR. CASIPIT: Second.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Maybe a
19 little more discussion on what that letter would
20 include. I think you mentioned talking points. Do we
21 have the talking points pretty much mirror the proposal,
22 or is that what you had in mind? Cal.

23
24 MR. CASIPIT: Yes. Mr. Chair, I --
25 basically that last page is to me would be a good --
26 it's good that we're approving this and we're accepting
27 this so that these can easily be turned into talking
28 points for a presentation to a -- to the Board or the
29 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes. I think
32 we've already got some wording in our previous
33 statements. But Jim, go ahead.

34
35 MR. SLATER: You know, the one thing and
36 I mentioned this to Mr. Ramp, and I think the comment
37 that came back and I thought it would be something that
38 I think is important to put in there, is that the logging
39 or reporting would require cooperation between both of
40 the boat renter and the boat rentee so that there would
41 be no pointing of fingers and blaming on each other
42 that, you know, maybe the fishermen would hand his ticket
43 or his log in to the boat renter, and then the boat
44 renter would file it. It could be done online as well,
45 but just something that had a chain of command that
46 would make -- they would have to be complicit to violate
47 it.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. We could
50 include that in the accountability portion of that

000130

1 recommendation. Anything else?

2

3

(No response)

4

5 Okay. I think we have enough information
6 to draft a letter that would accomplish that. So, are
7 you ready for the question? Okay. The question has been
8 called for the Council to draft a letter which addresses
9 the Council's concerns regarding the unguided sport fish
10 industry. And that letter could either go to the Board
11 of Fish, go to the North Pacific Fishery Management
12 Council as it -- as needed. I guess so, we'll have it
13 available to serve those purposes. So, all in favor say
14 aye.

15

16

IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
19 opposed? Say nay. Okay. So, that concludes our Board of
20 Fish business, I believe. And -- got to see where to
21 move on to next. I think it might be wise while we're
22 taking care of work group business, that maybe we move
23 to the forest plan. And I don't know if we still have
24 somebody from the Forest Service available to update on
25 that or I don't know. You could answer that, DeAnna.

26

27

28 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah.
29 Due to the lateness of our meeting, we do not have a
30 person available to go over the forest plan, but I. I
31 can follow up with her and provide additional
32 information to folks by email. The district ranger here
33 at Ketchikan, Misty Fjords, was so kind enough to reprint
34 one of the brochures on the forest plan with a nice
35 little QR code that goes straight to that website for
36 some information, and I believe I put the notice of
37 intent in your meeting books as well. I think the plan
38 was that the comment period would probably drop around
39 the end of January or February. And actually, district
40 ranger Cathy Tighe can probably fill in some blanks for
41 us. That's great. Thank you, Cathy.

41

42

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you.

43

44

45 MS. TIGHE: Good evening chair. For the
46 record, my name is Cathy Tighe. I am with the US Forest
47 Service serving as the district ranger here in
48 Ketchikan. Although I am not the planner for the forest
49 plan, I'm quite familiar with the process. Formally was
50 in that planning position. So, basically, it is a lengthy
process. Approximately four years or so to get through

000131

1 the whole process, and it was officially kicked off in
2 the spring. So, we're officially only a few months into
3 that process. There was a comment period over the summer
4 on a required wilderness inventory and a required Wild
5 and Scenic River inventory, and then currently internal
6 specialists are working on what are called forest plan
7 assessments. It's individual resources and what that
8 involves is looking at what information we know what
9 current trends are, what has changed, is there new
10 science? The basis of the current forest plan, it's been
11 amended a couple of times, but the base plan dates back
12 to 1997. So, you can imagine in that length of time
13 there's been some new information come out. So, it's
14 gathering all of that information together, resource by
15 resource. And it's going through an internal review
16 right now with an anticipated release in January for a
17 comment period on those assessments. They do hope to
18 finalize the assessments after that public comment
19 period in the spring. And then start what is called a
20 Need for Change analysis based on sort of what's in
21 these assessments that are going to come out. You know,
22 what we know versus, you know, new rules, new science,
23 what needs to change in the current forest plan. And so,
24 this is actually quite a critical step in the process.
25 It sort of sets the tone of where a new plan might need
26 to go. And so, I know that the Council won't be meeting
27 -- this Council won't be meeting until either right at
28 the end or after that comment period with that March
29 meeting. I would encourage people to look at that
30 handout. It does have the website that is posting all
31 of the -- anything that's available for comment is
32 getting posted on that website, along with updated
33 timelines. There's recorded webinars on there that sort
34 of explain the process and how to be involved. I believe
35 it was mentioned earlier that as a FACA committee, we
36 could accept comments outside of the comment period.
37 It's just most useful if we get them during. And then
38 shortly after those assessments and Need for Change are
39 complete, next summer, they would actually be starting
40 -- the specialist team would actually be starting on a
41 draft plan. That would be the new plan. They have to
42 have a draft plan with new standards and guidelines and
43 management areas. Mr. Sandhofer mentioned the land use
44 designation. The LUDs are going away, but there's an
45 opportunity to have management areas designated that
46 might have specific standards and guidelines associated
47 with those versus forest wide standards. And they have
48 to have that draft plan come out probably next fall in
49 order to even start the environmental review. Like we
50 don't know what the effects are without that draft plan.

1 So, that's actually coming out probably about a year
2 from now. The draft plan and that would be another key
3 stage for weighing in.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, we had our
6 work group session on this, and there were items that
7 we kind of wanted to recommend for the assessment, and
8 I guess it was our understanding that we could still
9 have those added to the list. Is that correct?

10

11 MS. TIGHE: I know that one of the
12 sections of the assessment is dedicated to subsistence.
13 I have not yet seen that draft assessment internally,
14 but I know that they were getting ready to have a meeting
15 about that. I think it was yesterday. So, I think
16 internally that one is just starting its review process.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, submitting
19 recommendations on the assessment is still timely. Is
20 that what you're saying?

21

22 MS. TIGHE: That would still -- yeah that
23 would -- I don't know if they could incorporate it into
24 the draft. But I think if they came in now it certainly
25 -- like that would be before the official comment period.
26 And I know we're allowing dedicated -- like official
27 partners to see those drafts. So, I believe that from
28 this Council, they would be accepted and they would try
29 to incorporate them now or while they're doing those or
30 while they're incorporating the comments in the spring.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right. Thank
33 you. Okay. So, that's what we're going to do, I think.
34 So, thank you for that information. And Cathy kind of
35 has a summation of our recommendations on items for the
36 assessment.

37

38 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So,
39 the Council did have a subcommittee that met on this --
40 the assessment portion of things on that subcommittee
41 was Don, Ted, Jim, Mike Douville stopped in and provided
42 some input, and Patti also stopped in and provided some
43 input. We had staff member Rob assisting us and then we
44 had students Naomi and Caleb that joined us. As you
45 remember, Heather had come before the Council kind of
46 at the beginning of the meeting and had recommended that
47 we, like -- she had said this is something analogous to
48 like pre-scoping. If we wanted to have input of what
49 would go into the assessment, it would be a good time
50 to try to do it while they're drafting it. So, we sat

1 down and we had a very long discussion, very broad
2 discussion. And Rob took very good notes. And at the
3 break just before this, I thought we were on the
4 understanding that we weren't going to specifically
5 bring up those topics at the table today, that we were
6 going to say that the workgroup efforts were basically
7 a list of different things that were discussed. And then
8 staff has that list now. And so, that the Council wasn't
9 going to put together any formal things as a Council,
10 but those broad topics staff would be able to look at
11 and make sure that they didn't miss anything because of
12 the breadth of the workgroup that was there. There was
13 a lot of just different topics. If you -- I do have a
14 copy of the list on my phone that I can read. It's very
15 lengthy. The workgroup did not have -- you know, we
16 said, well, what about access? Well, there's a lot of
17 things that can be said about access, and there were no
18 real specifics that we got into or any necessarily
19 agreement amongst the workgroup members. But the key
20 part to something about access was that maybe it's not
21 just specifically in the assistance analysis section,
22 but across other sections as well. And so that's kind
23 of an example of what the workgroup talked about. And
24 if the council is just okay with knowing that a list, a
25 very kind of exhaustive list of bullet items went to
26 staff, then I think we can probably leave it at that and
27 know that they have it. One big thing that was brought
28 up, I don't know if it needs extra discussion, but things
29 like cultural trees were actually, we did discuss that
30 one a little bit more and having protections about it
31 and making sure that the assessment included cultural
32 trees and uses of, you know, having them putting
33 protections on them so that tribes would have future use
34 to them and things like that.

35
36 So, if that's -- if the wish of the
37 Council is not to take action on anything specifically,
38 we can be done with the conversation. If they want to
39 actually get into the details, I can pull up the list
40 and be happy to go through them with you guys. Thank
41 you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
44 Cathy. Any discussion from Council and how we want to
45 proceed with this? Jim.

46
47 MR. SLATER: I'm happy with the list
48 Cathy's described and letting staff take the first cut
49 at it drafting the letter.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody
2 else? John.

3
4 MR. SMITH: I was in a different group
5 and would love to see it. If you can send us, share it
6 with the team. Would be cool. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Is that --
9 is it written out somewhere that Council member.....

10
11 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 Staff person Rob Cross, who's not here, actually created
13 the list, and I don't -- I want to make sure that he
14 feels like it's the cleaned up list. It was just his
15 notes that he took that I asked him to forward on,
16 because I thought we were going to try to summarize
17 them, and then we ran out of -- I mean, it's, you know,
18 our meeting is getting way on. We still have other things
19 to do. So, we didn't think that we were going to
20 necessarily do it. So, I would suggest just asking Rob
21 to send the list that he has that has the bullet points
22 on it, but maybe not like details in it to DeAnna and
23 then she can distribute it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
26 Cathy. But yes, we still need approval from the Council.
27 I've been informed to accept that work from the working
28 group. So, we do need to do that, Cathy.

29
30 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
31 think that if we were to try to do that, then we have
32 to go through the list and we have to talk about it
33 before the Council can accept it. So, I guess my
34 suggestion of what I was saying is that this -- that
35 list doesn't represent the Council. It just is a list
36 of things that folks talked about that were items that
37 could be addressed in the assessment level. This Council
38 hasn't had the time or won't have the time today to give
39 it the due diligence to make it a Council specific list
40 that we've approved, to give them to say that we want
41 all those things in. Now, I could be wrong about that,
42 but I think that's kind of why we decided to take the
43 tactic that we did. And I guess, yeah, I mean, I guess
44 it is what what's the wish of the Council. We can dive
45 into this if you'd like. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, well I'd
48 like to suggest essentially a work around here. So, this
49 is just getting submitted as suggestions. Then it's
50 going to come out in a form that the Council will be

1 able to comment on. And so, you know, as they prepare
2 their list and put it up for public comment, the Council
3 will then have a chance to review it and make any
4 recommendations changes, comments. So, I don't know,
5 maybe that's adequate that we just -- we know that staff
6 has it, they're going to work on it and it'll come back
7 to us in a way that we can comment on it. Maybe that's
8 adequate. Maybe that's all we can do for now. I think
9 it's important enough that we, you know, get it out
10 there. Ted.

11
12 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
13 Chair. You know, I did talk to Chad yesterday about this
14 issue with the timing and our ability to input -- to
15 have some input. And he assured me that, you know, if
16 it has to wait until we meet the next time, it's not too
17 late. These things never go as scheduled, as far as
18 planning, you know, we're going to be at this point at
19 this time. So, he assured me that our comments could be
20 incorporated at a -- if we're a little late. He's kosher
21 with that. So, I just wanted to make sure that we knew
22 that it it's going to be considered, you know.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, so let's
25 just say that our comments are with the staff. They
26 probably won't be in a form to be formally submitted,
27 but the staff will work on them. And for right now, it's
28 just a product that resides within our staff, which is
29 perfectly fine. And we hope to be able to have these
30 submitted after a Council has a chance to weigh in on
31 them. If that's satisfactory, we could do that. Okay.
32 So, I think that would conclude that topic. You concur,
33 Cathy? Yeah. Okay, sounds good. I do want to power
34 through here because we're getting close. I think we
35 have one more. Let me just consult with DeAnna here for
36 a second.

37
38 (Pause)

39
40 Okay. So, we do have our report section,
41 various people, some of which had to leave. But we still
42 have a lot of people here that can just inform us of
43 what's going on. But we do need to finalize Council
44 action on the letter that we recommended accompanying
45 the Rural Determination recommendation from the Council.
46 So, we may need to flesh out a little bit what that
47 letter will contain and how it's going to be dealt with.
48 So, maybe we need a motion on the floor to write a
49 letter. Such a letter to the Board explaining our
50 position on what we might suggest for a definition on

1 rural and how that pertains to tribal occupation on their
2 territorial -- traditional homelands. So, that's kind
3 of the gist of what we're doing. So, somebody wants to
4 try and put that into a motion? To write such a letter.
5 I know it's a lot. Jim, you wanna?

6
7 MR. SLATER: I move that we move forward
8 with drafting a letter that defines a new classification
9 of rural resident in Alaska, comprising of Native
10 residents in occupying ancestral land.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think that's
13 adequate. Second?

14
15 MR. WAGNER: Second.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: As far as
20 discussion. Anybody want to want to lead off on that?
21 Jim.

22
23 MR. SLATER: It seems like we're creating
24 a whole new class, so we kind of have a blank slate in
25 front of us. We're -- so, we can basically define it, I
26 think, quite -- in quite straightforward and maybe
27 condensed definition. And we don't have to go to any
28 large things to weave around what has been said before.
29 We're basically saying that Native residents living in
30 ancestral lands should be defined as a new class of
31 rural resident across the State, and it might be
32 something very simple like that and let them build on
33 it and make it more complex.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Good point.
36 Frank.

37
38 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You
39 know, Native means different things. I believe that what
40 we may deal with indigenous people, indigenous cus [sic]
41 if you're born in Alaska, you're a Native. But right
42 now, we're dealing with a community of indigenous tribal
43 members of an area that was engulfed by a larger
44 community. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
47 Frank. It's a good point. Yeah, I think that's the best
48 way to put it. And, I mean, we do have a lot of things
49 on record here in the course of this meeting that I
50 think we could add to that letter. A lot of discussion,

1 a lot of wording. But I think Jim is right. That's the
2 gist of the letter. And we can, as part of that letter,
3 we can maybe, you know, pull out some of the discussion
4 we had that pertains specifically to you know, our
5 determination, our recommendation on this proposal here
6 and how that relates to it. Yeah, that could be good
7 background to what is the important point of the letter.
8 So, that would be my recommendation. Anybody else? Mike.

9
10 MR. DOUVILLE: Members of federally
11 recognized tribes.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right. Yeah.
14 Wording. Yeah. The wording will have to be careful that
15 we accurately describe what we want. But yes, it would
16 pertain to tribal -- tribal membership was part of the
17 discussion and correct. Yeah. Federally recognized
18 tribes would be important. Jim.

19
20 MR. SLATER: I just wanted to add, I
21 think that's a perfect or excellent way to do it, to
22 give the background of the situation of why we're here
23 specific to KIC, and then come up with a simple
24 definition, like you were saying. I think that's a great
25 idea.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
28 suggestions on this letter? Albert.

29
30 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
31 think he mentioned we're starting with a blank slate in
32 regards to trying to help Ketchikan create a their own
33 rural designation. So, it seems like -- do we want to
34 say when -- I'm trying to put the words together with
35 the thought process. When a federally designated tribe
36 does not qualify for Title 8 of ANILCA based on
37 population, then this new mechanism would apply to them.
38 So, you're -- by creating saying that seems like we're
39 creating a whole new way for them to become a part of
40 the process without allowing everyone else to do it. And
41 you could allow other people to do it. And I was okay
42 with that part of it because we can hold each other
43 accountable. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Exactly,
46 Albert. And I think it might be a good idea to speak
47 about it in more of a specific way about the situation
48 we dealt with here with Ketchikan, because we have, you
49 know, all that testimony about, you know, existing you
50 know, occupation -- indigenous occupation in the area

1 that, you know, got swallowed up by a growing city. And,
2 and that's specific to Ketchikan, but it could apply
3 elsewhere. But we haven't really gone there yet. But
4 somebody else might want to. But so, let's just kind of
5 address the situation that we heard about here in
6 Ketchikan and see where it goes from there. I think
7 that's a good thing. Frank.

8
9 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
10 think Mike -- Mike's got it right by saying federally
11 recognized tribe, because right now we're dealing with
12 Ketchikan Indian asoci -- Ketchikan Indians. And so
13 yeah, just right now we're dealing with Ketchikan tribe.
14 So, the KIC is the one we're dealing with. So, and, you
15 know, that's one of the things that -- reason why we had
16 a hard time when we felt our hearts were dragging because
17 of what we had to deal with. So, Ketchikan Indian
18 Association should be mentioned. Gunalchéesh.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Very good. Thank
21 you, Frank. I agree. Any other discussion? Patti.

22
23 MS. PHILLIPS: No disrespect to all of
24 you, but here we are thinking about writing a letter,
25 you know, trying to make a definition for a stakeholder
26 group that's not even here.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Duly noted,
29 Patti, but I will have to say that you know, after our
30 action on that determination. I mean, I did speak with
31 several people on the -- the KIC President and their
32 attorney and they express support for what we were
33 attempting to do there. So, I do feel confident that.....

34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, was that on the
36 record?

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: No, I'm sorry I
39 wasn't, so. But I do feel confident, given the record
40 of the discussions that happened, you know, during the
41
42 course of the meeting that we could draft such a letter
43 based on the record, so. Mike.

44
45 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair. Well, I don't see
46 any of them here, but we're not changing the spirit of
47 what we wanted to accomplish. And they were sitting there
48 listening when we did all that.

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Right, and --
2 yeah. I mean, it was -- there was a lot on the record
3 of, you know, the interactions that we had, the
4 discussions and that's what kind of needs to be captured,
5 I guess in the letter and you know, typically we have
6 to work with staff to go back and, you know, review what
7 was said and put that -- try and capture that in a
8 letter. And hopefully we can do that in a timely manner.
9 So, that's what I foresee. Anybody else? Larry.

10
11 MR. BEMIS: Through the Chair. This is
12 new territory and Mike is right, we're probably -- and
13 Patti, we got to really be defined on what we're doing
14 because this is -- we're taking on the challenge of
15 supporting something that hasn't been done. I mean,
16 maybe in the past there might have been a little bit of
17 helping or whatever, but this is actually an action item
18 where we're placing a letter and putting it into the
19 record that this Board is hoping to help or guide KIC
20 to work towards a rural group of indigenous tribal
21 members or people of the Ketchikan City or Borough and
22 the separation is going to be the actual 3,000 or less
23 people that are going to be trying to regroup and put
24 their program together to keep this as the group and
25 separate from adding the whole population. So, it has
26 to be crafted in a sense that they need to have somebody
27 -- I would like us to say, we would like to help them
28 get there and not be so much as, you know, would be in
29 a help or a guide or whatever, rather than putting it
30 in the word that we were going to back this and make it
31 make it an action item that we're actually going to
32 follow through with. Because what this needs to do is
33 bring awareness and see how much work that KIC will do.
34 You know, like we're saying, nobody's really stood up
35 to -- until an issue comes where the resources are down
36 and you're having to go farther and all these things,
37 that this community all of a sudden decided we need to
38 stretch out and get farther, and we need to expand our
39 community subsistence boundaries. So, somehow we need
40 to structure this to more or less guide them and offer
41 help in the proper procedures and not make it look like
42 we're going to make this an action item to make it
43 happen. So, there's a fine line between helping and
44 guiding, then recommending and pushing it. So, I just
45 want to say that being -- this is a new item that we
46 kind of stay in the neutral aspect as a full-on Board
47 action item, as more to recognizing the problem and
48 trying to help them get there, to see how far they get
49 by their selves and how much time and effort we're going
50 to put into this. Thank you.

1

2

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Larry. I think that might even, -- even that might be getting a little ahead of us. I think it was made fairly clear that it would be up to Ketchikan Indian Community to -- if they so choose to go down that path of requesting a change to how the rural determination is arrived upon. It's premature to support any efforts yet, because it's totally up to them if they want to go down that path. And we don't know that yet. What I'm proposing in the letter is just informing the Board that the Council had a lot of discussion on the rural determination process. And, you know, going back into the background about, you know, how ANILCA talks about the importance of preserving the Native culture and how, you know, a lot of tribal members are not afforded that because they -- they're -- living in their traditional homeland has become non-rural, not by any action of them and that's not right. But the Council kind of -- would like the Board to recognize that a tribe's traditional homeland could be recognized as their place of residence for the purpose of determining their eligibility for subsistence priority. So, I would just leave it at that. We're not supporting any action because there is no action yet. We're just informing the Board of the discussions we had in relation to our Council's expressed, you know, a number of times it was expressed that we would support Ketchikan Indian Community having a subsistence priority, but with them being included in all of Ketchikan which we could not support, was a problem. So, we're looking for a way to separate them from the City of Ketchikan in some manner, by using their traditional homeland as the actual place of their residency. That's -- I know it's a fine point, but that's kind of where our discussions led today. Cathy.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I -- in hearing that, I wonder why you would need a letter when you couldn't just articulate that when you spoke at the Board of the -- Federal Subsistence Board in terms of the action that this Council took on the non-rural determination process. Because that was a part of the discussion and that could be a portion of, you know, the justification that is there. So, writing a separate letter just kind of feels a little bit like you're trying to over justify your opposition to the non-rural determination process in a lot of respect.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. I see your point. I guess I was just -- right, as you said, just

000141

1 kind of looking as you know, the person who would be
2 trying to present all this to the Board that, you know,
3 it might be helpful to me if we had a letter, but I can
4 see your point that, you know, we have a record that I
5 can go, go back to to make that justification to the
6 board. If the Council were comfortable with that, then
7 maybe that's the way to proceed. Go ahead, Cathy.

8
9 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
10 mean, I think that's the best representation of this
11 issue. You're an extremely articulate person and are
12 able to really portray, you know, why a Council -- our
13 Council has taken action over time. And this was an
14 issue that you brought forward to the Council, and I
15 think that it would -- to consider and a lot of
16 justification from other Council members that also posed
17 -- opposed non-rural determination, said, we think that
18 that was -- is an option that could be pursued in -- and
19 yeah, I have total faith in you that you'd be able to
20 deliver that message and it would be more powerful coming
21 in person, and it would allow the Board to interact
22 specifically on it and ask you follow up questions,
23 whereas a letter they wouldn't -- they would read it and
24 that would just be it. But thank you, Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
27 Cathy. Frank.

28
29 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
30 don't think we're going to be making any decisions for
31 Ketchikan tribe. What we're -- we will be doing would
32 be just explaining why and why it went the way it did.
33 So, I think that if we just said this is the way it went
34 and why it is and this is who we support, and we
35 supported the whole City of Ketchikan, then that'd be
36 different. But right now, we have a tribe that is --
37 wants -- getting too far. But anyway, I think that just
38 what happened should be explained. It's not that we're
39 -- it's hard for me to say we're not going to support.
40 I think that there's got to be a way because on the
41 record, we kind of said we want to support. But I'm
42 getting all tangled up here, you know. So, okay. Thank
43 you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: No. Thank you.
46 Frank, I think I understand what people are saying, and
47 I think that's possible. Ted.

48
49 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. You know, I guess
50 I could go either way, but I think more is better. I

000142

1 don't -- I think a letter is a good idea, and you don't
2 have to read the letter. You can still articulate in
3 your way when you're at the Board meeting. You know,
4 more is better, I think. I mean, in both -- having both
5 of them is I think, a better idea. But I'd go either way
6 like Cathy was suggesting.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
9 Anybody else? DeAnna.

10

11 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I would just
12 remind you that you do have a motion on the table to
13 write a letter. I realize it's 6:00, and I think we have
14 four Council members that need to catch the shuttle at
15 6:20 to get to the airport. So, I would encourage you
16 to go ahead and vote and decide what you want to do on
17 this issue so that those folks can get -- make it to the
18 shuttle.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, right.
21 They'll have to get going here pretty quick and the
22 motion is on the table. So, I don't know. Let's just
23 vote it up or down. The motion was to write a letter. I
24 know it's not fair, but the motion was to write a letter,
25 and it was kind of outlined that it would just detail
26 our discussions about the proposal and how we felt about
27 Native occupation of the territorial lands is related
28 to their eligibility for the rural priority. So, John.

29

30 MR. SMITH: I don't know if this is --
31 but, you know, in order for us to harvest seal or otter,
32 we have to showcase our tribal card. And that would
33 showcase everybody that, you know, that the tribal
34 members, they have a card and they'd be able to
35 participate. I know that's way off the subject, but that
36 would identify all the Alaska Native people. But in ANSCA
37 it doesn't, you know, it's there for everybody, but that
38 would identify them, you know what I'm saying?

39

40 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. There's
41 other precedents and other Federal management programs
42 where that is all that's required. So, yeah, it's a
43 factor. Albert.

44

45 MR. HOWARD: Call for the question, Mr.
46 Chair.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
49 Albert. So, all in favor of writing the letter, say aye.

50

000143

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: All opposed? Say
4 nay. Okay, I guess we can draft a letter. Thank you. And
5 yes, yeah. Folks that are going on that evening flight
6 have to get ready to go, so. It will take a few minutes.
7 A few minutes here. I know people want to say goodbye.
8 And the we've.....

9

10 (Pause)

11

12 Okay, Council members. The only thing
13 we have left on the agenda is just some reports,
14 informational things we need to know. The quicker we get
15 started, quicker we get to leave. So, we still have a
16 quorum. We lost a few Council members to travel. But
17 I'll just go down the list here. Hopefully everybody's
18 still available, but we have special actions by Jake
19 Musselwhite. Jake is still here? He had to go. Okay. I
20 don't know if anybody else can do that, but okay.

21

22 Yeah. There's something included in our
23 in our package here that informs us on special actions
24 so Council members can look at that. National Park
25 Service has a report from Dillon Patterson. Is Dillon
26 on the phone?

27

28 MR. PATTERSON: Good afternoon. I'm on.
29 Can you hear me?

30

31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead.
32 Dillon. Thanks for staying on so late.

33

34 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you. Yeah,
35 absolutely. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Members of the
36 council. For the record, my name is Dillon Patterson,
37 and I work at the National Park Service subsistence
38 program at the regional office in Anchorage. I know
39 you're trying to get through so, I'll try not to take
40 too much of your time. I just wanted to provide a short
41 update on the National Park Service Wildlife Rule that
42 became effective on August 2nd of this year. And this
43 is just an informational update so, not an action item.
44 The National Park Service amended its regulations for
45 sport hunting and trapping in National Preserves in
46 Alaska. The harvest practices addressed in this final
47 rule are specific to harvest on National Preserve land
48 only, and to the harvest under the authorization for
49 sport hunting and trapping and ANILCA. So, none of these
50 rules address subsistence harvest by rural residents

1 under Title 8 of ANILCA. The public was invited to
2 comment on the draft EA and the proposed rule that
3 published on January 9th, 2023. Over the past two years,
4 National Park Service staff presented on the draft
5 Wildlife Rule at all NPS Subsistence Resource Commission
6 meetings and all NPS Nexus Federal Subsistence RACs and
7 solicited your feedback. All comments were reviewed and
8 informed this final decision.

9
10 The 2024 Federal Final Wildlife Rule
11 explicitly addressed two topics on national preserve
12 lands in Alaska. First, it prohibits bear baiting for
13 sport hunters on National Preserve lands in Alaska, and
14 second, clarifies how a firearm can be used in
15 conjunction with trapping. So, first, bear baiting is
16 prohibited for public safety reasons. The concerns are
17 both immediate relative to bears defending their bait
18 stations, and more long-term relative to food
19 conditioning. And the second component, the trapping
20 portion of this rule applies to both those trapping under
21 State regulations and National Preserves -- and to
22 federally qualified subsistence users trapping in
23 National Preserves. And it just simply clarifies
24 existing regulations that individuals may harvest
25 furbearers with a firearm under a trapping license only
26 if the furbearers is ensnared in an intact trap, ensnared
27 in a trap that is no longer anchored, for example,
28 dragging a trap that has been unanchored or an animal -
29 - a furbearers that is mortally wounded by a trap but
30 the animal has since broken free from the trap. So, free
31 ranging furbearers may not be harvested with a firearm
32 under a state trapping license on NPS managed land.
33 Rather, an open hunting season and hunting license would
34 be required. So, thank you for your time. That's my
35 hopefully brief update. And I'd be happy to answer any
36 questions if there are any.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
39 Dillon. Questions?

40
41 (No response)

42
43 Okay. Thank you very much.

44
45 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: How about
48 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park service? Are they still
49 with us? Amber Cohen.

1 MS. COHEN: Yes. Hello. We are still
2 here. Can you hear me?

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes. Go ahead.

5
6 MS. COHEN: Awesome. Thank you. My name
7 is Amber Cohen. I'm a cultural anthropologist at
8 Wrangell-St. Elias. Also, Barbara Cellarius, our
9 cultural anthropologist and subsistence coordinator, is
10 also on the phone, too. And we're calling in from Copper
11 Center. The report that we have for you starts in your
12 supplemental materials on tab five. And it's a quick
13 update. So, let me just get into it.

14
15 First, we have an interpretation and
16 education update from our team over there. They lead
17 activities for two Yakutat youth events, Oceans Week at
18 the Yakutat school and the TURN Festival. They also
19 partnered with the Wrangell Institute for Science and
20 Environment to support the TURN Festival in Yakutat.
21 Time was spent with local youth exploring nature,
22 cleaning up beaches, making art and learning about the
23 aerodynamics of birds. And it was a great way to connect
24 to the community of Yakutat and if you want to know more
25 or contact theirs -- our education specialist named Russ
26 Scribner, and you have his information in the report.
27 The next one is about glacier research. So, scientists
28 from the National Park Service, University of Alaska
29 Fairbanks, University of Arizona, and University of
30 Montana are wrapping up a three-year project studying
31 recent and ongoing changes in the dynamics of Sit' Tlein,
32 recently known as Malaspina Glacier. Based on field data
33 collected so far, preliminary results and model outputs
34 appear to confirm that the project hypothesis is that
35 the glacier is on the cusp of a major retreat. Most
36 field work is now complete for this project, and all
37 equipment has been removed, and there are several
38 scientific papers that are underway and will be shared
39 in the future. And there's a major publication that has
40 gone to press, and you can see that link also in the
41 report. For more information, the two contacts there are
42 our geologists at the park, Mike Loso and Martin Truffer
43 from the University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

44
45 On the next page, number three, we're
46 excited for this project. It builds off of Frederica de
47 Laguna 1972 under Mount St. Elias and the parks 2015
48 Yakutat Tlingit ethnographic overview and assessment to
49 look at and document the places and resources that
50 connect Eyak and Yakutat Tlingit people to the Wrangell-

1 St. Elias coastline, a culturally and spiritually
2 significant environment and landscape. In fall 2023,
3 park staff met with the Yakutat Tlingit tribe and the
4 Native Village of Eyak staff to discuss project
5 logistics. And then, beginning this year, a team, me and
6 Barbara, as well as an archaeologist, will be working
7 with Eyak and Tlingit knowledge holders to gather
8 information to complete an ethnographic landscape study,
9 which will be used as a baseline document for park
10 management to understand coastal resources that might
11 be at risk of being lost due to climate warming and
12 glacial melt. In addition to National Park Service
13 staff, we anticipate working with Doug Deur from
14 Portland State University and likely Tom Thornton from
15 University of Alaska Southeast and the National Academy
16 of Sciences. So, we're really excited, it will involve
17 a lot of collaboration with Native Village of Eyak and
18 Yakutat Tlingit Tribe, and will involve site visits,
19 interviews and opportunities for knowledge transfer
20 between elders and youth and myself and Barbara
21 Cellarius are your contacts for that project. If you
22 would like to know more.

23
24 Number five is some wildlife research
25 that unfortunately didn't quite get done this fall. But
26 so, in early September, our park staff had planned on
27 collecting wolf scat to evaluate marine diet use along
28 a remote portion of the coast near the Esker Stream and
29 Grand Wash areas of the Malaspina Foreland area. Natural
30 resource staff from Wrangell-St. Elias and NPS Ocean
31 Alaska Science and Learning Center are interested in
32 evaluating wolf diets along the Malaspina Glacier
33 coastline. This work is in part of a larger project that
34 looks at wolf diets across multiple National Park units.
35 Unfortunately, because of weather and illness within the
36 field crew, surveys were postponed until next year in
37 2025, and that next field season, wolf surveys and wolf
38 scat samples will be collected for genetic analysis to
39 determine the type of species, as well as their primary
40 dietary sources, and then genetic analysis will be done
41 as well too. And for that one, your contacts are our
42 wildlife biologist Kyle Cutting and Kelsey Griffin from
43 the OASLC.

44
45 And then finally, we have quite a bit
46 of research going on in the Park. Generally, we have
47 about 20 to 30 projects a year, and we just listed a few
48 of those that are going on in the Yakutat area that you
49 can see there under number six. So, that is my report
50 and thank you so much for giving us the opportunity to

000147

1 present to you all. And if there are any questions, I'm
2 happy to answer and I'm sure Barbara is as well. So,
3 thank you.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
6 Amber. A lot going on up there in Wrangell-St. Elias. A
7 lot of good research. Any questions from the Council? I
8 guess not. Yeah. Thank you for sticking with us here
9 this evening. Enjoy the rest of it.

10

11 MS. COHEN: Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Scott Ayers from
14 the Office of Subsistence Management with an update.

15

16 MR. AYERS: Hi, it's good to see you all
17 again still, or at least some of you. I will do the
18 condensed version of this update for OSM. So, as always,
19 we start out with just saying thank you. We really
20 appreciate the amazing and tireless work that you all
21 do. It's been three very long days. I know just sitting
22 over there, it's been three very long days, and I'm not
23 the one having to make the decisions or work through
24 this discussion. So, we really, really, really
25 appreciate the work that you all do. All right. So,
26 first thing OSM was moved, I don't know if you all heard.
27 We used to be part of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and
28 we are now under the Office of the Assistant Secretary
29 of Policy, Management and Budget and that became
30 effective July 15th. Our responsibilities and functions
31 of administrative support to the Federal Subsistence
32 Board and the Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils
33 remains the same. We do have new email addresses, their
34 on our website. You have DeAnna, she can help get contact
35 with any of us if you have troubles with that. The main
36 subsistence email has changed, it's now
37 subsistence@ios.doi.gov.

38

39 The next item is that the wildlife
40 regulations have finally published. They were a little
41 slow this year in publication, but not nearly as slow
42 as the fish regulations that were supposed to publish
43 last year and just published earlier this year. So, we're
44 catching up. It's just taking a little bit of time. The
45 regulations went into effect on August 29th and
46 regulation booklets are available. There's even some in
47 the back of the room. A third item is that we're going
48 to be getting three new board members. They are going
49 to be public members, and they're going to be tribally
50 nominated. They don't have to be tribal citizens. They

1 just have to be nominated by tribes. Dear tribal
2 administrator letters went out, I believe, last week
3 with the announcement of this to all of the federally
4 recognized tribes across Alaska, letting them know of
5 the opportunity to nominate folks. They are hoping to
6 have people on the Board by the February fisheries
7 meeting. So, this is going to be a fast process, and
8 we're all looking forward to seeing how that's going to
9 work out. And if anyone has questions on how -- who to
10 contact about that, let me know and we can talk
11 afterward.

12
13 I have an update on deferred wildlife
14 proposal 24-01, which was the proposal to sell the hides
15 of brown bears. The Board deferred action on this in
16 their April meeting. The justification for deferring the
17 proposal was twofold. First, to allow time to explore
18 options for a federally qualified subsistence user to
19 obtain a permit allowing the sale of hide from Federal
20 agency, and then, secondly, to potentially establish a
21 work group to negotiate with the Alaska Department of
22 Fish and Game concerning the use of its permits to sell
23 a brown or grizzly bear hide and or skull. The updates
24 that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is not able
25 to permit the sale of brown bears on behalf of the
26 Federal Subsistence Management Program if the proposal
27 was passed as submitted as -- and as discussed by the
28 Board. In other words, they cannot sell permit -- they
29 cannot permit sale of brown bear hides taken in units
30 with one bear limits under Federal regulations. OSM is
31 therefore exploring opportunities for federally
32 qualified subsistence users to obtain permit from
33 Federal agency and we're going to update the Board on
34 this also at our February meeting. It's going to be a
35 busy meeting. As for staffing we've welcomed our new
36 acting director, Crystal Ciisquq Lionetti. She's going
37 to be acting with us until the end of November. In her
38 permanent position, she is the Alaska Native Affairs
39 Specialist at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and
40 the advertisement for that director position closed
41 earlier this month. We're hoping that it will be filled
42 soon. We've also had some other staff departures. Theo
43 Matuskowitz, who was our supervisory regulation
44 specialist and was with us for a very long time and was
45 a huge part of our program retired in July after 20
46 years of service. A familiar face to you all, Justin
47 Koller has been acting in that role recently. It has
48 also just been -- the recruitment for that one is
49 currently happening so, we're hoping to have that
50 position filled soon. Kayla McKinney, who was our

1 outreach coordinator has left earlier this year upon
2 moving to another State. She was doing double duty as
3 our outreach coordinator and our records management
4 Specialist. We're looking to fill those positions soon.
5 We got a lot of stuff in the hopper here. And then most
6 recently, our deputy director, Amy Howard, left Federal
7 service for a new job with the Aleut Corporation as
8 their director of lands and natural resources. This was
9 at the end of August. We wish her very well, but we're
10 really going to miss her. She was another huge part of
11 our program. Katya Wessels, who's here with us, has been
12 acting for the last month and a half and Brent Vickers,
13 also here with us, is going to be serving as our deputy
14 director for the next two months. And we're hoping to
15 have that position filled again soon. And the last item
16 quickly is a litigation update from you all. There was
17 the last update was to the Council's at the March 2024
18 all Council meeting. Since then, in the Kake emergency
19 hunt matter, which is Alaska Department of Fish and Game
20 v. the Federal Subsistence Board briefing is now in
21 progress before the Ninth Circuit Court. In the
22 Kuskokwim matter U.S. v. ADF&G, the District Court found
23 in favor of the U.S. on all claims and enjoined the
24 State from taking any further actions in violation of
25 Title 8 on the Kuskokwim River. The State has appealed,
26 and briefing has just recently commenced before the
27 Ninth Circuit Court.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
30 Scott. Any questions? Okay. Thank you very much. DeAnna,
31 you have a report on our 805C letter from the Board.

32
33 MS. PERRY: I do, Mr. Chair, and I think
34 myself and Katya will be tag-teaming in the next few
35 items just so we can change up our voices a little bit
36 and keep you all awake. For the record, this is DeAnna
37 Perry, Acting Council Coordinator. The Federal
38 Subsistence Board met and took action this past April,
39 the formal 805C report is in your meeting books starting
40 with the cover letter on page 213. As a reminder, the
41 805C report is a document generated from the Board
42 meeting. It provides details to each Regional Advisory
43 Council on the Board's actions with respect to that
44 region's specific proposals. The report attached to the
45 805C cover letter, details any actions taken by the Board
46 that differ from the Council's recommendations. You'll
47 see on this report the Board's reasonings for not
48 following the Council's recommendation on Wildlife
49 Proposal WP24-02. It was a proposal extending the
50 mountain goat season in Unit 1C within the drainages of

1 the Chilkat Range south to the south bank of Endicott
2 River, and those dates would be July 24th through
3 December 31st. Although the Council supported this
4 proposal with the OSM modification to sent -- to change
5 that season to begin July 15th instead of the 24th, the
6 Board adopted the proposal as originally written. It
7 found it was a compromise between providing a meaningful
8 preference for federally qualified subsistence users in
9 the area and conserving goat population. And just a side
10 note, I would again like to congratulate this Council
11 on the success of the three Unit 4 deer proposals. This
12 Council did put in an amazing amount of time on all the
13 proposals, all the different modifications through the
14 years. The meaningful priority statement that was born
15 out of that, and your Chair highlighted that at the
16 Board meeting, and the Board ended up adopting all three
17 proposals at its last meeting. So, congratulations,
18 because I know that was quite, quite a lot of work that
19 went into that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
22 DeAnna. And then something about applications. Katya,
23 wanna inform us on that.

24
25 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
26 members of the Council. We already spoke about that a
27 little bit. Usually, we open the application period in
28 September of each year, but this year we're trying to
29 change our processes to improve it. So, we're thinking
30 of opening the application period actually in January.
31 And it will be open for a period anywhere from 4 to 6
32 weeks. So, it will be a pretty short period when the
33 people can apply, but anyone can really apply now. It's
34 not like they cannot apply it now, but it's officially
35 going to be open like around January 2nd or something
36 like that. Several of you probably have your term
37 expiring next year so, I encourage you to apply, reapply
38 to continue serving on the Council and any kind of help
39 that you can give us -- the program to encourage
40 additional applications of the best possible people and
41 even younger people, because you only need to be 18 to
42 actually be appointed to serve on the Council. We would
43 be very happy if you can help us with that. Just as long
44 as everybody is so stoic as you are and can stay at the
45 meeting until after 6 pm, that's one of the requirements.
46 Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
49 Katya. Correspondents report. DeAnna.
50

1 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I'll try to make
2 this super quick. We do have to be out of our venue at
3 seven. And we have a lot of correspondents in the meeting
4 book. I know folks have taken a look at that, but I can
5 do a quick summary in case you all haven't gotten to
6 through the entire packet. Again, for the record, this
7 is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. This is a quick
8 summary of the correspondents that the Council's voted
9 to send since the winter meeting, and copies of these
10 letters are included in your meeting book. On page 216,
11 the first document contains the Council's comments on
12 the proposed rule to add three new public members to the
13 Federal Subsistence Board. Page 219 is the Council's
14 letter to the Board regarding its support for
15 compensation to Council members. We included letters
16 from other Councils as well, and you'll see that the
17 Board has elevated this letter to the Secretaries, per
18 your request, on July 29th and that letter is on page
19 252. Page 255 is the Council's letter to Admiralty Island
20 Ranger regarding concerns about the use of jet boats.
21 We have not received a response to that letter yet. Page
22 257 begins the letter to the Board regarding this
23 Council's concerns of the inadequacies of the
24 correspondence process. This letter, along with another
25 letter submitted jointly by six other Councils, was
26 elevated to the Secretaries on July 29th and a copy of
27 that letter is on page 260. Page 265 is the Council's
28 letter to the Board regarding the Fish and Wildlife
29 Services representative on the North Pacific Fisheries
30 Management Council. Page 269 is the Council's support
31 letter for the co-management of the Northern Sea otter.
32 The regional director of Fish and Wildlife Service has
33 responded to that letter, and that's on page 268 and
34 inform the Council that they were holding government to
35 government consultations with Tlingit & Haida on this
36 matter. Page 284 is the Council's request to the Board
37 for additional services and resources to conduct its
38 business, such as additional funding for Fisheries
39 Resource Monitoring program, the creation of a wildlife
40 resource monitoring program, and additional staffing and
41 resources to support an independent research and data
42 gathering program. I've also included a copy of some of
43 the other letters recently forwarded to the Secretaries
44 that the Council has requested previously, just letting
45 you know they're still going through the process and are
46 being elevated. Page 287 begins the package from the
47 Board that elevated the Council's concerns and requests
48 regarding transboundary mining issues and its potential
49 impacts to Southeast subsistence resources, and page 303
50 begins the package from the Board elevating bycatch and

000152

1 salmon management concerns of many Regional Advisory
2 Councils, including Southeast. And that's a quick wrap
3 up of the recent Council correspondence from this
4 Council. You guys have been really busy.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. A lot of
7 those letters, some of those letters were generated, I
8 guess, at our All Council meeting as well, so. Yeah. Any
9 questions?

10

11 (No response)

12

13 No. Thank you, DeAnna. And now somebody
14 wants to -- Katya, you want to tell us about the
15 declining balance cards that are in the works here?

16

17 MS. WESSELS: Okay. So, I'll try to be
18 really quick. Again, it's about improving the processes.
19 So, we are trying -- we -- it's just a proposal at this
20 point. We're trying to figure out how to streamline some
21 things in our office and one of the proposals that was
22 made by our budget people that we asked the Councils
23 what they think about if we will use the declining
24 balance cards to pay for your travel. And what it is,
25 it's sort of like a debit card. And right now you receive
26 the checks with a 60%, which is in advance of your travel
27 costs that you either cash or, you know, basically use
28 it for your needs and in the meeting. So, the declining
29 balance card will serve the same purpose. So, it will
30 have 60% of your travel money and then the rest of the
31 money will be deposited to your bank account after your
32 travel is completed. So, the -- and you will keep that
33 card. It's not like we're going to be bringing a new
34 card to you every time. One caveat here is that if we
35 decide to go with the declining balance cards, that you
36 will need to fill out the form where you provide such
37 things as your personal identifiable information like
38 your bank account and your Social Security number. So,
39 we just wanted to bring it to -- we're bringing it to
40 all Councils. It's nothing being decided. We just wanted
41 to see what kind of sentiment the Councils have about,
42 you know, us possibly going that way. And if there's a
43 lot of opposition, we're not going to do it. So, that's
44 a question to the Council. If anybody has any kind of a
45 strong feeling about that.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Would this be the
48 time to express those feelings? Okay. Council members
49 anybody have thoughts on that? Maybe not? Cal, there you
50 are.

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

MR. CASIPIT: Hate to drag this out, but you mentioned the declining balance card. But then our final payment would be deposited into our account. So, is that the account that's attached to the declining balance card, or is that my personal checking account?

MS. WESSELS: That's your personal checking account.

MR. CASIPIT: Okay. Okay. And so, the declining balance card is something else. And that's just -- okay.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody else with questions, comments, preferences? You like the idea? Maybe we're neutral. More Cal, go ahead.

MR. CASIPIT: I again, I don't want to beat this dead horse. But if you're if you can deposit my final payment into my account, why can't you just deposit my advance into my account?

MS. WESSELS: Well, I will have to ask our budget people that question. Maybe we actually can, but I'm not aware of that. There is, you know, some rules because you all are invitational travelers in, you know, eyes of the Government. So, there are some rules about, you know, how things can be done. And you know, like, I cannot answer that question. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Ted.

MR. SANDHOFER: Thanks. Thanks, Chairman. Yeah. My preference would just be to do it the way you're doing it. I'd just soon have a check, deposit it. You know, these cards are something that could be lost. Who knows? You might not use it. You know, you might go to pay something, and it's -- your card is not enough. So, then you got to come up with cash because your card is only so much. You know, I'd just as soon have a check, personally. That's just my take.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted. Anybody else? Mike. You like the check? Yeah. Okay. Duly noted. Anybody else? Yeah. I think I'd have to say that I'm probably more in favor of the checks. I can see a lot of problems with the cards getting lost, misplaced if they're not used regularly. They could be -- yeah.

1 Not be kept track of. So, that'll be my comment, John.

2

3 MR. SMITH: I like the check too. But
4 whatever makes it easier for you folks I think is the
5 best.

6

7 MS. WESSELS: Well, thank you. I feel
8 like it's not necessarily what makes it easier for us.
9 We just want to work for the Councils as well. We're
10 looking for improvement of the processes, but it's you
11 know, if the other method works better, that's fine with
12 us.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Frank.

15

16 MR. WRIGHT: Don't fix it when it's not
17 broke. Gunalchéesh.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
20 Frank. Anybody else? Okay. Did you get enough Katya
21 for...?

22

23 MS. WESSELS: Definitely. Thank you so
24 much for your feedback.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Partners
27 Monitoring. Scott Ayers again.

28

29 MR. AYERS: Hello, Council. We have a
30 call for proposals that will be coming out between this
31 meeting and the Council's winter meeting, seeking
32 applications for the partners for fisheries monitoring
33 program. We have that call every two years now. It used
34 to be once every four years. We split it up similar to
35 how we do the FRMP, where we have half of the proposals
36 coming in one cycle and the other half coming in the
37 other cycle. It's for up to four years' worth of funding.
38 And that is the end of my presentation on this, unless
39 anyone has questions.

40

41 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any questions on
42 that? Just a slight change there in the program. Okay.
43 One more item, and Katya, I'll call you back for that.
44 I think you have something to present. There it is.

45

46 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Members of the Council, it is my pleasure to present the
48 20-year award to one of your most esteemed members, Frank
49 Wright.

50

1 (Pause)

2
3 Yeah. While DeAnna is looking for his
4 bio, I'm just going to say a couple of words. Just,
5 Frank, I knew your name before I ever met you. Because
6 every time you would reapply to serve on the Council, I
7 will send your name forward in the packet to the
8 Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to get you
9 approved for the next term and every time you got
10 approved. So, you know, it's very impressive. 20 years
11 of service on the Council. That's a lot of work, a lot
12 of dedicated work. So, we really, really appreciate it.
13 The program appreciates it. The users in your region
14 appreciate it. And you know you're an example for other
15 Council members. So, thank you so much. And you didn't
16 have a chance to go to the All Council meeting where you
17 would have received that award from the Chair of the
18 Board, Anthony Christianson. But so, I'm a poor
19 substitute for Tony, but nevertheless, DeAnna, did you
20 have a chance to find it?

21
22 MS. PERRY: I have not been able to find
23 my updated one. I think I archived it with All Council
24 member information so, I apologize. I've kind of got a
25 few windows open and I haven't been able to find it yet,
26 but Frank has been one of our gurus on the rules --
27 Robert's Rules of Procedure, and you're one of the most
28 active Secretaries, I think, of all 10 Regional Advisory
29 Councils, and I've actually learned a lot from you. You
30 keep us straight and so, just for that in particular, I
31 wanted to thank you. And yeah, your years of service,
32 you keep us grounded. You help us with the new Council
33 members. They all want to be you, and they grow up. And
34 anyway, thank you very much for your service, Frank.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And that
37 concludes our business for this meeting. But we do have
38 an opportunity here. They're not ready to kick us out
39 quite yet to, you know, ask for some closing comments.
40 And of course, we cannot get away from this meeting
41 without also recognizing Cathy Needham for all of her
42 years of service. She got her service award up in
43 Anchorage. But, you know, just I think, you know, coming
44 from this Council, we also want to thank her so much and
45 she will be very much missed. Your input has just been
46 invaluable to this Council. That's all I can say. I
47 don't know, and you know, as you have your time here,
48 as the Vice Chair, I mean, it's just been so helpful to
49 me. I, you know, look to you for assistance and advice
50 and help and you know, you run the meetings, and you go

1 to the Board meetings. And I don't think I could have
2 stayed in as the Chairman if I didn't have you as Vice
3 Chair. So, I'm really appreciative of that. And yeah. I
4 don't want you to feel bad about leaving the Council,
5 as invaluable as you have been. I'm sure we can find
6 other people that can fill this seat as well, so. Yeah.
7 Don't worry about us, if you were at all. No need. So,
8 thank you again. Yeah. Yeah. Anybody else with closing
9 comments? Yeah. Go ahead, John.

10
11 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I just want to echo
12 what you said and I learned quite a bit. I remember you
13 guys putting me up front on the seat and we went to the
14 Federal building, and you guys coached me through what
15 was going to happen when I sat up front. So, I really
16 appreciate that and George Pappas and there was another
17 gentleman, too, but DeAnna Perry. I know my term's coming
18 up you know, here, and I don't know exactly what date
19 it's up, but I did reapply. So, I really appreciate even
20 if I don't come back, I'm going to come and sit at the
21 seat and keep focused on, you know, the future of our
22 grandchildren. But I just want to say to all of you
23 folks here in the building that I learned a lot from
24 every one of you. And I still have lots to learn. You
25 know, I'm not much of a politician, but definitely
26 appreciate watching you guys all at work. And, Don, I
27 appreciate you putting up with me.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John,
30 you may not be a politician, but you certainly are a
31 good public speaker. Anybody else? Larry.

32
33 MR. BEMIS: I'm sorry I missed the fall
34 meeting. It would have put me in a little better frame
35 for what we come to hear. But medical things are going
36 to finally come to an end. I no longer have to go to
37 Anchorage for checkups every three months. And I will
38 do a six month in a virtual, and the things are looking
39 pretty good. But I want to thank you for having me here.
40 And I'm learning as I go and I am passionate about what
41 I do and believe in. I live as subsistence as he possibly
42 can. I fish, I hunt, two thirds of the time on the water,
43 and the other third trying to sleep or go in the woods,
44 but I'm glad to be here and work with you. And I enjoy
45 learning all the procedures and knowing how to get things
46 done in the manner that was set forth for us. Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
49 Larry. Mike.

1 MR. DOUVILLE: I want to thank Cathy for
2 being my -- one of my go to people for advice and, you
3 know, get to discuss things and figure things out before
4 meetings and -- or in between meetings. We always have
5 a lot of issues, Unit 2 is always on the hot seat. The
6 only other thing -- one of my other concerns is that I
7 would like to see a Federal biologist on in Unit 2. We
8 haven't had one for a while and I think it deserves one.
9 There's a lot of things going on there. But Don is the
10 other person I do have conversations with occasionally.
11 And I appreciate conversations with you all.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank
14 you, Mike. John, go ahead.

15
16 MR. SMITH: Sorry, I forgot some folks.
17 The OSM, Fish and Game, Forest Service, I love you guys.
18 I just want to share, in my term of watching the teamwork
19 that I've seen and how you guys work and help the team,
20 I really appreciate you guys. Every one of you. You guys
21 are family, really, truly. Gunalchéesh.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John,
24 for that. Anybody else? Albert?

25
26 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One
27 thing I forgot when we were doing and I forgot it again.
28 So, anyway, I for sure wanted to get that on record that
29 I appreciate everything I learned from Cathy. I don't
30 know if you guys remember my first meeting, but I came
31 out swinging at the air until you guys taught me the
32 process. And that's the honest truth. I -- you know, it
33 must have been fun to watch because I didn't know what
34 I was here for, but by golly, I was pissed off about
35 something. And through this whole process, I learned
36 everything from Cathy and Patricia. And I know you guys
37 are upset with me today for, you know, and I'm used to
38 that kind of a thing, but I -- everyone around this
39 table I -- when I make friends, it's for life. And that's
40 how I'm going to look at you from now on as a friend and
41 everyone around this table. Same thing with OSM. I kind
42 of missed the other guys. There were a lot of fun, but
43 we're working with what we're left with. Oh, that's what
44 it is, Mr. Chair. Getting them funding. I think we need
45 to push that into the forefront because we need them to
46 do their jobs to help us. But they can't do it without
47 the funding they need. So, that was what I missed on --
48 our Annual Report. So, again, Cathy, thank you for
49 everything you taught me. Sometimes you probably don't
50 realize just your conversation you're having and the way

000158

1 you're dealing with proposals. I'm sitting here
2 listening and learning. So, I don't make a fool out of
3 myself like I did at the first meeting. But there's no
4 guarantee I won't do that, though. So, thank you, Mr.
5 Chair.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
8 Albert. Ted. Go ahead.

9

10 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Thanks, Don. Hey,
11 you know, I'm the. I know I'm the newest member of the
12 group, and I really appreciate Cathy. I mean, she's top
13 notch. You know, I hope to see you around. I'm sure we
14 will. And I thank all of you for kind of teaching me the
15 ropes a little bit, and I got a lot to learn. And you
16 know, this is just my second meeting. The first one was
17 kind of condensed so, I'm getting there, and I hope,
18 hope that you keep helping me. And definitely thanks to
19 all the staff. You know, it's been real helpful. So,
20 thanks.

21

22 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
23 Let's see. Anybody else? Frank, yes.

24

25 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I look
26 at you and I say, it's good to have you here because
27 you're emotional about what going on in this with us You
28 know so, when you speak and you are very emotional about
29 what's going on and what you want to accomplish, it's a
30 big deal. Makes it even more fun. So, you know, for me
31 being here, I look forward to being here. I always look
32 for what we are going to do to help this world? You
33 know, what are we going to do to help our people? What
34 are we going to do to help the communities? And
35 everything we do is for the benefit of all of us. Not
36 only the Southeast Alaska, but this world. So,
37 gunalchéesh Cathy, I don't know what I'm going to say,
38 nice about you. But anyway, I'm going to miss you. So,
39 good luck and have fun whatever you're going to do.
40 Gunalchéesh. Thank you everyone for being here.

41

42

43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
44 Frank. See anybody else? Closing comments. Cathy, did
45 you want to -- were you getting ready to say something?

46

47 MS. NEEDHAM: Well, I was just going to
48 say háw'aa for all the kind words and -- talk about
49 emotional. Albert, I don't get upset with you. You
50 represent subsistence users in this region, and that's

1 important. And it's a voice. So, if you've ever felt
2 like I was upset with what you said, I apologize if I
3 did anything to do that, but keep doing what you're
4 doing. You are a voice, and you represent subsistence
5 users, a contingent of subsistence users that we can't
6 always hear from. So, please keep doing that. I think
7 subsistence users in this region are in good hands. So,
8 you guys keep doing the great job you're doing. Thank
9 you for all the staff, the students, the gentleman that's
10 been here the whole time and I didn't get a chance to
11 meet, but he's here till the bitter end. And DeAnna, I
12 appreciate you and all the work that you do for this
13 Council. And thank you.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
16 Cathy. Cal.

17
18 MR. CASIPIT: I'm tearing up. I try not
19 to get emotional. I try to stay even keeled and --
20 Albert, you -- I get so much from listening to you and
21 hearing from your -- hearing your perspective. I really
22 appreciate it. And don't ever think that me or anybody
23 else resents anything about what you say. You say
24 important things when they need to be said so, I would
25 encourage you to keep, you know, keep letting us know
26 what you think. And I will say, I try not to get
27 emotional, but, you know, earlier this week, I -- I have
28 to say this. One of Heather's young students that was
29 here, I remember, I think it was Frank that asked her,
30 you know, do you miss home? Do you miss your life at
31 home? You know, being in -- being at Mount Edgecumbe.
32 She said, I have to do this for my community. I have to
33 do this for my people. And for her to say that, such a
34 young person to say that at the table and realize that,
35 you know, she's trying to help her people and she's
36 making a personal sacrifice to help her people. And she's
37 so young, so young. And I just -- I wish she was here.
38 I said, but yeah...

39
40 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Was that Naomi?

41
42 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, Naomi. And anyway,
43 if you could pass that on to her, I -- I really got
44 choked up when she said that. But anyway, that's all I
45 have. Thank you, guys.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
48 Back to Albert.

49
50

1 MR. HOWARD: One last one, Mr. Chair. I
2 realize that a lot of this wouldn't happen without all
3 the effort DeAnna puts into making it happen, and I want
4 to express my appreciation for all your hard work. And,
5 Mr. Chairman, you gave me ten minutes for three days,
6 so I timed it.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Doing good,
9 doing good, Albert. I just, you know, I just want to,
10 you know, compliment this Council. I mean, this was a
11 really tough meeting. We knew it was going to be. And
12 man, I'll tell you that you just did some really great
13 work. I mean, I came into this meeting just really
14 worried about how it was going to go. And, you know, I
15 asked a few things of you to kind of make it go better.
16 And you responded, and I just couldn't be happier with
17 the outcome. I mean, I think we can all just be really
18 proud of, you know, what we accomplished at this meeting.
19 So, and the way that we went about it, it was all very
20 respectful and a lot of emotional testimony. And -- but
21 you know, it was all well taken. No -- yeah. As difficult
22 as the issue was -- the main issue there, he just handled
23 it, you know, really well. And I'm just I just couldn't
24 be happier with that. So, I appreciate it. And with
25 that, I think I can ask for a motion to adjourn. Correct.
26 We need a motion to adjourn. Cathy.

27
28 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I move to
29 adjourn.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Do we have
32 a second?

33
34 MR. HOWARD: Second.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Meeting
37 adjourned!

38
39 (Off record)

40
41 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Rafael Morel, for Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 160 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III recorded on the 24th day of October;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Isabela, Puerto Rico this 3rd day of December 2024.

Rafael Morel
Chief Project Manager