

0408

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

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

REGULATORY MEETING

VOLUME IV

EGAN CONVENTION CENTER
Anchorage, Alaska
February 3, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Anthony Christianson, Chairman
Charles Brower, Public Member
Rhonda Pitka, Public Member
Jill Klein, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service
Steve Cohn, Bureau of Land Management
Glenn Chen, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Greg Risdahl, U.S. Forest Service

Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

Recorded and transcribed by:
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
329 F Street, Suite 222
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-227-5312; sahile@gci.net

0409

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

(Anchorage, Alaska - 2/3/2023)

(On record - 9:07 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning everybody, welcome to the final day of the Federal Subsistence Board meeting and welcome everybody here. I'm Anthony Christianson for the record and we'll go ahead and open it up for Sue to do roll call.

Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Starting with Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Glenn Chen.

MR. CHEN: Present.

MS. DETWILER: Bureau of Land
Management, Steve Cohn.

MR. COHN: Present.

MS. DETWILER: Fish and Wildlife
Service.

MS. KLEIN: Jill Klein sitting in for
Sara Boario, present.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. National
Park Service.

MS. PATTON: Eva Patton sitting in for
Sarah Creachbaum. She'll be here around 9:30 or so.
Thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Dave Schmid
-- or I'm sorry, U.S. Forest Service.

MR. RISDAHL: Good morning, this is
Greg Risdahl sitting in for Dave today.

MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda
Pitka.

MS. PITKA: Here.

0410

1 MS. DETWILER: Rhonda Pitka is here.

2

3 Public Member Charlie Brower, online.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 MS. DETWILER: And Chair Anthony

8 Christianson.

9

10 MR. BROWER: I'm here.

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Present. I

13 heard Charlie on there.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Oh, Charlie's on, okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Charlie, that

18 was you I heard you?

19

20 MR. BROWER: Yeah, I tried to give my
21 proxy to Rhonda because I have an engagement here
22 pretty soon for about an hour so I just want to pass it
23 on.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
26 letting us know that on the record, Charlie. Thank
27 you.

28

29 MR. BROWER: Thank you.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: You have a quorum, Mr.

32 Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At
35 this time we've established a quorum and we also have
36 our Regional Advisory Council Chairs here and the State
37 so we'll go ahead and get started this morning with --
38 each day we take testimony on non-agenda items so at
39 this time it's an opportunity for the public to engage
40 with the Board on non-agenda items. So this is your
41 opportunity and we do have a blue card here so we'll
42 call on Chris Price first.

43

44 MR. PRICE: Good morning. I want to
45 thank everyone for yesterday's presentations and all
46 the work you guys put in this week.

47

48 Just a few things I thought we might
49 have missed yesterday when we were talking about salmon

50

0411

1 bycatch for chum and kings was that the halibut and
2 crab bycatch is also an important subsistence resource
3 in our -- in Unalaska and we'd like to make it, you
4 know, for the record, that we have concerns about how
5 the bycatch and crab bycatch, especially in our small
6 region. Again, I represent Unalaska. I'm representing
7 myself today but, of course, I wear some other hats as
8 well. But, again, thank you.

9
10 One other thing I wanted to point out
11 about Unalaska, we are in Area M but we do not have any
12 commercial fishermen that fish salmon in Unalaska. So
13 I just want to -- it's pretty complex, it's a huge --
14 the Aleutians Islands are an immense landscape
15 geography so not every community is going to be the
16 same.

17
18 Unalaska, the small boat fishermen, or
19 the Native population were left out of the CDQ program,
20 so many people don't know that. They think CDQ
21 represented every community in the Bering Sea, Unalaska
22 was left out, so not a lot of people know that.

23
24 And so one thing I wanted to say about
25 yesterday's report, it was really good, it was really
26 fast, she got a lot done in a short amount of time but
27 it was really small print, it was hard to read a lot of
28 those slides and I hope we can get copies of all those
29 slides in that presentation, somewhere online to look
30 at a little bit better. And then a bit of confusion,
31 is these overlapping management regimes in the Federal
32 entities and State entities that are responsible in the
33 Bering Sea and it's a bit confusing who has all the
34 authorities to manage that and so my question for you
35 guys would be, based on what we learned yesterday, does
36 this Board have authority to act on behalf of
37 subsistence that are being impacted by the Bering Sea
38 fisheries that are managed under NOAA. I'm not sure, I
39 don't know if you guys know either, but that's
40 something I'd really like to help understand for some
41 of the users.

42
43 This is a great learning opportunity.
44 I really want to let these youth and young people who
45 came to testify, I want to tell you guys are doing a
46 fantastic job, this is going to be important for you
47 guys to learn all this. It's a lot of work, a lot of
48 commitment but you should be commended for taking time
49 to be here and your teachers and your school supporting
50

0412

1 you.

2

3

Just a couple more things here.

4

5

The regional travel by the Regional
Advisory Council is super important, we really
appreciate when you guys come out in to the communities
and spend time with us, learn about our communities,
it's really been good for Unalaska. I got to travel to
Kodiak, Cold Bay, and looking forward to other
communities in our region to get to visit and hear what
they have to say. It's been really important for us.

13

14

15

16

So that's about all I have this morning
and, again, I just want to say thanks to everybody for
what you're doing this week.

17

18

19

Thank you.

20

21

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Chris. Any questions or comments.

22

23

(No comments)

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Chris, I
just wanted to say when we do take testimony here and
we take the non-agenda items, we compile a list and if
there are various concerns at this level we do try to
forward letters to appropriate agencies or to the
Secretary so thank you for that, that's if it's outside
the purview of this Board.

32

33

34

We'll call on John Simon.

35

36

MS. DETWILER: Jim.

37

38

39

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, Jim. Jim,
sorry.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

MR. SIMON: Yeah, thank you very much.
For the record my name is Jim Simon, I'm a consultant
with the Kuskokwim InterTribal Fish Commission but I'm
just giving my personal testimony and what I would like
to do is read to you some from the 2022 Kuskokwim River
InterTribal Fish Commission situation report.

47

48

49

50

So the Coastal Western Alaska chum
salmon genetic stock grouping includes the Kuskokwim,
Yukon, Norton Sound, Kotzebue and Bristol Bay regions,

1 which at this time cannot be genetically differentiated
2 based on genetic analysis of samples from the
3 commercial salmon fishery in the South Alaska Peninsula
4 during the 2007 to 2009, WASSIP showed that Coastal
5 Western Alaska stocks comprised on average of 57
6 percent of the chum salmon harvested. This agreed well
7 with the average of 57 percent observed in the June
8 1993 to 1994 by Seeb&Crane 1999, one the other studies
9 cited are Monroe, et al., 2012, Foster&Dan 2022. These
10 analysis of stocks of origin conducted 14 years apart
11 suggest considerable stability in the proportion of
12 Coastal Western Alaska chum salmon in the South Alaska
13 Peninsula commercial intercept fishery during the
14 period 1993 to 2007.

15
16 The rationale for assuming Coastal
17 Western Alaska chum salmon currently continue to
18 comprise the majority of the Area M June chum salmon
19 harvest is based on the evidence that Kuskokwim salmon
20 stocks which rear in the Gulf of Alaska must pass
21 through the Area M region making them highly vulnerable
22 to harvest regardless of their total abundance.

23
24 It's important to note that these
25 studies are based on sampling of chum salmon after they
26 have been caught at sea and then delivered to the
27 processor. There is significant uncertainty in the
28 number of chum salmon that are landed, discarded or
29 released or not reported in the Area M fishery. Chum
30 salmon caught and released, rather than harvested by
31 these commercial vessels are highly unlikely to survive
32 and thus will not return to their natal streams to
33 spawn. Impact rates based on documented harvest and
34 genetic studies are therefore conservative estimates at
35 best.

36
37 The WASSIP findings at the time showed
38 that despite the large proportion of chum in the Area M
39 fishery in 2007 to 2009 the harvest rate on Coastal
40 Western Alaska chum salmon was fairly small compared to
41 the total returns in their rivers of origin. That's
42 Monroe, et al., 2012. With current declines in AYK
43 rivers the impact is clearly more pronounced. Based on
44 our estimate of the likely number of coastal Western
45 Alaska chum salmon harvested in the commercial salmon
46 fisheries during the month of June from 1980 to 2021,
47 the harvest of Kuskokwim and other AYK region chum
48 salmon stocks in this intercept fishery in recent years
49 has been massive.

0414

1 In 2021 alone an estimated 690,000 chum
2 salmon bound for Western Alaska rivers were harvested
3 in the June South Alaska Peninsula. With a preliminary
4 2022 chum salmon harvest of over 544,000 fish a
5 combined total of nearly one million Coastal Western
6 Alaska chum salmon were harvested in this commercial
7 fishery between 2021 and 2022. For comparison, that is
8 larger than the total combined estimated chum salmon
9 in-shore returns or the harvest escapement in-river of
10 the total years run size in 2021 to both the Yukon and
11 Kuskokwim Rivers.

12
13 So in 2020, the Area M chum harvest of
14 Coastal Western Alaska was about 290,000 fish whereas
15 the chum harvested in the Bering Sea bycatch was 30,000
16 in 2020.

17
18 In 2021, there was 690,000 in the Area
19 M chum harvest from Coastal Western Alaska and about
20 51,000 from the Bering Sea bycatch.

21
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jim.
25 Any questions from the Board.

26
27 Jill.

28
29 MS. KLEIN: Thank you. Thanks, Jim,
30 for sharing that information. I know you said you're
31 up here doing personal testimony but yet reading from
32 the Kuskokwim River InterTribal Fisheries Commission
33 situation report, and I wanted to know if you could
34 share any information, if you have any, on the efforts
35 of the fish commission or other stakeholders to address
36 the issues that you just shared. If it's the Area M
37 fisheries and the relationship to Western Alaska
38 rivers, yeah, if there's any updates you could share
39 with the Board that may be helpful.

40
41 MR. SIMON: Yeah, thank you for the
42 question, Jill. The Kuskokwim River InterTribal Fish
43 Commission and the Tanana Chiefs Conference,
44 Association of Village Council Presidents, Bristol Bay
45 Native Association and a total of 15 organizations have
46 been meeting for the past six months, have had two
47 meetings with the Governor to discuss these issues of
48 concern, and, of course, as you know later this month
49 there is the Alaska Board of Fisheries meeting dealing
50

0415

1 with the Alaska Peninsula issues.

2

3

4 And the concern is that this
5 interception of Coastal Western Alaska bound chum
6 salmon are being intercepted, fished, commercially, and
7 sold when chum salmon subsistence fishing is entirely
8 closed on the Yukon River, we're not meeting
9 escapement goals, nor are we meeting our Treaty
10 obligations to Canada and so the Federal subsistence
11 priority is at play, the State subsistence priority is
12 at play as well as Pacific Salmon Treaty is in play and
13 so there is an expectation by many of the 100-and some
14 odd thousand residents of the Arctic, Yukon, Kuskokwim
15 region as well as residents in Bristol Bay to see this
16 addressed and mitigated in order to ensure the
17 sustainable management of these salmon fisheries as
18 well as the State and Federal subsistence priorities
19 implemented rather than the continued priority placed
20 on commercial sales of our natural resources.

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

And, you know, the relevance here is in part due to Fish and Wildlife Service having a non-voting seat on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, you know, the State of Alaska represented at the table here at this meeting and there are lots of discussions, you know, and confusion among the public between interception versus bycatch and a lot of attention focused at like we had the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council here yesterday, where with the statistics that I've just shared with you, there's another big problem here and there are -- you know I have had conversations during this meeting with the southern fisheries division in Fish and Wildlife Service, Jonathan Gerken, you know, there's a lot of concerns and there is impacts that both the Federal Subsistence Program and the State of Alaska must address.

Thank you.

I hope that answers your question.

MS. KLEIN: Yes, thank you. And it does get into the earlier testimony we heard too, just the question about jurisdiction and, you know, what this Board can do. Yesterday we heard from Dr. Stram, her reference to State jurisdiction where something was outside of the Council's jurisdiction but yet we have a migratory salmon cycle going between multiple

0416

1 jurisdictions and how do we best address that.

2

3 MR. SIMON: Yeah, thank you. That's a
4 very good point. And I think one of the things that we
5 can all benefit is understanding an indigenous point of
6 view and the tribal stewardship principles of caring
7 for these salmon from gravel to gravel, throughout
8 their life phase and to stop utilizing bureaucratic
9 silos to disregard the proper stewardship of our salmon
10 resources.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jim.
15 Any other questions.

16

17 MR. COHN: Mr. Chair.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Steve.

20

21 MR. COHN: Thank you, Jim, for your
22 testimony. I'm curious, from your perspective, what
23 role do you potentially see for this Board?

24

25 MR. SIMON: It's a good question and
26 these bureaucratic silos of jurisdiction are, you know,
27 part of the problem and I don't know how any particular
28 entity can solve those problems. You know, we do know
29 that at least some members of our Congressional
30 Delegation are aware of these problems. We know, you
31 know, that some of the negotiations that we've had with
32 some of your agencies, you know, are prioritizing this
33 gravel to gravel perspective of stewardship principles
34 and efforts to better incorporate indigenous
35 stewardship principles into fulfilling our obligations
36 as Alaskans to steward these resources that are owned
37 by the Alaskan people and I think that just as we've
38 seen, you know, Brian Newland the Assistant Secretary
39 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, you know, sends
40 letters to the North Pacific Fisheries Management
41 Council regarding, you know, initiating tribal
42 consultation. You know it's been decades since tribal
43 consultation has been required by the Federal
44 government, and it's been nice to see that that's
45 actually started to happen in the Department of
46 Commerce in the past year.

47

48 So I think the Federal Subsistence
49 Board, you know, can continue to engage and address the

50

0417

1 fact that you are being required to not provide a
2 subsistence priority for Federally-qualified users and
3 yet there are still fish being discarded in the Bering
4 Sea. There are other tools available to your agencies
5 with respect to extraterritorial jurisdiction
6 petitions, et cetera, that should -- we should all
7 start thinking about as to how we might approach fixing
8 this problem and ensuring that escapement goals are
9 being met and subsistence priority uses are provided.
10 And to stop selling these fish in the absence of
11 escapement goals and subsistence needs being provided
12 for.

13

14 MR. COHN: Great, thank you very much.

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jim.
17 Any other public wish to testify this morning on non-
18 agenda items, this is your opportunity.

19

20 You have the floor.

21

22 MR. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Federal Subsistence Board. For the record my name is
24 Keenan Sanderson. I come from Ketchikan from the
25 traditional homelands of the Saanya Kwaan and Taanta
26 Kwaan, I want to thank them and their home and land
27 owners for growing me up in such a beautiful place in
28 southern Southeast Alaska.

29

30 I am wearing my Ketchikan Tlingit and
31 Haida Community Council hat on this morning, and I
32 wanted to discuss something that I heard during the
33 North Pacific update and specifically during one of the
34 comments from another public testifier.

35

36 I won't mention any names, I'm not here
37 to start any arguments with anybody, I will be as
38 respectful as I can be, however, I did take a little
39 bit of issue with one of the comments that was made and
40 I don't want the rest of the public to be completely
41 swayed by this, I don't necessarily think what they --
42 this individual said was completely accurate. I'll
43 essentially summarize what was said and if I was wrong
44 I'll totally own up to that but this is kind of how I
45 interpreted what was said.

46

47 It was basically that the problem with
48 Western Alaska chum and king salmon is basically not at
49 the fault of any of the commercial fisheries, whether
50

0418

1 that be State or Federal operated -- or managed Okay.
2 and we need to completely focus all of our energy in
3 addressing environmental issues, whether that's in the
4 ocean or within the watersheds where our salmon are
5 going about their life history. And while I definitely
6 think that it is a major factor on determining, you
7 know, mortality rates at different parts of their life
8 stages, that is not the only issue that we have here.
9 And to be quite honest, none of the Federal manager --
10 or none of the mangers, whether it's the State or
11 Federal level has jurisdiction to change at a snap of a
12 finger on environmental conditions. That is something
13 that the Federal Subsistence Board can't control, the
14 North Pacific can't control, Fish and Game, Board of
15 Fish -- excuse me -- Board of Fish, Board of Game,
16 Pacific Halibut Commission, they don't have the
17 authority to make big regulatory changes to reduce
18 fossil fuel emissions, to cut down on, you know, big
19 infrastructures that could potentially change watershed
20 dynamics, you know, that is not the jurisdiction of
21 what you guys can control. You guys can provide input
22 but that's on our Legislators to do.

23

24 And to basically say that there's no --
25 that you guys have the obligation to do that and not to
26 -- you guys don't control the North Pacific obviously,
27 but to basically -- well, there was a lot of shift of
28 blame on that and I didn't take -- I didn't like that
29 at all.

30

31 Maximum sustainable yield is not
32 something that stays constant through time. All sorts
33 of different things change that, food availability,
34 water temperature, ocean acidification, all sorts of
35 different environmental factors, you know, stuff like
36 prey availability, it's just -- any type of fishing,
37 whether it's the State -- or excuse me, the commercial,
38 subsistence or sport of whatever, it cannot stay
39 consistent through time because it is a changing
40 maximum sustainable yield.

41

42 And when fish populations are down
43 commercial fisheries should have to deal with lower
44 harvest -- or total allowable catches.

45

46 I don't know, I'm kind of a little
47 frustrated with this concept because it basically --
48 there's not a lot we can do especially on a quick
49 timeframe when people in Western Alaska are struggling
50

0419

1 to, you know, survive. Environmental conditions can't
2 be changed overnight, however fish regulation and
3 allowable catch can.

4

5 So I just wanted to express my concern
6 with the comment, that's how I interpreted it anyways,
7 and if I interpreted it wrong I apologize. But that is
8 what I wanted to bring today and happy to have more
9 conversations about that in the future but there's got
10 to be some accountability outside of just environmental
11 conditions so.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
14 Keenan. Any questions for Keenan. Comments.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, I
19 appreciate that. This is the place to talk about it.

20

21 Anybody else in the room who would like
22 to be recognized at this time this is your opportunity.

23

24 SAVANNAH: I thank you for giving me
25 this opportunity to speak this morning. For the record
26 my legal name is Oliver but as I am presented today I
27 would like to be identified as Savannah. Not only is
28 this my first Federal Subsistence Board meeting but
29 this is also one of my first times pushing myself
30 publicly and socially.

31

32 Nevertheless, as part of one of my
33 assignments for the fishery policy practicum class for
34 UAS I'm required to get a minimum of 10 people for a
35 contact list as well as some interviews in relation to
36 any subsistence uses and how you are involved in this
37 process. However, I don't just want a regular contact
38 list for my class, I would like to be able to have a
39 conversation with some of you in regard to some open
40 job or career opportunities in relation to any type of
41 field work, research projects, data collection or
42 anything related to being outdoors because I enjoy the
43 outdoors and what nature has to offer us and I'd like
44 to help preserve that for our future generations and
45 hopefully assist with future meetings such as this with
46 biological components.

47

48 On the other hand, I would like to talk
49 to some of you about visiting the various regions

50

0420

1 around Alaska in hopes of learning your concerns, ways
2 of life, language, cultural, whether it is Athabascan,
3 Yup'ik, Aleut, Alutiiq, Tlingit, Haida or Tsimshian,
4 but most importantly for me is my own culture language
5 and way of life which is Inupiat, something that has
6 been mostly absent for me in my life because as soon as
7 I was born in Nome I was adopted so I hardly know
8 anything about my biological family and even though my
9 adopted dad is from Unalakleet, he was put in a foster
10 home at a younger age than me in Seattle, not only that
11 but he has also suffered from past trauma of being
12 oppressed as well as other trauma that has torn us
13 apart from our culture and our family. So I haven't
14 had anyone in my family teach me about my culture, way
15 of life, or language so it's been difficult for me to
16 find a direction to start in.

17

18 So if you can have a conversation with
19 me some time today before I head back to Sitka about
20 job or career opportunities as well as learning your
21 concerns, way of life, culture and language that would
22 be great.

23

24 And, again, I would like to thank you
25 for giving me the opportunity to speak today and I
26 greatly appreciate the amount of work you guys put into
27 this.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

30

31 (Applause)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I know from
34 Southeast they're doing ANILCA hire.

35

36 (Laughter)

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And so if you
39 want to take a plug there, I know Dave's not here but I
40 know that's a program they have down in Southeast and
41 with the way you articulate yourself I think they'd be
42 looking for people like you with a passion for resource
43 management.

44

45 MR. COHN: Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Steve.

48

49 MR. COHN: Thank you for sharing that.

50

0421

1 And also, Keenan, thank you yesterday for talking about
2 the -- just the question around opportunities for youth
3 and particularly youth that are interested in natural
4 resource careers. The Department of Interior has a
5 direct hire authority. The Park Service has been
6 really at the forefront of utilizing that authority but
7 I think all of us, in our respective agencies, are
8 quite interested in seeing how we can expand on that
9 and we've also been considering how we might partner
10 with organizations and programs like ANSEP to really
11 try to increase our ability to reach out to youth
12 around the state and, particularly, Alaska Native
13 Science Engineering Professional youth who are
14 interested in potentially pursuing Federal careers.

15
16 So just want to share that that's
17 something we are exploring how we can, I would say,
18 greater institutionalize, the opportunity that we have
19 with that direct hire authority and begin to really
20 grow our programs and our outreach and our ability to
21 draw from Alaska's future resource managers in a more
22 proactive way.

23
24 So thank you for sharing that.

25
26 MS. CREACHBAUM: Keenan, I look forward
27 to speaking with you later today. I think the National
28 Park Service may have some opportunities here in
29 Anchorage and in Nome.

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think we're
32 talking to Savannah.

33
34 MS. CREACHBAUM: Oh, my apologies. My
35 apologies, Savannah.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board
38 members have opportunity for the youth to engage in, or
39 jobs they need to fill. This is your opportunity to
40 recruit.

41
42 (Laughter)

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We're also
45 taking a plug for RAC nominations, was that yesterday?

46
47 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So there you
50

0422

1 go, there's also a RAC nomination period open which is
2 as long as you're an adult and a represented position
3 you have an opportunity. Oh, yeah, and the RAC is,
4 these people you see sitting around here are the
5 Regional Advisory Council Chairs who are volunteers and
6 let's remember they do it because they love to and
7 they're not paid so you got to watch out what you ask
8 for too.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
13 public like to speak at this time on non-agenda items
14 you can be recognized at this time.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is
19 there anybody online at this time who would like to
20 speak to non-consensus agenda items, this is their
21 opportunity.

22

23 OPERATOR: Thank you. If you would
24 like to make a comment at this time, please press star,
25 one on your phone, be sure your line is unmuted and
26 record your name at the prompt. Again, to make a
27 comment, please press star, one. One moment as I wait
28 for any to come through.

29

30 (Pause)

31

32 OPERATOR: And first up we have Gloria
33 Simmon [sic], go ahead, please, your line is open.

34

35 GLORIA: Thank you so much for this
36 opportunity. I'm an advocate with the Salmon State and
37 I'm also a citizen of the Orutsararmiut Traditional
38 Native Council which is the Native Village of Bethel
39 and I welcome this opportunity to speak to you. It's
40 been an educational experience listening in on
41 conversations prior to this.

42

43 Getting away from the seriousness and
44 the direness of the salmon, the high seas trawling and
45 the bycatch, I'd like to bring focus to another issue
46 we have in this region relating to our concerns of the
47 BLM opening (d)(1) lands to mining and the concern
48 about the impacts that they have on our land and our
49 resources.

50

1 In the Kuskokwim region the lands with
2 (d) (1) protections in the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta have
3 been used by our communities and people for hunting,
4 fishing, harvesting, trade and living since time
5 immemorial, losing the protections across (d) (1) lands
6 put our communities and way of life in jeopardy. This
7 is the case in many parts of the state. In the case of
8 our region, open pit mining and additional mining
9 exploration and development in the Yukon Kuskokwim
10 Delta poses great risks to subsistence land and life.
11 We have requested that BLM retain the (d) (1)
12 protections to safeguard subsistence fish, wildlife,
13 and plant resources, access to these resources and
14 culturally important lands and resources from
15 destructive extraction and development.

16
17 BLM managed lands support important
18 subsistence resources that serve as the bread basket
19 for thousands of Athabascans, Aleut, Dena'ina, Inupiat,
20 Yup'ik, and Tlingit people. The fish and wildlife
21 habitat and migration corridors within lands managed by
22 BLM are important to our people for subsistence
23 resources and cultural practices. Listing (d) (1)
24 protections would fragment important habitat,
25 jeopardize access to subsistence resources and could
26 turn the Yukon Kuskokwim region into a mining district.
27 Our people have cared for our ancestral lands for
28 millennia, sustainability, using resources from the
29 land while protecting waters and lands to ensure our
30 people have food and can engage in cultural practices.
31 These lands and waters provide our communities with
32 clean drinking water and healthy subsistence foods.
33 The coalition is concerned that lifting (d) (1)
34 protections and opening these lands to mining will
35 expose these important resources to contamination from
36 mineral exploration and mining development.

37
38 Because almost all communities impacted
39 by the (d) (1) protection decision our Alaska Native
40 communities residing off the road system we hope the
41 Department will carefully consider people's intrinsic
42 connections to places in which over 80 percent of food
43 consumed in our communities comes directly from
44 surrounding land and waters.

45
46 Alaska is at the forefront of climate
47 change. Speak to the facts that -- speaking to the
48 fact in a rapidly changing environments across Alaska
49 with so many future unknowns. Federal land managers
50

1 should think about what is in the public interest and
2 prioritize the protection of natural environments and
3 our people's subsistence resources over industry.
4 Prioritizing industrialization would pose significant
5 adverse effects to current intact lands and waters.

6
7 We are encouraging them to adopt a
8 precautionary action and keep the existing protections
9 in place. We strongly encourage others to get involved
10 in this public process in their part of Alaska.

11
12 We have respectfully requested BLM to
13 consider the real and likely impacts that lifting
14 (d)(1) protections will have on the vital subsistence
15 resources, cultural practices in our communities. We
16 have asked the BLM to engage tribes in formal tribal
17 consultation through the EIS process and in any land
18 use decisions within the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta region
19 and encourage others to do so.

20
21 And a previous speaker mentioned the
22 bureaucratic silos. It's so important that all the
23 Federal agencies, especially agencies working within
24 the Department of Interior that are charged with
25 protecting the tribal interests of the 500-plus tribes
26 in our nation and our rights to clean air, land and
27 water. Right now we are depending on you in
28 desperation because we find our interests are not being
29 protected by the State of Alaska. Currently the tribes
30 within the State of Alaska are being denied the right
31 to apply for water rights. Water is so important to
32 us. You find that we live along rivers and water ways,
33 we protect the water and we need clean, healthy water.
34 The Clean Water Act must be protected for the whole
35 country and all protections must be in place for all of
36 our resources.

37
38 So we plead with you to hear us and to
39 make the right decisions.

40
41 And I thank you so much for this
42 opportunity to present our cause. I know that this is
43 probably not as critical to you as the fish but it's
44 very dire to us considering the looming prospect of the
45 Donlin Mine in our region so thank you once again.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
48 taking the time to call in. Any questions from the
49 Board.

0425

1 (No comments)

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate it.
4 Operator, is there anybody else to be recognized at
5 this time for non-agenda items.

6

7

MR. COHN: Mr. Chair.

8

9

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

10

11

MR. COHN: Sorry.

12

13

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, you
14 have the floor Steve.

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. COHN: Thank you. Not a question.
I just want to thank the caller for sharing that
information. This is Steve Cohn, I'm the State
Director for the Bureau of Land Management and look
forward to engaging with you on this very important
matter. It sounds like you already are well aware of
the environmental impact statement on the public land
orders and the process that we're undertaking on that
and look forward to working with you on that as we
proceed.

Thank you.

GLORIA: Thank you.

OPERATOR: And up next we have Mike
Bethers, go ahead, please your line is open.

MR. BETHERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Have you started on Wildlife Proposals 22-08 yet?

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, we're going
to get to those probably within the hour.

MR. BETHERS: Okay, thank you, I'll
call back then. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
Bye.

OPERATOR: And I'm showing no further
public comment at this time.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No further

0426

1 public comment, all right, thank you for everybody this
2 morning for your engagement with the Board and
3 appreciate the Board having some interaction.

4
5 We'll go ahead and move on to the
6 consensus agenda this morning.

7
8 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair. Glenn Chen with
9 the BIA, also known as Gene Peltola.

10
11 (Laughter)

12
13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hey, we'll call
14 you little Mean Gene. That's a wrestler name, I'm an
15 old WWF guy.

16
17 (Laughter)

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
20 floor.

21
22 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair. BIA would like
23 to make the motion for the consensus agenda if that's
24 okay.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You got it.

27
28 MR. CHEN: The BIA.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, Scott's got
31 something.

32
33 MR. AYERS: Sorry. If I can jump in
34 there, Mr. Chen, through the Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

37
38 MR. AYERS: So, thank you. Again, this
39 is Scott Ayers here, the Fisheries Division Supervisor
40 for the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be
41 reading all the consensus agenda proposals and closure
42 reviews along with the recommendations into the record.
43 These are the proposals and closure reviews for which
44 there is agreement among the affected Subsistence
45 Regional Advisory Councils, the InterAgency Staff
46 Committee and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
47 concerning Board action.

48
49 Proposal FP23-02 request revisions to
50

0427

1 the customary and traditional use determination for
2 salmon in the Yukon River management area by adding
3 residents of Chevak, Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay. The
4 recommendation is to support.

5

6 Deferred Fisheries Closure Review
7 FCR21-18 is a review of the closure to the subsistence
8 harvest of salmon in Unalaska Lake in the Aleutians
9 Island area. The recommendation is to retain status
10 quo.

11

12 Deferred Fisheries Closure Review
13 FCR21-09 is a review of the closure to the subsistence
14 harvest of salmon in Summers and Morris Lakes in the
15 Aleutian Islands area. The recommendation is to retain
16 status quo.

17

18 Deferred Fisheries Closure Review
19 FCR21-11 is a review of the closure to the subsistence
20 harvest of salmon in McLees Lake in the Aleutian
21 Islands area. The recommendation is to retain status
22 quo.

23

24 Fisheries Closure Review FCR23-11 is a
25 review of the closure to the subsistence harvest of
26 salmon in Unalaska Bay area freshwaters in the Aleutian
27 Islands area. The recommendation is to retain status
28 quo.

29

30 Proposal FP23-05a requests revisions to
31 the customary and traditional use determination for
32 salmon in the Kodiak area. The recommendation is to
33 oppose.

34

35 FP23-05b requests revisions to the
36 description of the Kodiak area. The recommendation is
37 to oppose.

38

39 Fisheries Closure Review FCR23-19 is a
40 review of the closure to the subsistence harvest of
41 salmon in Selief Bay. The recommendation is to
42 rescind.

43

44 Proposals FP23-08, FP23-09 and FP23-12
45 request revisions to the customary and traditional use
46 determination for salmon in the Kenai Peninsula
47 district, waters north of and including the Kenai River
48 drainage within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and
49 the Chugach National Forest by adding residents of
50

0428

1 Moose Pass. The recommendation is to support FP23-08
2 and take no action on Fisheries Proposal FP23-09 and
3 FP23-12 based on the action on FP23-08.

4
5 Proposal FP23-20 requests revisions to
6 the customary and traditional use determination for
7 shellfish in the Southeastern Alaska Yakutat area to
8 include all rural residents of the Southeast Alaska
9 area. The recommendation is to support.

10
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
12 the consensus agenda proposals and closure reviews.

13
14 And I'd like to take this opportunity
15 to give thanks and appreciation to the analysts who
16 work on these analysis as well as the time and input
17 provided by OSM Staff, Council members, other agency
18 Staff, tribes and the public. Our public driven
19 process is truly special.

20
21 And with that I'll hand it back over to
22 you.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
27 questions for Scott from the Board.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Glenn, you have
32 the floor.

33
34 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
35 apologize sincerely for getting out of sequence and
36 getting ahead of things and appreciate Mr. Ayers
37 providing that summary.

38
39 The BIA moves to adopt the consensus
40 agenda as described by Mr. Ayers which includes a list
41 of proposals and the actions that have been taken on
42 them -- or will be taken.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 And if I have a -- getting a second I
47 will explain why I will vote in favor of my motion.

48
49 MS. PITKA: Second. Rhonda Pitka.

50

0429

1 MR. CHEN: Thank you. BIA finds that
2 the consensus agenda is thorough and adequate and
3 addresses all the proposals and all the actions we need
4 to take on them.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
9 other Board discussion or deliberation on the consensus
10 agenda this morning.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call,
15 please, Sue -- or call for the question.

16
17 MS. CREACHBAUM: Question.

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call,
20 please.

21
22 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

23
24 Glenn Chen, BIA.

25
26 MR. CHEN: Yes.

27
28 MS. DETWILER: Steve Cohn, BLM.

29
30 MR. COHN: Yes, I support.

31
32 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Fish and
33 Wildlife Service, Jill Klein.

34
35 MS. KLEIN: Support.

36
37 MS. DETWILER: Sarah Creach -- I'm
38 sorry -- Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service.

39
40 MS. CREACHBAUM: NPS supports.

41
42 MS. DETWILER: Greg Risdahl, Forest
43 Service.

44
45 MR. RISDAHL: Forest Service supports.

46
47 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda
48 Pitka.

49
50

0430

1 MS. PITKA: I support and thank you all
2 for all of your comments and considerations for these
3 proposals, I appreciate it.

4
5 MS. DETWILER: And I believe Charlie
6 Brower was going to be off for an hour or so so Public
7 Member Rhonda Pitka as his proxy.

8
9 MS. PITKA: As proxy for Member Charlie
10 Brower, he also supports. Thanks.

11
12 MS. DETWILER: Finally, Chair Anthony
13 Christianson.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

16
17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. The motion
18 passes unanimously.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.
21 We'll move back to the wildlife proposals at this time,
22 WP22-08.

23
24 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Good morning, Mr.
25 Chair. Members of the Board. For the record my name
26 is Jake Musslewhite and I'm a Fishery Biologist for the
27 Forest Service out of Juneau. I'm here to tell you
28 today about WP22-08, which was submitted by the
29 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
30 and requests that the Northeast Chichagof Controlled
31 Use Area annual deer harvest limit for non-Federally-
32 qualified users be reduced to two male deer. And the
33 analysis for this proposal begins on Page 779 of the
34 meeting book.

35
36 The proponent states that it recently
37 became more challenging for subsistence hunters in
38 Hoonah to harvest sufficient deer to meet their
39 subsistence needs due to increased hunting pressure
40 from non-Federally-qualified users. They state that
41 regulatory change is needed to protect the deer
42 population from further depletion and increase
43 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users.

44
45 This proposal was also deferred by the
46 Board at their April 2022 meeting and was among those
47 discussed at the open meeting held by OSM that I told
48 you about yesterday. The analysis of this proposal was
49 also revised with additional data from biological
50

1 surveys and harvest reports which are detailed in the
2 updated analysis in the Board book.

3
4 The Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use
5 Area consists of Chichagof Island north of Tenakee
6 Inlet and east of the drainage divide from the
7 northwest point of Gull Cove to Port Frederick Portage
8 including all drainages into Port Frederick and Mudd
9 Bay. And this area is shown on a map on Page 790.

10
11 The community of Hoonah is located
12 within the Controlled Use Area and most of the deer
13 hunting locations for Hoonah residents are within its
14 boundaries.

15
16 Current State regulations provide for a
17 harvest limit of three deer on Chichagof Island east of
18 Port Frederick and north of Tenakee Inlet, which is the
19 eastern portion of the Controlled Use Area. The State
20 season runs from August 1st to December 31st and female
21 deer may only be taken after September 15th. Under
22 Federal regulations the harvest limit for all of Unit 4
23 is six deer and the season lasts through January.
24 Rural residents of Units 1 through 5 have a customary
25 and traditional use determination for deer in Unit 4.

26
27 The harvest and effort data for the
28 analysis area are shown on the graphs on Page 793
29 through 795. Harvest of deer in the Controlled Use
30 Area has been generally increasing following severe
31 winter mortality of 2007/08. In most recent years
32 harvest by Federally-qualified users has been slightly
33 higher than by non-Federally-qualified users, however,
34 the amount of effort in terms of hunter days has been
35 lower for Federally-qualified users due to their higher
36 success rate. The success rate for residents of Hoonah
37 has been trending upward since 2009 as measured by
38 percent harvesting a deer and the number of deer
39 harvested per hunter. Most, 82 percent, non-Federally-
40 qualified hunters in Unit 4 harvest between zero and
41 one deer and relatively few, about 17 percent harvest
42 three or more. Most of those deer harvested are bucks,
43 with does averaging about 17 percent of the harvest
44 since 2000.

45
46 This proposal would restrict non-
47 Federally-qualified users on Federal public lands
48 within the Controlled Use Area by limiting harvest to
49 two male deer. Restricting non-Federally-qualified
50

0432

1 users could decrease both deer harvest and competition
2 with Federally-qualified subsistence users in the area.
3 Lower harvest by and competition with non-Federally-
4 qualified users may result in more deer harvested by
5 Federally-qualified subsistence users. Non-Federally-
6 qualified users may shift some effort to other areas of
7 Unit 4 outside of the Controlled Use Area possibly
8 displacing hunters in other areas. Non-Federally-
9 qualified users may also concentrate more efforts on
10 the State managed lands within the Controlled Use Area
11 including lands immediately surrounding Hoonah.
12 However, considering that very few non-Federally-
13 qualified users harvest more than two deer in Unit 4
14 and most of the deer are harvested within the analysis
15 area are males, this restriction would probably have
16 little impact on the hunting effort, location, or
17 harvest by non-Federally-qualified users within the
18 analysis area.

19

20 The OSM conclusion is to oppose this
21 proposal.

22

23 Section .815 of ANILCA provides that
24 the Board may restrict non-subsistence uses on Federal
25 public lands if necessary for the conservation of
26 healthy populations of fish and wildlife, or to
27 continue subsistence uses of such populations.
28 Restricting non-Federally-qualified users to two male
29 deer annually in the proposal area does not appear
30 necessary for conservation because deer populations in
31 Unit 4 are high and may be approaching carrying
32 capacity in some locations. This restriction also does
33 not appear necessary for the continuation of
34 subsistence uses. The average success rate for Hoonah
35 deer hunters has been increasing since 2008 and the
36 deer harvested per hunter has rebounded to pre-2011
37 levels. Further, few non-Federally-qualified users
38 harvest more than two deer in Unit 4 and they harvest
39 primarily males in the analysis area, therefore, the
40 proposed restriction is not likely to significantly
41 affect effort by non-Federally-qualified users or the
42 success rate of Federally-qualified subsistence users.

43

44 And with that I'd be happy to take any
45 questions.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions
48 from the Board for Staff.

49

50

0433

1 (No comments)

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing or
4 seeing none, thank you for the presentation. Was
5 there any public comment received during this.

6

7

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, Mr. Chair.
8 During that first public comment period, there were 44
9 opposing and two neutral. And those were the comments
10 that were included in the Board book for that April
11 2022 meeting. We also received that comment from the
12 north Lynn Canal AC that I read into the record
13 yesterday also addressed this proposal.

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
that.

At this time we'll open up the floor to
the public.

OPERATOR: And just a reminder for
everyone, if you have a comment at this time please
press star, one on your phone and be sure your line is
unmuted. Again, that's star, one for any comments.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: And up first we have Mike
Bethers, go ahead, please, your line is open.

MR. BETHERS: Thank you. Good morning,
Mr. Chairman. Thanks for this opportunity to comment
on Wildlife Proposal 22-08. I'm Mike Bethers a 75 year
old life long deer hunter from Auke Bay.

I've hunted the Tenakee Inlet area for
decades and I spend about 50 days in the fall in the
woods hunting deer. Today I'm representing myself and
the Jay Walker and Shawn Bethers families who are
unable to participate today.

We ask you to oppose Wildlife Proposal
22-08. The story for this proposal is similar to the
other two we have been discussing.

The greatly reduced hunting effort by
Federally-qualified hunters is well documented and we
feel this is the main reason that Hoonah may not be
getting an abundance of venison. We've heard that

0434

1 Federally-qualified hunter effort is incorrect because
2 of their low reporting, however, you also need to know
3 that all user groups are reluctant to report non-
4 successful trips. This was very obvious in one of my
5 earlier careers where I was involved in sampling
6 resource harvesters.

7

8 And to conclude on this I would say
9 that the available data is probably a lot more accurate
10 than you might think.

11

12 Further, Hoonah, really compromised its
13 wildlife habitat and subsistence lifestyle many years
14 ago through construction of miles of logging roads and
15 extensive clear-cut logging. The hunters could
16 initially just drive down the roads and shoot deer
17 easily but now after several deer generations deer have
18 adapted to this heavy hunting pressure and moved away
19 from the roads in order to survive. It's the same
20 along heavily cruised beaches. You've probably seen
21 typically like this that you don't see many deer along
22 these heavily cruised areas but you'll find them in a
23 quarter mile off the beach or a few hundred feet up the
24 hill. Typically most of the animals you see in these
25 heavily hunted areas are younger age class animals that
26 just haven't caught on yet.

27

28 A couple of Hoonah residents that I
29 know that hunt away from the roads tell me that they've
30 seen a lot of deer and there's no problem with the
31 population but you won't find many deer along the roads
32 anymore.

33

34 Climbing the hills and calling isn't
35 nearly as much -- is not nearly as driving roads or
36 cruising beaches but I'll guarantee that day in and day
37 out it will put more venison in your freezer. It's a
38 method that has served me well for decades. I'm 75
39 years old with physical issues and I don't shoot big
40 bucks a long ways from the beach anymore, but I still
41 get the job done and get all the meat I need and if I
42 can do it I know anybody could that really wants to.

43

44 I think it might be a good idea for the
45 villages to introduce into their school system a
46 hunting and outdoor skills program, or maybe a cultural
47 camp to try to reinstall a more of a deer hunting
48 attitude back into the subsistence lifestyle in
49 northern Southeast. And I think also if the qualified
50

50

0435

1 hunters have a designated hunter program and if they
2 have a problem getting deer themselves they should be
3 able to find some young guy willing to go out and do
4 some hunting for them.

5
6 Another issue that's quite important to
7 me and this issue is the fact that the north shore of
8 Tenakee Inlet is included in the regulations designed
9 for the Hoonah area and the remainder of the North
10 Chichagof Management Area. Conservative deer
11 regulations, bag limits that is, intended to solve
12 problems with lands accessed by the Hoonah Road system
13 in high use areas as not appropriate for the north
14 shore of Tenakee Inlet. The north shore of Tenakee has
15 no roads, it has no access from Hoonah and it's very
16 rarely, if at all, hunted by Hoonah hunters and can
17 easily be separated from the more northern portions of
18 Chichagof Island that are accessed from the road
19 system. Deer tagging studies have shown that deer
20 rarely cross over between the drainages draining
21 towards Hoonah and that drain towards Tenakee. The
22 north shore of Tenakee Inlet included in Wildlife
23 Analysis Area 3526 should be excluded from any
24 regulation proposed for the Hoonah Northeast Chichagof
25 area. Further regulation in this area is just flat not
26 needed. This area is really, really important to
27 Tenakee hunters because when heavy north winds or
28 easterly winds blow we can't cross the Inlet to hunt on
29 the south side of the Inlet and the north shore is the
30 only place we have to hunt during these heavy winds.

31
32 My final comment, today is similar to
33 that of yesterday and that is, any reduction in non-
34 qualified hunter opportunity in the uplands will simply
35 drive more non-qualified people to hunt the beaches.
36 And you would think that the reduced ferry service to
37 all communities to northern southeast would also reduce
38 the number of non-qualified hunters from Juneau
39 reaching Hoonah but on the other hand, you know, the
40 Hoonah beaches are the closest to Juneau. So I don't
41 know how that would work out but I think they're
42 chancing more competition on the beaches if you were to
43 further reduce opportunity for non-qualified hunters.

44
45 Thank you. Any questions.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
48 questions from the Board.

49
50

0436

1 (No comments)

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for your thorough testimony this morning.

MR. BETHERS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator, is there anybody else online who would like to be recognized at this time, WP22-08.

OPERATOR: Yes, up next we have Frank Wright, go ahead, please, your line is open.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. My name is Frank Wright. I'm from Hoonah. I'm President of the Hoonah Indian Association. I've been President for some time. I've been with the Council since 1988. I'm a Tlingit from Hoonah. My father's a (In Tlingit).

So one of the things that I worry about is a lot of the Hoonah people pay a lot of gas -- money to go anywhere. And since I've been the President of the Hoonah Indian Association for so long my duty is to protect the lifestyle of our people, Huna Tlingit. Right now I'm on a boat right running south going for sheep.

You know at one time there was a snow storm that in Hoonah the snow was high there was over 200 deer spotted on the beach that were dead. You know when I say I am protect -- I'm the President of the Tribe and the people that I represent is more important than what ANILCA says. Let me give you an example.

The Federal Government had decided that we could not go into Glacier Bay to get seagull eggs or even hunt seal so I had a nephew that said, what do I -- why should I want to go to Glacier Bay and there are people in Hoonah that don't even eat seal meat anymore or eat seagull eggs anymore, so right now ANILCA was designed to protect the people of our region, the indigenous people but we are being denied a resource that makes us Tlingit. I want to say look at my skin, I'm a Tlingit.

And, you know, the ferry system, there has been times when the ferry system has brought in people that left with their trucks (indiscernible -

0437

1 cuts out) so I'm here speaking -- I'm also a Regional
2 Advisory Council member for Southeast Alaska but I'm
3 speaking for Hoonah right now. There are so many --
4 when you got a people that are diminishing because of
5 being regulated out of being able to do what they need,
6 we always wonder who's in charge here, who's in charge
7 of the people. We have the United States Government
8 that are fighting for people, who they are like
9 Ukraine, but no one is really fighting for the people
10 that are existing within our region. So as a Huna
11 Tlingit person, I always wonder about the people that
12 are coming into our town and driving those roads. The
13 person from Tenakee doesn't know that the roads are
14 always shut off, shut down but when there's high snow
15 they know no one can drive out those roads. When we
16 had a big snow that one year some guys were driving out
17 -- I mean on a skiff and they found over 200 deer that
18 were dead on the beach because there was no food and
19 the snow was too deep. And I drove up the road one
20 time where the dump was at and I was watching a deer
21 trying to struggle going up on the side of the road
22 because it was so deep that he couldn't even walk, so
23 he was just stuck.

24
25 We as a people need to take care of
26 ourselves as a Tlingit people, indigenous people. I'll
27 give you another example.

28
29 One of my sister's kids had moved away
30 from Hoonah and my daughter was eating seal meat and my
31 sister had said, you eat that, and my daughter just
32 looked at her and just kept eating seal meat, and a
33 deer is so important to us, that a lot of people just
34 eat the back -- eat the hindquarters, the front
35 quarters but leave the rest there. There's been signs
36 of where people just -- that's all they took. If
37 people knew about the back bone, they could cut it into
38 chops and make chops out of it. And, you know, the
39 thing is that we eat the stomach, the liver, the heart
40 and everything else and there's fat inside the body and
41 Tlingit people, we call it (In Tlingit) (In Tlingit),
42 we cook that up.

43
44 And the thing is that Hoonah, too, a
45 bag of rice, \$97. My wife called me the other day and
46 said we heard a person had bought some bananas, 8
47 bananas for 15 bucks and the food that we eat, you
48 know, is so important to us. You know you look at what
49 are called beach people, when the tide goes out the
50

0438

1 table is set. So I have to support the 08 on the
2 Hoonah side so anyway I'm glad I was able to testify on
3 this, you know.

4

5 A couple decades ago that -- I mean not
6 a couple decades but a few years back when we had a bad
7 snow they had -- I think it was the Forest Service that
8 called me and asked me are you willing to sign this to
9 stop the hunting in Hoonah, Alaska and I said yes
10 because the winter kill was so bad that there wasn't
11 hardly any deer. There was 200 deer on the beach.

12

13 So I appreciate you guys on the Federal
14 Subsistence Board looking into this and I know there's
15 a lot of people that want to hunt our area but if
16 there's another winter kill what is our people going to
17 do, we can't just go to Juneau any time you feel like
18 it because employment is low in the winter and it cost
19 \$318 roundtrip on the plane to go to Juneau.

20

21 So Gunalcheesh. I'm speaking for
22 people. You know ANILCA was put there to protect the
23 people and subsistence is a different kind of word to
24 the Federal government than it is to me. To me,
25 subsistence is me, I am subsistence. Like I said, you
26 look at my skin and then you say who are you, I'm a
27 Tlingit.

28

29 Gunalcheesh.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
34 Frank, for taking the time to call in. Any questions
35 for Frank from the Board.

36

37 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
40 floor Glenn.

41

42 MR. CHEN: Thank you. Mr. Wright, this
43 is Glenn Chen from the BIA. Gunalcheesh for your
44 heartfelt observations and we share your concerns about
45 the economic difficulties that your community's facing
46 with the rising prices for all goods and services and
47 fuel and so forth.

48

49 I was wondering if you could provide

50

0439

1 the Board with some local information regarding
2 competition for the deer hunting in your area because
3 that seems to be a primary reason for this proposal,
4 that there's competition from people living outside
5 your area, coming in and trying to hunt the deer. If
6 you can provide some information that would be very
7 helpful.

8
9 MR. WRIGHT: Well, when the ferry
10 system is running here, you know, the people from
11 Juneau end up coming over to Hoonah and the road
12 system, or even Whitestone, they camp out there when
13 the road's are clear. And whenever there's good
14 weather they run the shores on Chichagof Island too.
15 But when you see a truck leaving Hoonah with a bunch of
16 deer on the back of their truck it doesn't feel good.
17 And I -- like I said, I eat -- we eat everything from
18 the deer but then when you see a bambi out there that
19 is cut just the front quarters out then -- then we --
20 what meat is going away, there's a difference between
21 -- there's a difference between them and us as a
22 Tlingit person. And, you know, it's just -- it's just
23 -- like my dad always said, we eat everything, you
24 know, and -- but when you shoot a bambi and you don't
25 even let it grow to even reproduce so everyone always
26 says well the numbers speak for themselves but what are
27 we going to do when a big winter kill comes again. So,
28 yeah, I can hear -- hear some people objecting to what
29 I'm saying but as the President of the Tribe and I've
30 been on the Council, the Hoonah Indian Association
31 since 1988 and always fought for the rights of our
32 Tlingit people, that's why I'm speaking.

33
34 Gunalcheesh.

35
36 MR. CHEN: Gunalcheesh, Mr. Wright.
37 Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And
40 you have a safe boat ride there, Frank.

41
42 Operator, is there anybody else who
43 would like to be recognized at this time.

44
45 OPERATOR: I am showing no further
46 comments at this time.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
49 That concludes the summary -- I mean the open public
50

0440

1 testimony, we'll move on to Alaska/Tribal Native
2 Corporation comments.

3

4 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair, can
5 you hear me?

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Orville,
8 you have the floor.

9

10 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
11 Board Members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM.
12 I'm really sorry I couldn't be with you guys for the
13 last couple of days. Winter weather. If I had my
14 dad's dog team though I would have been there everyday.

15

16 (Laughter)

17

18 MR. LIND: Of course it probably would
19 have been a problem for me to find parking.

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 MR. LIND: Anyway, again, pleasure to
24 be able to be in contact via teleconference. During
25 our consultation session we held August 19th for that
26 region, we did not have any questions or comments on
27 that proposal.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
32 Orville. Regional Advisory Council recommendation.

33

34 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
35 Cathy Needham for the Southeast Regional Advisory
36 Council.

37

38 In the fall of 2021 the Council
39 supported the proposal. The restriction is necessary
40 for the continuation of subsistence uses based on
41 public and written testimony from residents and is
42 supported by local and traditional knowledge. This
43 proposal benefits Federally-qualified subsistence users
44 in a meaningful subsistence priority because.....

45

46 1. It reduces the harvest limit and
47 restricts the harvest to bucks only for non-Federally-
48 qualified users which reserves does for Federally-
49 qualified users.

50

0441

1 2. It provides additional harvest
2 opportunities.

3
4 3. May help limit hunting competition
5 around Hoonah during the hunting season.

6
7 Limiting non-Federally-qualified users
8 to two bucks would not be an inconvenience as these
9 users rarely take more than two deer.

10

11 As you are aware the Board deferred
12 these proposals to collect more information and so the
13 Council took these proposals back up at their fall 2022
14 meeting. The Council took no action in 2022
15 maintaining their support for Wildlife Proposal 22-08
16 as read into the record.

17

18 After receiving an updated analysis and
19 considering the new data, the Council took no further
20 action at its fall 2022 recommendation -- or sorry --
21 2021 recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board
22 remains unchanged. The Council chose to focus on
23 meeting subsistence needs and recognized that local
24 impact to heavily hunted areas might constitute a
25 conservation concern in the future.

26

27 The Council noted that there is a
28 higher level of criteria required to close an area to
29 harvest that are not appropriate in this case of
30 reducing harvest limits, which still provide hunting
31 opportunity for non-Federally-qualified users. I will
32 remind the Board that under Section .815(3) of ANILCA,
33 provides that the Board may restrict non-subsistence
34 uses on public lands only if there is a conservation
35 for healthy populations of fish and wildlife or to
36 continue subsistence uses of such populations.

37

38 The buck restriction on non-Federally-
39 qualified users will offer a meaningful preference to
40 Federally-qualified subsistence users by reducing
41 competition and also have a dual purpose for protecting
42 and supporting deer populations. The Council noted
43 that previous testimony indicated that non-Federally-
44 qualified users primarily target bucks anyway.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
49 questions from the Board for the Regional Advisory
50

0442

1 Council.

2

3

MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

With regard to this proposal, could you

please tell us about the local knowledge that your

Council has been provided and how this was used to

develop your recommendations to the Board.

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

I think, like an example of that is users testified that they don't always, like there's a problem with reporting in terms of use reporting overall. There's likely an under represented, like people just not reporting their harvest as one example. There's also people not necessarily reporting accurately their unsuccesses. If you're a subsistence user and you're reporting on your ticket, you're not exactly capturing every single time that you went out and did not harvest a deer and the amount of effort that you put in to do that. Part of it is the way the harvest ticket reporting is, you know, how you actually record the information and part of it is cultural. And the Council has heard this from other users on other resources as well in terms of reporting on that.

0443

1 We also heard from another example of
2 how the data doesn't accurately reflect what might be
3 going on around Hoonah, is the data collected on the
4 population of deer in Unit 2 and the statement that
5 Unit 2 deer populations, that there's not a
6 conservation on it really applies unit-wide. And
7 locally, that data does not capture what's going on in
8 small localized areas. And in teasing that out a
9 little more with folks that testified or with
10 individuals that sit on our Council, like Mr. Wright
11 that called in today, you know, there is a -- in the
12 particular area that the Council put these proposals
13 forward on there are habitat considerations in there as
14 well and the deer population decline around that area
15 was studied in 2019, however, it hasn't been --
16 localized data from that area hasn't been taken since
17 then, and so it's really difficult to know how much
18 those populations have bounced back so that has been
19 something that we've heard from residents as being a
20 concern.

21
22 So that being said the Council
23 recognized that there were limitations in that data and
24 when there are limitations in the data we do rely more
25 on conversations that we have with local users, people
26 that this effects in terms of their day to day lives
27 and we do take those concerns into consideration and
28 add that traditional and localized-based knowledge into
29 the actions that we take, or the support that we may or
30 may not give on a proposal.

31
32 So I hope that answers your question,
33 it was kind of a long way around it but I think those
34 are some examples of testimony that we did receive when
35 deliberating these proposals.

36
37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

40
41 MR. CHEN: Gunalcheesh, Ms. Needham.
42 That's very helpful.

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
45 questions. Comments.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Alaska

50

0444

1 Department of Fish and Game.

2

3 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
4 and good morning. For the record the Alaska Department
5 of Fish and Game opposes WP22-08 for the same reasons
6 that we've stipulated in our comments for WP22-07.

7

8 And just to kind of point out just a
9 couple of points that, you know, we've heard along the
10 way, is that, you know, a lot of times when -- if you
11 do a closure like this, everything from below or near
12 high water is still under State jurisdiction and so in
13 some ways the problem will still be there because those
14 folks have that ability.

15

16 The Board of Game, just to remind
17 folks, recently just passed a area wide -- or unit wide
18 reduction for non-resident hunters to two bucks and
19 then also just the example that we know that the
20 reduction in bag limit that was done by this Board for
21 Unit 2 so far hasn't proven a successful measure in
22 improving Federally-qualified users ability to harvest
23 deer in that game unit as well.

24

25 If the Chair will give us the latitude
26 our regional supervisor, Mr. Schumacher had to go home
27 but he is on the line now and I would appreciate the
28 ability for him to add some details.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yep, he has the
31 floor, thank you, Ben.

32

33 Operator, will you make sure that Mr.
34 Tom Schumacher has the opportunity to speak. Thank
35 you.

36

37 OPERATOR: Yes, one moment, thank you.

38

39 MR. MULLIGAN: Mr. Chair, I know he was
40 listening because I've been chatting with him on Teams
41 the whole time through.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: He's showing in
44 the cue so, Operator, I'll ask you again if you can let
45 Tom in or give him instructions on how to get in
46 please.

47

48 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. I apologize.
49 I've been trying to hail him, his line is open but he's
50

0445

1 not responding to me.

2

3 MR. MULLIGAN: He can hear the operator
4 but obviously she can't hear him.

5

6 MS. LAVINE: Operator, this is
7 Robbin.....

8

9 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello.

10

11 MS. LAVINE: Oh, there he is, thank
12 you.

13

14 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello. Can you hear
15 me?

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, we can
18 hear you, Tom, you have the floor, thank you.

19

20 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay, thank you.
21 Yeah, to build on what Mr. Mulligan said. Well, first,
22 through the Chair to the Board. This is Tom Schumacher
23 with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of
24 Wildlife Conservation, Regional Supervisor for
25 wildlife in Southeast.

26

27 All the Unit 4 deer proposals use the
28 same justification for restricting non-Federally-
29 qualified hunter opportunity and that's trends in deer
30 population and trends in competition. Now, the word,
31 trends, there is what I want to emphasize. It's an
32 increasing competition, decreasing deer populations.

33

34 We, you know, do surveys in Unit 4 and
35 harvest is another indicator of population trend for
36 deer and we don't see any declines anywhere.
37 Admittedly that is not very precise information on
38 northeast Chichagof Island but if we were -- if there
39 were big declines we would see it in our harvest data.

40

41 So absent that information, the focus
42 goes to competition.

43

44 And that's where you need to talk about
45 trend. We've heard how people have been -- or don't
46 report accurately or only report when they're
47 successful and things like that. I'd like to point out
48 to all the Board members that people have been
49 reporting that way for decades. How people report

50

0446

1 doesn't change, so it's really the trend that you need
2 to look at. They've been reporting the same way, it
3 may not be accurate but the trend is what you need to
4 think about, has anything changed over the last 25
5 years and the data presented in our comments show that
6 what's changed is there's a downward trend in the
7 number of hunters, it's not as steep in Hoonah as it
8 was in Angoon what we talked about yesterday. There's
9 been a downward trend in days of hunting effort. The
10 days per deer, in other words, hunter efficiency, how
11 long it takes to find and harvest a deer is flat.
12 That's been flat for 25 years. Since people are
13 reporting the same way, and the trend is flat it means
14 that the fewer people who are reporting are harvesting
15 fewer deer but the people who are still hunting are
16 doing well.

17
18 And that's really the point I want the
19 Board to take home, is that, fewer people are hunting
20 but the people who are hunting are doing pretty well.
21 They're doing just as well as they were 10 years ago,
22 20 years ago so there's been no change in quality of
23 hunting opportunity there.

24
25 Our data also shows the number of non-
26 Federally-qualified users using northeast Chichagof
27 Island, again, that's flat or declining. So
28 competition, instead of increasing as the proposals
29 indicate has been declining. Just the total number of
30 hunters using that area has been declining. So it's --
31 but we don't see either of those justifications being
32 supported by the data that we have.

33
34 So at this point, you know, you have
35 the Hoonah Indian Association is planning on collecting
36 information that is more specific to northeast
37 Chichagof, you know, we look forward to seeing what
38 that information produces and we'll work with them to
39 collect what, hopefully, will be objective information
40 about this because it's really the lack of objective
41 information that I think fuels the controversy between
42 non-Federally-qualified and Federally-qualified users,
43 you know, we there are -- we have a lot of opinions and
44 some personal experience but we don't have a broad
45 scale objective set of data here to work with.

46
47 So we look forward to hearing what the
48 Hoonah Indian Association's work turns up and we think
49 that without better information on this there really is
50

0447

1 no justification for depriving non-Federally-qualified
2 users of the opportunity they currently have in
3 northeast Chichagof Island.

4

5 And with that I'll take any comments --
6 or any questions.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
9 open.

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

Jill.

MS. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And to the State, I wanted to ask about the Board of Game's decision that you shared about reducing the harvest, if you could just share any more information on what the rationale was or who submitted the proposal, any context for us would be helpful.

Thank you.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, this is Tom Schumacher, I'll answer the question from Member Klein through the Chair.

There was a proposal submitted by an individual from Juneau to reduce bag limit, the State bag limit for deer in Unit 4. The Board deliberated on that proposal and based on the data available determined that reducing the bag limit for non-resident hunters would be an appropriate move forward because (indiscernible) non-resident hunters actually take more than two deer, two bucks, they confined it to two bucks because resident hunters, and all Alaskans are resident hunters and maintaining the current bag limit on State lands within Unit 4 creates opportunity for everyone, not just Federally-qualified or non-Federally-qualified users, it creates opportunity for everyone and the Board thought that would be the best way to address the proposal.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other comments for the State.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I'd just like to make a comment. As Federal Board Chair, I, on the other hand have a different opinion about

0448

1 what the opinion of our people are when they call in, I
2 call that traditional knowledge. And I know sometimes
3 we have a hard time listening to it when it reflects
4 against scientific and Western data, but for me I would
5 say the two leaders who called in here who are strongly
6 opinionated come from the same background I do, and I
7 would advise us to keep in mind that people, when they
8 do call in, deserve that. And our opinions are
9 science. And I just want to put that on the record
10 today and I just do that so we can continue this
11 respect that we have in the room and I ask for it and I
12 want to maintain it and so I don't want to see us fall
13 into a place where we start pit each other against user
14 and even office against manager.

15

16 I just want to state that for the
17 record, I come from the same place these people do.
18 And as Ben mentioned there it didn't change anything on
19 Unit 2 but a guy like me has a hard time getting a deer
20 sometimes and so when guys like us say that, we mean
21 it. And a guy like Frank and Mr. Howard come from a
22 place of leadership in their communities there's way
23 more on the table than shooting a deer and so they're
24 looking at a comprehensive picture like you guys have
25 but they lack the information to get it there and so we
26 hope we could build relationships built on trust and
27 start to build a better relationship on the ground.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 I apologize and I want to make a run at the question
33 one more time because I'm not quite understanding so a
34 little more information would be helpful, about the
35 reducing the bag limit and the reasons for doing that
36 if there's plenty of deer available.

37

38 MR. MULLIGAN: Through the Chair.
39 Member Creachbaum, I also attended that Board of Game
40 meeting. You know, I think the Board's, it's
41 responsibilities and it's scope to look at things is
42 much broader than just the Department. I mean that's
43 why we have that public process. You have the social,
44 the public aspect that goes into play, and you had
45 members of the RAC, members of communities down there
46 who were able to speak with the Board and have them
47 understand, so the Board felt that a good first step in
48 listening to them while still providing opportunity was
49 to reduce non-resident bag limit at this time, you

50

0449

1 know, despite the resource, but still listening and
2 having that be within their purview to do, not just
3 following the science, but listening to the people who
4 were there.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I appreciate
7 that comment, Ben. Thank you.

8

9 Yeah, just for the record, I think we
10 all have the same thing in mind, providing an
11 opportunity for the public and everybody to meet their
12 needs and engage in our wonderful environment we have.

13

14 We'll move on to InterAgency Staff
15 Committee if there's no more questions, thank you.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
20 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the same comment I
21 read into the record yesterday afternoon for Wildlife
22 Proposal 22-07. It can also be found in full on Page
23 802 of your meeting materials.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
28 Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No more
33 questions or discussions, we'll open the floor for a
34 Board motion. Thank you.

35

36 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair, this is Greg
37 Risdahl with the Forest Service sitting in for Dave
38 Schmid today. I move to adopt Proposal WP22-08 as
39 submitted by the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional
40 Advisory Council. Following a second I will explain
41 why I intend to oppose my motion.

42

43 MS. CREACHBAUM: Sarah Creachbaum.
44 Second.

45

46 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Sarah. First
47 of all, I, again, want to acknowledge all the effort
48 that the Southeastern Regional Advisory Council has put
49 into trying to address these concerns, concerns of many

50

0450

1 Federally-qualified users in Southeastern Alaska
2 especially related to their concerns over competition
3 and trying to come up with a meaningful priority.
4

5 Those of us that live in Southeast have
6 seen a decline in available food and no one has felt
7 this impact more than the people in our smaller more
8 isolated communities.
9

10 We have listened to the testimony at
11 the Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
12 meetings, including me, I've been to those, and can
13 appreciate how geographic isolation, unemployment, high
14 gasoline prices, empty store shelves, and the lack of
15 ferry service have had an effect on food security.
16 However, the Board's authority is limited and there are
17 only certain actions that we can take for specific
18 reasons as has been pointed out by Cathy Needham,
19 Acting Chair for the Southeast Regional Advisory
20 Council.
21

22 As the Staff analysis also has pointed
23 out, Section .815(3) of ANILCA states that the Board
24 may only restrict non-subsistence uses on Federal
25 public lands if it's necessary for the conservation of
26 healthy populations of fish and wildlife, to continue
27 subsistence uses of such populations or for health and
28 human safety reasons.
29

30 The existing deer population and
31 harvest survey data clearly shows the deer population
32 in Unit 4 has remained stable, it's considered the
33 highest in the state and currently there are no
34 conservation concerns. Subsistence users have been
35 able to continue to harvest deer at approximately the
36 same level for the past 10 or 20 years and the amount
37 of time it takes for a Federally-qualified users to
38 harvest deer has not changed.
39

40 In summary, the proposed regulation
41 change does not meet the criteria for a closure or
42 restriction to non-subsistence uses.
43

44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
47 Board discussion. Deliberation.
48

49 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.
50

0451

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: BIA, you have
2 the floor.

3

4 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
5 the Federal Subsistence Program has always used
6 multiple sources of information when implementing
7 ANILCA, Title VIII. We've considered and had made
8 extensive use of traditional and local knowledge from
9 rural subsistence users along with the biological and
10 harvest data. In a number of situations traditional
11 and local knowledge has been the primary information
12 source when species population or quantity of harvest
13 data aren't available or not current.

14

15 So during the deliberations on this
16 proposal we've heard from the rural residents who are
17 most affected by it and they've provided substantial
18 information about how competition by non-qualified
19 users are affecting their ability to harvest deer to
20 meet their subsistence needs.

21

22 We, therefore, feel that this meets one
23 of the Section .815 criteria and will therefore be
24 voting in support of the Southeast Regional Advisory
25 Council's recommendation on WP22-08.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board
30 discussion. Deliberation.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
35 question.

36

37 MS. KLEIN: Question.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Sue,
40 please.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Starting with the
43 maker of the motion, Forest Service, Greg Risdahl.

44

45 MR. RISDAHL: Forest Service opposes.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. National
48 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

49

50

0452

1 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
2 opposes for the reasons stated in the justification
3 provided by the U.S. Forest Service.

4
5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Fish and
6 Wildlife Service, Jill Klein.

7
8 MS. KLEIN: The Fish and Wildlife
9 Service votes to oppose WP22-08. And I -- while the
10 Southeast RAC does support this proposal as we've heard
11 the deer population as indicated by the Alaska
12 Department of Fish and Game surveys that it's the
13 highest deer population in Alaska and there is not
14 currently a conservation concern. We also did hear,
15 though from Ms. Needham on behalf of the RAC, the
16 Southeast Regional Advisory Council and also testimony
17 from local leaders in the area about their local
18 knowledge in the area, that tells us more of the story,
19 in addition to the scientific data and it does indicate
20 that some people may be having a hard time meeting
21 their subsistence needs.

22
23 So I do continue to support the idea of
24 the deer working group and the possible deer management
25 strategy also discussed by the Council and look forward
26 also to the efforts of the Hoonah Indian Association to
27 address this.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Jill. BLM,
32 Steve Cohn.

33
34 MR. COHN: BLM opposes WP22-08 for the
35 reasons articulated by the Forest Service.

36
37 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Glenn Chen,
38 BIA.

39
40 MR. CHEN: The BIA votes yes. We
41 support the recommendation of the Southeast Regional
42 Advisory Council and find that their justification for
43 their recommendation to be sound and supports our
44 decision.

45
46 Thank you.

47
48 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public
49 Member Rhonda Pitka.

50

0453

1 MS. PITKA: I vote to oppose WP22-08
2 based on the justification of the Fish and Wildlife
3 Service [sic].

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Checking to
8 see if Public Member Charlie Brower is online.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 MS. DETWILER: It sounds -- I do not
13 hear Mr. Brower so that means you still have his proxy,
14 Rhonda Pitka.

15
16 MS. PITKA: As proxy for Public Member
17 Charlie Brower, he also votes to oppose WP22-08 based
18 on the previous justification.

19
20 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Chair
21 Anthony Christianson.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I oppose.

24
25 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion to
26 adopt the proposal fails, seven to one.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll take a
29 five minute break, maybe 10 minutes here, sorry.

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 (Off record)

34
35 (On record)

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, that was
38 12 minutes to 11 and it's 12 after 11 so we will get
39 started.

40
41 (Pause)

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, it
44 looks like we have an established quorum here, we'll
45 get back to the order of business here.

46
47 It looks like we are WP22-10 and we'll
48 go ahead and call on the Staff, you have the floor.

49
50

1 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 For the record my name is Jake Musslewhite, Fishery
3 Biologist for the Forest Service out of Juneau. And
4 Wildlife Proposal 22-10 submitted by Patricia Phillips
5 of Pelican requests that the deer harvest limit for
6 non-Federally-qualified users in Lisianski Inlet and
7 Lisianski Strait be reduced to four deer. The analysis
8 for this proposal begins on Page 823.

9
10 The proponent of WP22-10 states that
11 hunting pressure from non-Federally-qualified users
12 results in Federally-qualified subsistence users deer
13 needs not being met. The proponent further contends
14 that bear predation on deer populations have deer
15 staying out of the beach fringe which makes deer
16 skittish when there is ongoing deer hunting pressure.

17
18 This proposal was first considered by
19 the Board at its April 2022 meeting with the Council
20 recommendation to support it with a modification of
21 area and a harvest limit of three bucks for non-
22 Federally-qualified users. Like the previous two
23 proposals, the proposal was deferred by the Board at
24 the April 2022 meeting and was among those discussed at
25 the open meeting held this past year held by OSM. The
26 analysis of the proposal was also revised with
27 additional data from biological surveys and harvest
28 reports, which are detailed in the updated analysis in
29 the Board book.

30
31 The current Federal season for deer in
32 Unit 4 is August 1st to January 31st with a limit of
33 six deer, antlerless deer may only be taken after
34 September 15th. The State general season runs from
35 August 1st to December 31st and also allows antlerless
36 deer to be taken only after September 15th. And in
37 2019 the State bag limit was increased from four to six
38 deer.

39
40 The Lisianski Inlet area is located in
41 the northwest corner of Chichagof Island. The
42 community of Pelican is located in Lisianski Inlet and
43 the area is shown on maps on Pages 831 and 832 of the
44 meeting book.

45
46 The harvest and effort data for the
47 analysis area are shown on the charts on Page 834
48 through 836. Based on harvest report data, deer
49 harvest by Federally-qualified users in the Lisianski
50

1 area is higher than harvest by non-Federally-qualified
2 users, however, hunting effort in terms of hunter days
3 tends to be higher for non-Federally-qualified users.
4 Non-qualified users have a lower success rate which
5 requires more effort to harvest deer. Overall, Pelican
6 residents have a high deer hunting success rate at 93
7 percent or higher for the past few years. The number
8 of deer harvested per Pelican resident hunting in Unit
9 4 also has trended upwards since 2009. About 82
10 percent of non-Federally-qualified hunters in Unit 4
11 harvest between zero and one deer and about 17 percent
12 harvest three or more. Most of those deer harvested
13 are bucks with does averaging about 17 percent of the
14 harvest since 2000.

15
16 This proposal would restrict non-
17 Federally-qualified users on Federal public lands in
18 the Lisianski area. Restricting non-Federally-
19 qualified users could decrease both deer harvest and
20 competition with Federally-qualified subsistence users
21 in the area. Lower harvest by and competition with
22 non-Federally-qualified users may result in more deer
23 harvested by Federally-qualified subsistence users.
24 Non-Federally-qualified users may shift some effort to
25 other areas of Unit 4 possibly displacing hunters in
26 those areas. However, considering that few non-
27 Federally-qualified users harvest more than two deer in
28 Unit 4, this restriction would probably have little
29 impact on the hunting effort, location, or harvest of
30 non-Federally-qualified users within the analysis area.

31
32 The OSM conclusion is to oppose
33 Proposal WP22-10. Section .815 of ANILCA provides that
34 the Board may restrict non-subsistence uses on Federal
35 public lands if necessary for the conservation of
36 healthy populations of fish and wildlife or to
37 continued subsistence uses of such populations.
38 Restricting non-Federally-qualified users does not
39 appear necessary for conservation because deer
40 populations in Unit 4 are high and may be approaching
41 carrying capacity in some locations.

42
43 A harvest limit reduction for non-
44 Federally-qualified users in the proposal area also
45 does not appear necessary to continue subsistence uses.
46 The deer hunting success for residents of Pelican has
47 been 93 percent or higher in recent years and the
48 number of deer harvested per hunter has been trending
49 up since 2009. The majority of non-Federally-qualified
50

0456

1 hunters harvest zero to two deer annually in Unit 4 so
2 a harvest limit restriction is unlikely to
3 significantly affect harvest or effort by non-
4 Federally-qualified users or the hunting experience of
5 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

6

7 And with that I'll be happy to take any
8 questions.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions
11 for Staff.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
16 public testimony received on this. Thank you.

17

18 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, Mr. Chair. As
19 with the others there was written public comments for
20 the first go around of this that were included in the
21 April 2022 Board book. Of those, 63 opposed the
22 proposal and one was neutral. And also we had that
23 earlier letter from the north Lynn Canal AC in
24 opposition to all three of these proposals as well as
25 the written comments that have been submitted during
26 the meeting.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. At
29 this time we'll open the floor to the public.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Seeing none in
34 the room, Operator, is there anyone on the line who
35 would like to be recognized at this time for WP22-10,
36 this is their opportunity.

37

38 OPERATOR: Again, as a reminder please
39 press star, one on your phone, record your name if you
40 have a question. One moment please.

41

42 (Pause)

43

44 OPERATOR: A comment coming in, one
45 moment please.

46

47 (Pause)

48

49 OPERATOR: The first question is from

50

0457

1 Patricia Phillips, go ahead, your line's open.

2

3

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. This is
5 Patricia Phillips. I'm from Pelican, Alaska. I am a
6 50 year resident of Pelican. I am currently the Mayor
7 for the city of Pelican and also the Chairman of the
8 Pelican Fish and Game Advisory Committee and I also
9 serve on the Southeast Regional Advisory Subsistence
10 Council. However, these comments are my own.

10

11

12 I reassure you that I have every
13 respect ADF&G wildlife concerns, however, as a 50 year
14 resident of Pelican, Alaska with customary and
15 traditional use for subsistence harvest of deer, my
16 personal observations are blended traditional and
17 ecological observations and based on recognized
18 scientific principles having heard the review and
19 evaluation of information made available to the
20 Southeast Subsistence RAC and to the Pelican ADF&G
21 Advisory Committee.

21

22

23 I just want to make note my
24 granddaughter is here with me and she's three years old
25 and so you may hear her in the background.

25

26

27 The analysis provides technical and
28 scientific support data that is broadly related to the
29 entire Unit 4 area, which is Admiralty, Baranof and
30 Chichagof Island. It's the -- the southern end of Unit
31 4 is like the Port Alexander area and the eastern area
32 is Admiralty Island all the way over to Stevens Passage
33 and the northern end is, you know, the Icy Straits
34 corridor, well we have -- Pelican is on the northwest
35 corner of Unit 4 and we experience -- you know, Unit 4
36 is an expansive area with significant geographic and
37 weather related differences and biological differences.
38 ADF&G -- excuse me the Alaska Department of Fish and
39 Game describes healthy populations based on -- not only
40 on deer harvest surveys but on, you know, actual
41 surveys, but these surveys are from areas in Unit 4
42 with conditions much more moderate than the Pelican
43 area, the Lisianski area has greater weather events,
44 more snow and colder conditions.

44

45

46 Also, you know, the citizens of Pelican
47 are -- because of weather are limited to the times that
48 they can, you know, go out and harvest and
49 traditionally a lot of the harvest of deer comes during
50 the rut which happens to be in October and November and

50

0458

1 it's kind of -- you know it's sort of a secret that
2 became known and so we see greater influx of non-
3 Federally-qualified and Federally-qualified hunters
4 coming to our area to utilize this method of, you know,
5 hunting deer in the rut. Our community is -- we are
6 basically shut off from the rest of the World come --
7 after our -- we get one ferry a month in September,
8 October, November and December and then we get no ferry
9 until March and our price of fuel has gone up to like
10 -- it was at 6.20 but now we've dropped down to like
11 5.60 a gallon. The price of bringing in groceries is
12 like 1.20 a pound and so we really rely on the
13 resources that we can harvest locally. And when we
14 have this perception that, you know, the non-Federally-
15 qualified are, you know, harvesting a deer that, you
16 know, is one that we won't be able to harvest, it
17 raises concerns.

18

19 So at the Fish and Game Advisory
20 Committee we did, you know, review this proposal and
21 decided that we would -- you know my proposal was for
22 four deer and the local AC decided to go with -- I
23 think we went down to three deer, it's been awhile now
24 and then the numbers went down to two deer for non-
25 Federally-qualified. We never actually shut them down,
26 these proposals, I mean the recommendations were to
27 never actually shut them down, at least for WP10.

28

29 So we had within our own community this
30 gathering of Federally-qualified and non-Federally-
31 qualified, you know, and came to a consensus with, I
32 think, with three deer during that specific time of
33 year. And then at the Board of Game there was a
34 proposal to reduce deer harvest levels down to four
35 deer and the Pelican Fish and Game Advisory Committee
36 met and agreed to support the proposal for four deer.
37 You know, because we supported the reduction of deer
38 from six to four for Unit 4, that doesn't set aside our
39 support for reducing the harvest for -- Federal harvest
40 to three deer for non-Federally-qualified, it is a
41 consensus amount that we all agreed to and it doesn't
42 actually shut down non-Federally-qualified, it still
43 gives them that opportunity.

44

45 And as for the population of deer in
46 the Inlet, I was asked how are the population of deer
47 in the Inlet and Straits and the hunters are seeing
48 more deer population on the outer coast of Lisianski,
49 you know, like on the outer coast of west Chichagof and
50

0459

1 west Yakobi Island. And as far as being in the Inlet
2 we haven't had as much snow as we could have but we do
3 have more snow than other areas of Unit 4 and perhaps
4 the deer are in the timber but we're just not seeing
5 them at the beach fringe. So, you know, we don't --
6 we're not sure on what the -- if our population is
7 healthy or not but our guys are getting -- our hunters
8 are getting deer and filling their freezers and, you
9 know, we can't afford to bring meat in so it's really
10 important that we do have deer that we can put into our
11 freezers or turn into jerky or, you know, however we
12 use it, can it.

13

14 So ADF&G says, well, in the areas where
15 we do our deer surveys, the deer are healthy, there's
16 adequate numbers and then they extrapolate that number
17 of deer across the whole entire Unit 4, ABC Islands,
18 and that's -- I would contend that that does not
19 reflect the actual micro area of the Lisianski Inlet,
20 Lisianski Strait. And also the ADF&G report says that,
21 well, you have less -- Pelican has lesser number of
22 hunters actually, you know, going out to hunt and that
23 their hunt is actually very successful based on what
24 they turn in. Well, I would tell you that a lot of
25 times at the end of the year we just put down the
26 number of deer we get, we're not telling you how many
27 times we actually go out, I mean, you know, as you're
28 aware sometimes hunting is opportunistic, you might be
29 going to go get a log and you're not really counting
30 that -- a log for firewood and you might not be
31 counting that as going out hunting but, hey, there's a
32 deer, get the deer, so at the end of the year you're
33 thinking back when you're filling out your deer harvest
34 surveys, oh, how many deer, I got four deer, I'll just
35 put down four deer. How many times did I go out and do
36 that, well, you're not really putting down your, you
37 know, dedicated hunting effort because you're living
38 there, it's your traditional way of life, you're not
39 really counting, you know, you're not making the
40 concerted effort, this is the day I'm going to go out
41 and deer hunt, I mean even though there are days we do
42 that. I'm just trying to explain that number of actual
43 days hunting deer aren't reflected in the deer harvest
44 surveys for the Pelican area. We're trying to comply
45 by telling you how many deer we got but it may not
46 match up with how many days we actually hunted.

47

48 So those are the two things that were,
49 you know, highlighted in the ADF&G report, I respect,

50

0460

1 you know, the wildlife biologists, that they put a lot
2 of effort to bring good data to you but, you know, as
3 far as for our area and representing the customary and
4 traditional use hunters of Pelican Alaska there is a
5 slight discrepancy that needs to be considered in your
6 decisionmaking.

7

8 So, again, I would ask for your support
9 for WP10, you know, and say that, you know, at the
10 local level we said that we would reduce that down to
11 three deer and then at the Southeast Regional Advisory
12 Council meeting, of which I was a public member, and I
13 was not yet appointed a member then, but they decided
14 to reduce that number down to two. So, you know, you
15 have a broad range, from four, three, two and then at
16 the Board of Game level the proposal was submitted for,
17 you know, reducing overall the harvest from six to
18 four, so I ask that you pass some sort of, you know,
19 action here that's reflective of -- six deer is too
20 many for non-Federally-qualified.

21

22 And that's my comment, thank you very
23 much.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
26 Patty. Any questions for Patty. It was good to hear
27 you.

28

29 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
32 the floor, Glenn.

33

34 MR. CHEN: Thank you. Ms. Phillips,
35 this is Glenn Chen from the BIA. We really appreciate
36 the time you took to give your testimony today and we
37 wholeheartedly feel for your community about the rising
38 cost of everything, goods, services, fuel and so forth
39 and how that's affecting and creating economic hardship
40 for your residents.

41

42 The information you provide about the
43 deer the hunters are seeing on the outer coast as well
44 as within the Inlet is very important. Those sources
45 of local information are helpful when we make our
46 decisions regarding proposals. I was wondering if you
47 could provide additional information, if you have any,
48 about the issue with regarding non-qualified hunters
49 affecting your harvest there in that area, if you could
50

0461

1 provide the Board with that that would be helpful.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

6

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So you're asking about the impact of non-Federally-qualified hunters in our area, correct?

7

8

9

MR. CHEN: That's correct, Ms. Phillips. If you could provide some information.

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

Then we have a segment of the population that comes in on their boats, they either come in from -- you know, maybe they come from Juneau or maybe they come -- or we see hunters that come in that are rural residents from other communities who are qualified but, you know, the community doesn't know where these vessels are coming from but they're coming in and some of them we know and some of them we don't

0462

1 know so they're utilizing their boats or their skiffs
2 or -- you know some of them have fast skiffs, some
3 don't have fast skiffs and they're running the same
4 beaches that we were and so that causes deer to be
5 skittish and so you may not be seeing deer along the
6 beach fringe because, you know, the deer they hear a
7 skiff coming and they step back in to the beach fringe
8 where you can't see them. So one reason we may be
9 seeing more deer on the outer coast is because not --
10 it's not as protected waters, and so you're not seeing
11 as much vessel traffic out there so you're seeing more
12 deer out there.

13

14 So that -- those are, you know, the
15 impacts from non-Federally-qualified as well as from
16 Federally-qualified hunters that are coming from other
17 areas other than the Lisianski area.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
22 Patty.

23

24 MR. CHEN: Gunalcheesh, Ms. Phillips.
25 That information is very helpful.

26

27 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
30 questions from the Board.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
35 Patty, for calling in and good luck with your
36 granddaughter today.

37

38 Operator, is there anybody else in the
39 cue that would like to be recognized at this time.

40

41 OPERATOR: I show no questions at this
42 time.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. That
45 concludes the public testimony on this proposal, we'll
46 move on to Tribal/Alaska Native Corporation comments.

47

48 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the

50

0463

1 consultation held we did not have any questions or
2 comments on this proposal.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
7 Regional Advisory Council recommendation.

8

9 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Cathy Needham for the Southeast Regional Advisory
11 Council.

12

13 In the fall of 2021 the Council
14 actually looked at two proposals, one that the Council
15 submitted which was a closure for the area that we're
16 discussing under this proposal and we did not support
17 that proposal so it did not go through the process
18 because we chose to support WP22-10. So in the fall of
19 2021 the Council supported the proposal with
20 modification to add language on Federal public lands
21 within drainages flowing into Lisianski Inlet,
22 Lisianski Strait and Stag Bay south of a line
23 connecting Soapstone and Column Points and north of a
24 line connecting Point Theodore and Point Uray non-
25 Federally-qualified users may harvest up to three
26 bucks. Our justification for supporting that modified
27 proposal was the restriction is necessary for the
28 continuation of subsistence uses based on public and
29 written testimony from residents and is supported by
30 local and traditional knowledge. It benefits
31 Federally-qualified subsistence users because it
32 reduces the harvest limit and restricts the harvest to
33 bucks only for non-Federally-qualified users which
34 reserves those for Federally-qualified users.

35

36 There are concerns that residents are
37 not meeting their subsistence needs for deer.
38 Predators are focused more on deer because of recent
39 failed fish runs and warm winters. Limiting non-
40 Federally-qualified users to three bucks would not be
41 an inconvenience as these users rarely take more than
42 two deer.

43

44 In the fall of 2022, we deliberated the
45 proposal again after the Board deferred the proposal
46 for this meeting. The Council supported the proposal
47 with an additional modification to reduce the harvest
48 limit for non-Federally-qualified users to two bucks
49 from three and to maintain the area that we recommended

50

1 in the fall of 2021. Non-Federally-qualified users are
2 limited to two male deer on Federal public lands within
3 drainages flowing into Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski
4 Strait and Stag Bay south of a line connecting
5 Soapstone and Column Points and north of a line
6 connecting Point Theodore and Point Uray. Similar to
7 Wildlife Proposal 22-08 there is a high level of
8 criteria required to close an area to harvest that are
9 not appropriate in this case of reducing harvest limits
10 which still provides hunting opportunities for non-
11 Federally-qualified users but ensure a subsistence
12 priority. The buck restriction on non-Federally-
13 qualified users will provide a meaningful preference
14 for Federally-qualified subsistence users by reducing
15 competition. This additional limitation on harvest in
16 Lisianski area will also minimize conflict and
17 regulations and align the harvest limit by non-
18 Federally-qualified subsistence users with the harvest
19 limit with the Hoonah area in 22-08 making the
20 regulations for these areas easier to understand
21 overall. With this regulatory alignment addressing
22 Unit 2 [sic] deer issues in the future will be easier.

23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
27 Cathy. Any questions for the RAC Chair.

28

29 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
32 floor, Glenn.

33

34 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms.
35 Needham, so your Council decided to, in your most
36 recent modification, to change the buck harvest limit
37 from three to two, could you provide some information
38 regarding that decision to make that reduction.

39

40 MS. NEEDHAM: Through the Chair. Mr.
41 Chen. I believe we decided to further reduce the non-
42 Federally-qualified user limit because as the data
43 showed, limiting Federally-qualified users to three
44 bucks wouldn't be an inconvenience because they rarely
45 take more than two deer. So that, in addition to
46 aligning it, trying to make it easier for subsistence
47 users throughout the unit, these proposals -- the three
48 proposals, there were three, one regarding Angoon, one
49 regarding Hoonah, one regarding Pelican, and we always

50

0465

1 talked about Pelican in the context of having the other
2 two communities, the proposals associated with them,
3 those proposals became two deer, so allowing non-
4 Federally-qualified subsistence users to have three in
5 Lisianski Inlet was more than what we were allowing
6 non-Federally-qualified users for Hoonah and Angoon.
7 So the discussion, I believe, centered around that. I
8 also believe the Council, through testimony and
9 information that we heard even from Ms. Phillips
10 today, the competition in Lisianski Inlet is high, it
11 was a little more apparent to us given the topography
12 and landscape of Lisianski Inlet, and we believe
13 there's competition there, not just from non-Federally-
14 qualified subsistence users but from Federally-
15 qualified subsistence users from other communities.
16 And so I believe that's why the Council chose to reduce
17 it again from two buck -- from three bucks to two
18 bucks.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 MR. CHEN: Gunalcheesh, Ms. Needham.
23 That's very helpful.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
26 other questions for the Chair.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
31 seeing none, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

32

33 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
35 opposes this proposal. I will reference our past
36 materials for the sake of brevity and just point out a
37 couple of specific statistics having to do with the
38 Lisianski area.

39

40 You know people come in to get their
41 harvest tickets so that is actual data, we know those
42 numbers and we know the number of non-Federally-
43 qualified hunters has dropped dramatically in that area
44 and, you know, more so we're seeing the trends in the
45 data of those non-Federally-qualified users have
46 decreased in the days that they've been hunting that
47 area. You know, again, Mr. Schumacher mentioned it
48 during the last proposal's testimony, in that, we may
49 have, you know, some issues with how people are
50

0466

1 reporting their days hunted and their success rates but
2 they've been reporting that consistently the same way
3 and so we're seeing that trend line, at least, for that
4 area actually increasing for deer per hunter. You
5 know, that data is, you know, something that is
6 provided to us voluntarily and we really appreciate it
7 and, you know, that's coming from a broad range of
8 those folks, of local hunters and everybody else who's
9 taking advantage of harvesting the deer population.

10

11 Thank you, sir.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
14 Any questions for the State.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
19 seeing none, we'll move on to Board discussion with the
20 Council Chair and State Liaison. Any additional
21 questions.

22

23 Jill, you have the floor.

24

25 MS. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
26 this is a question to the State, if they could maybe
27 address the comments that Patty Phillips, if I have her
28 name correct, from Pelican, shared just about how the
29 Department does the surveys in her area of Pelican and
30 Lisianski Straits being different and if that area is
31 surveyed or it's one of those areas with the
32 extrapolated data.

33

34 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you for the
35 question, Member Klein. We do have Tom Schumacher on
36 the line still and his expertise is a lot more than
37 mine on that area so I'll ask him to answer that
38 question.

39

40 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello, this is Tom
41 Schumacher, can you hear me.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Tom, you
44 have the floor.

45

46 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay, thank you. For
47 the record this is Tom Schumacher with Alaska
48 Department of Fish and Game responding to the question.
49 Through the Chair.

50

0467

1 Unit 4 is a large area, we can only
2 survey portions of it at any one time so population
3 trend data is -- you know, although it's collected in a
4 small area we do need to kind of think of it as an
5 indicator of what's going on in the entire unit. Unit
6 4 deer populations are primarily driven by winter
7 severity, we did -- we had what started out as a severe
8 winter in 2021 but conditions moderated in January and
9 following fairly extensive mortality surveys in that
10 spring we determined that the overwinter mortality of
11 deer remained low. Prior to that we've had seven or
12 eight consecutive mild winters, consequently winter
13 mortality really hasn't been an issue in a decade. So
14 we believe that deer surveys in Unit 4 are pretty
15 representative of the entire unit.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
18 Any questions for Tom.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
23 thank you, Tom.

24

25 Any additional Board discussion.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
30 open for a motion.

31

32 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 This is Greg Risdahl with the Forest Service. I move
34 to adopt Proposal WP22-10 as submitted and modified by
35 the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
36 Council. Following a second I will explain why I
37 intend to oppose my motion.

38

39 MS. KLEIN: Second. Fish and Wildlife
40 Service.

41

42 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Jill. Like
43 the previous two Unit 4 deer proposals, I, again, want
44 to acknowledge all the effort that the Southeast
45 Regional Advisory Council has put in to trying to
46 address the concerns of the Federally-qualified users
47 in this region, the Pelican region, and to come up with
48 a meaningful priority.

49

50

0468

1 Folks that live in the Southeast have
2 seen a decline in available food and no one has felt
3 this impact more than the people in these smaller
4 communities, these small isolated communities.

5
6 We have listened to the testimony at
7 the Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
8 meetings and appreciate how the geographic location,
9 it's isolation, unemployment, high gasoline prices,
10 again, empty store shelves, and lack of ferry services
11 have had an effect on food security. However, the
12 Board's authority is limited and there are only certain
13 things that we can do and take specific actions on.

14
15 As the Staff analysis also has pointed
16 out, Section .815(3) of ANILCA states that the Board
17 may only restrict non-subsistence uses on Federal
18 public lands if it is necessary for the conservation of
19 healthy populations of fish and wildlife, to continue
20 subsistence uses of such populations or for health and
21 human safety reasons.

22
23 It appears that the existing deer
24 population and harvest survey data show that the deer
25 population in Unit 4 has remained stable, may be the
26 highest in the state and there are no conservation
27 concerns. Subsistence users have been able to continue
28 to harvest deer at approximately the same level. And
29 the amount of time that it takes for a Federally-
30 qualified users to harvest their deer has apparent not
31 changed based on the data that we have.

32
33 In summary, the proposed regulation
34 change does not meet the criteria for a closure or
35 restriction to non-subsistence uses.

36
37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
40 further Board discussion or deliberation.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
45 question.

46
47 MS. CREACHBAUM: Question.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
50

0469

1 called, roll call, please.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Forest Service, Greg
4 Risdahl.

5

6 MR. RISDAHL: The Forest Service
7 opposes.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Sarah
10 Creachbaum, National Park Service.

11

12 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
13 opposes for the reasons stated in the U.S. Forest
14 Service motion.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Fish and
17 Wildlife Service, Jill Klein.

18

19 MS. KLEIN: The Fish and Wildlife
20 Service opposes for the justification shared by the
21 Forest Service. Thank you.

22

23 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Steve Cohn,
24 BLM.

25

26 MR. COHN: BLM opposes for the reasons
27 articulated by the U.S. Forest Service.

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Glenn Chen,
30 BIA.

31

32 MR. CHEN: The BIA votes yes, we feel
33 that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council's
34 recommendation is well supported by the information and
35 background that they provided.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public
40 Member Rhonda Pitka.

41

42 MS. PITKA: I vote to oppose WP22-10
43 based on the Forest Service justification. Thank you.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public
46 Member Charlie Brower, have you joined us.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

0470

1 MS. DETWILER: Member Pitka, you still
2 have Charlie's proxy.

3
4 MS. PITKA: As proxy for Member Charlie
5 Brower, he also votes to oppose WP22-10 based on the
6 Forest Service justification.

7
8 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Chair
9 Christianson.

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I vote to
12 oppose as stated on record.

13
14 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion fails
15 seven to one.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Alrighty, so
18 we're going to go ahead and break here for lunch and
19 before we do we'll let people know where we're going to
20 fall after lunch with the agenda. We'll start with the
21 Secretarial regulation proposed inclusion of identified
22 submerged lands in Tongass National Forest. We also
23 have the request for reconsideration of Fishery
24 Proposal FP21-10. And a non-rural determination
25 proposal by the Ketchikan community. So that's the
26 order of business this afternoon.

27
28 See you at 1:30, thank you.

29
30 (Off record)

31
32 (On record)

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
35 we'll go ahead and come back to order here. We'll go
36 ahead and just ask Sue to establish a quorum again for
37 the record. Thank you, Sue.

38
39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. BIA, Glenn
40 Chen.

41
42 MR. CHEN: Present.

43
44 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. BLM, Steve
45 Cohn.

46
47 MR. COHN: Present.

48
49 MS. DETWILER: Fish and Wildlife
50

0471

1 Service, Jill Klein.

2

3 MS. KLEIN: Present.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: National Park Service,
6 Sarah Creachbaum.

7

8 MS. CREACHBAUM: Good afternoon, Sue,
9 I'm present.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Forest Service, Greg
12 Risdahl.

13

14 MR. RISDAHL: Greg's here.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Rhonda Pitka, Public
17 Member.

18

19 MS. PITKA: Here.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie
22 Brower.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Chairman Anthony
27 Christianson.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Present.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. You have a
32 quorum, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
35 We'll go ahead and call on Staff to present the
36 Secretarial regulation proposed inclusion of identified
37 submerged lands in Tongass National Forest.

38

39 MS. HOWARD: Good afternoon. Ameer
40 Howard, Deputy Assistant Regional Director for the
41 Office of Subsistence Management. I hope everyone had
42 a good lunch. Hello Members of the Board.
43 Representatives from our Regional Advisory Councils.
44 I'm here to present on the Secretary regulations
45 proposing the inclusion of identified submerged lands
46 in the Tongass National Forest. This is an action item
47 for you but probably will be relatively easy going.

48

49 Joining me online is Jacob Hoffman from

50

0472

1 the U.S. Forest Service and so he will also be adding
2 his expertise on mapping, which you will see on the
3 slides presented in front of you and on the screen and
4 he'll explain more about those in a little bit after my
5 overview.

6
7 So we'll jump in.

8
9 This is an update for the Federal
10 Subsistence Board and action is required on the part of
11 the Board.

12
13 The recommendation you will make is, it
14 will be to the Secretaries on whether or not they
15 should move forward in the rulemaking process on this
16 proposed rule. The purpose of this proposed rule which
17 was published in the Federal Register on May 12th, 2022
18 is to complete regulatory proceedings addressing
19 submerged public lands within the Tongass National
20 Forest as directed by the courts.

21
22 This is the second rulemaking on this
23 subject. The first took place with the publication of
24 a proposed rule in June 2016 and a final rule in May
25 2018 so this is our second time around.

26
27 To comply with a court order from
28 Peratrovich, et al., versus the United States and the
29 State of Alaska, the Secretaries were directed to
30 initiate regulatory proceedings to identify those
31 submerged lands within the Tongass National Forest that
32 did not pass to the State of Alaska at statehood and,
33 therefore, remain Federal public lands subject to
34 Federal subsistence provisions. This task was
35 forwarded to the Federal Subsistence Board by the
36 Secretaries. This proposed rule would add to the list
37 of submerged parcels in the Federal subsistence
38 regulations that have been identified through agency
39 review.

40
41 The OSM team passed out a copy of the
42 proposed rule to the Board, the InterAgency Staff
43 Committee and to our State Liaisons. In that proposed
44 rule you can find the list of each submerged lands
45 identified this go-around.

46
47 The majority of these identified
48 submerged lands are low water lines, reefs, rocks and
49 very small islands. During the public comment period
50

0473

1 for this proposed rule, which closed on August 10th,
2 2022 one public comment was received on August 7th,
3 2022. That comment asked decisionmakers to do their
4 best to protect the animals living in these lands from
5 destruction. Alaska Region Staff from the Forest
6 Service developed a number of maps to help agencies and
7 the public better visualize what lands have been
8 identified. Jacob Hoffman, Forest Service cartographer
9 is on the line to present an overview of the U.S.
10 Forest Service mapping efforts and answer any questions
11 regarding those maps.

12

13 Thank you, Jacob. And I'm going to
14 hand the line over to you.

15

16 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Ameer. Yes,
17 this is Jacob Hoffman, Cartographer with the U.S.
18 Forest Service based in Juneau, Alaska. And I am here
19 to share briefly more information about these reference
20 maps that the Forest Service has developed to kind of
21 aid in the location of these proposed subsistence
22 areas.

23

24 So as Ameer mentioned the Federal
25 Register document has a list of the locations, there's
26 162 locations, they're in a chart/table, and the
27 information in the document includes the name, the
28 chart, meridian name, area description, in some cases
29 that includes a legal description and that legal
30 description includes both up lands and tide lands, and
31 then an approximate latitude and longitude coordinate.

32

33 That's the starting point the Federal
34 Register document did the -- those latitude and
35 longitude values are rounded to the nearest half or
36 quarter so those are accurate within a half mile or
37 better so it's very much an approximate location.

38

39 We had our internal request of the
40 Forest Service, Greg requested that we develop some
41 maps off of this information to better identify where
42 these locations are listed and hopefully you're seeing
43 Slide 1 and that's -- as the slide indicates these are
44 unofficial maps, they are not part of the proposed or
45 the final rule and so they are an unofficial map but
46 they were developed with the materials in the proposed
47 rule. So the map, themselves, we have a basic map view
48 of the area and then an overview map that shows the
49 location within Southeast Alaska.

50

0474

1 So the table information from the
2 Federal Register document was brought into our mapping
3 software and then compared with publicly available BLM
4 survey data, map data and then I went through in the
5 process and adjusted for that approximate location
6 error and moved the location into the legal description
7 and then further refined the location referencing pre-
8 statehood, U.S. Coast and survey charts and those
9 charts would feature navigation aids. A lot of these
10 locations are associated with title reserves by the
11 U.S. Government related to navigational aids. So this
12 improves the location accuracy of these proposed
13 subsistence locations. The maps also feature, where
14 applicable, the BLM survey data and not all locations
15 feature BLM survey as a legal description, some use
16 just the public land survey system or the township
17 range and section description which is very
18 approximate.

19
20 So all data used in these maps is
21 publicly available and they're listed there in that
22 slide. And we have developed these reference maps so
23 there's 162 maps but we have yet to share them outside
24 of the Forest Service but our intent is to share them
25 with the Federal Subsistence Board.

26
27 Go to Slide 2.

28
29 And Slide 2 is just another example of
30 another reference map. And the hatched pattern is the
31 BLM survey information and then it would match the
32 legal description that's there.

33
34 Let's go to Slide 3.

35
36 And on Slide 3 is an example of a
37 proposed location where the area description does not
38 include a full like legal survey description. A legal
39 description with a survey reference. So it's just a
40 point, that's all we have. So I refined that point to
41 actually land in the location described using the
42 coastgenetic (ph) chart.

43
44 So with that said, again, these are
45 unofficial maps, not part of the proposed or final
46 rule, it's just a reference for a better understanding
47 of where these locations are and I will note that the
48 proposed rule is for submerged land. The base map
49 that's depicted shows the approximate high water levels
50

0475

1 but it is not mapped with any degree of accuracy and
2 the BLM survey data is out of -- their documentation
3 is intended for mapping purposes only and is not a
4 substitute or replacement for the legal land survey
5 records or other legal documents so really, unofficial.
6 You could not delineate -- with these maps
7 you would not be able to actually delineate on the
8 ground where these submerged lands are that are being
9 proposed. And my understanding is that would take a
10 physical site survey, to have a surveyor go out there.

11

12 And that concludes my presentation and
13 I'm happy to answer any questions.

14

15 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Jacob. Again,
16 for the record this is Ameer Howard. So in summary,
17 this is a Secretarial rulemaking. It does not fall
18 within Subpart C or D, which the Board has purview over
19 in our regulations which is why for the motion today
20 for you to consider is whether or not you would make a
21 recommendation to the Secretaries to move forward to
22 final rulemaking in this rulemaking process.

23

24 So please let me or Jacob know if you
25 have any questions and we will do our best to answer
26 them.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
29 Ameer. Any questions from the Board for Staff.

30

31 MS. KLEIN: Thanks, Ameer, and the
32 Forest Service for the presentation. So you're saying
33 it doesn't come under Federal subsistence regulations
34 but once the lands are conveyed, then does it come
35 under the purview of the Board to have any regulations
36 or no?

37

38 MS. HOWARD: So the rulemaking is a
39 Secretarial decision and a Secretarial rulemaking and
40 -- but once, should it go forward to a final rule and
41 these lands be included as identified Federal public
42 lands then, yes, any take of wildlife and subsistence
43 harvest regulations that the Board now has the
44 authority and purview over will also apply to these
45 lands that are included.

46

47 MS. KLEIN: Thank you. And then just
48 to followup. So are there any, I guess, current State
49 regulations that are on these parcels that the Federal
50

0476

1 Board, I guess, eventually would need to know about or
2 would that be something that the Program would inherit
3 like in the past, how we inherited State regulations.

4

5 MR. LORD: Ken Lord for the record.
6 So, Jill, maybe a little background would be helpful
7 here. What this is is the recognition of a large
8 number of pre-statehood Federal withdrawals in marine
9 waters in Southeast Alaska and there were so many --
10 they're very tiny, and there were a large number of
11 them so the Program initially decided that -- sort of
12 made a decision that just the administrative burden of
13 trying to find all of them and identify them was too
14 big and we would just let the public let us know if
15 they wanted us to examine a particular parcel. We got
16 sued over that and lost, that's the Peratrovich
17 litigation, the district court said no, no, no, you got
18 to go out and actively find all of these little parcels
19 and so there was a large effort on the part of the
20 Forest Service and BLM to go out and go through all
21 their records and find these little parcels, some of
22 which are lighthouse sites and some of which are log
23 transfer sites that were on Federal property and so
24 theoretically State law never applied on them because
25 they're still Federal waters it's just that we didn't
26 identify them in our regulations and now we are.

27

28 Does that help?

29

30 MS. KLEIN: Yes, thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Ben.

33

34 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
35 just actually wanted to thank Member Risdahl for his
36 help, you know, when this first came out I inquired
37 with him about getting some maps because physical
38 descriptions is, as you probably all know looking at
39 this, doesn't help the general person out and I mean
40 I'm not a GIS expert so it definitely didn't help me
41 out either and those maps, even then were difficult to
42 read, but, I think, through his efforts and his
43 inquiries as it was mentioned, internally, the new maps
44 that we have are a lot better and I just want to say
45 thank you to him for making those maps easier to read,
46 more identifiable and look forward to having those
47 posted so the public can see them. Because it'll -- I
48 mean if you look at it, it's a lot and like they said
49 it's a lot of little places so it'll be good for the
50

0477

1 public to understand exactly where it is those are just
2 for the sake of knowing where it is they're doing what
3 they're doing and where it's at.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.

8

9 Steve.

10

11 MR. COHN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
12 for my own knowledge are the bulk of these withdrawn
13 lands, did the date of the withdrawals place them such
14 that they're within the Tongass National Forest
15 withdrawal overall or are some of these -- do some of
16 these predate the Tongass and, therefore, I guess would
17 default to BLM jurisdiction?

18

19 MR. LORD: They do not predate the
20 Tongass -- the 1907 Tongass withdrawal necessarily but
21 I don't know any more detail on that.

22

23 MR. COHN: Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any more
26 questions for Staff.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
31 seeing none, ISC recommendation.

32

33 (Pause)

34

35 MS. LAVINE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.
36 Members of the Council [sic]. The ISC did not develop
37 a recommendation on this agenda item.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
42 Board discussion with Council Chairs, State Liaison.
43 Any of the Council Chairs here want to discuss this.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
48 we'll move forward to Board motion.

49

50

0478

1 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair, this is Greg
2 Risdahl for the Forest Service. I am pleased to be
3 able to make the motion to recommend to the Secretary
4 of Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to support the
5 Tongass National Forest Submerged Lands Proposed Rule
6 and to include the list of 162 submerged parcels for
7 inclusion into the Federal public lands available for
8 subsistence uses in the Federal Subsistence Management
9 Program. Following a second I will explain why I
10 intend to support my motion.

11
12 MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda Pitka. I'll
13 second.

14
15 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Rhonda. First
16 of all this is something that is long overdue, it's a
17 process dating back to 1992 as Mr. Lord had mentioned
18 with the Peratrovich case and Ameer also noted.

19
20 Just a little bit more background and
21 some of this has been discussed briefly by responses
22 from folks up here at the Board.

23
24 In May 2011 the U.S. District Court of
25 Alaska mandated that the Forest Service identify those
26 submerged lands within the Tongass National Forest that
27 did not pass to the State of Alaska at statehood. On
28 October 17th, 2011 in Peratrovich, et al., versus the
29 United States of America and the State of Alaska, the
30 U.S. District Court enjoined the United States to
31 promptly initiate regulatory proceedings for the
32 purpose of implementing the subsistence provisions in
33 Title VIII of ANILCA with respect to submerged public
34 lands within the Tongass National Forest.

35
36 So jump ahead to last year, as
37 mentioned already by Ameer, on May 12th, 2022 the
38 Tongass Submerged Lands proposed rule was finally
39 published in the Federal Register which identified 162
40 different specific parcels. The public comment period
41 ended on August 10th, 2022 as Ameer also mentioned and
42 this brings us up to today and our current purpose and
43 this is a bit of a review now at this point, but it is
44 to complete the regulatory process as directed by the
45 court and consider adding these submerged parcels to
46 the list of Federal public lands subject to Federal
47 subsistence management provisions and then make a
48 recommendation to the Secretaries.

49
50

0479

1 Simply put, the Board supports -- if
2 the Board supports this rule it will result in
3 increased subsistence harvest opportunities for rural
4 Alaskans within the Tongass National Forest.

5

6 And I'd also like to say thank you very
7 much to Jacob Hoffman and the Tongass GI Staff for
8 jumping on this project and I thought it was
9 overwhelmingly large but he took it on and within just
10 a few weeks he had developed some really marvelous maps
11 compared to what we had when we started out and I think
12 they will be very useful for people to at least get an
13 idea of where these things are and what they really --
14 what kind of opportunities might be there.

15

16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
19 Board discussion or deliberation.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
24 seeing none, Board motion -- question.

25

26 MS. KLEIN: Question.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call,
29 please.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Forest
32 Service, Greg Risdahl.

33

34 MR. RISDAHL: Forest Service supports
35 recommending this list to the Secretaries.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. National
40 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

41

42 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
43 supports.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Fish and
46 Wildlife Service, Jill Klein.

47

48 MS. KLEIN: Fish and Wildlife supports.

49

50

0480

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. BLM, Steve
2 Cohn.

3
4 MR. COHN: The BLM supports.

5
6 MS. DETWILER: BIA, Glenn Chen.

7
8 MR. CHEN: The BIA also supports. We'd
9 like to thank all the Staff who did all the hard work
10 to get us to this point in the process.

11
12 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public
13 Member Rhonda Pitka.

14
15 MS. PITKA: I support. Thank you.

16
17 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie
18 Brower.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 MS. DETWILER: I don't hear Mr. Brower,
23 but the motion passes with a vote of seven -- oh, I'm
24 sorry -- vote of six so far.

25
26 Mr. Christianson.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

29
30 MS. DETWILER: Now it passes now with a
31 vote of seven.

32
33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No worries,
34 five days, I feel transparent.

35
36 (Laughter)

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, very
39 much for that. We'll call on Staff for request for
40 reconsideration of Fisheries Proposal FP21-10.

41
42 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 Members of the Board. Today, myself, Robbin LaVine,
44 Subsistence Policy Coordinator and my colleague Scott
45 Ayers will presenting and responding to this agenda
46 item. You should have the threshold assessment or
47 analysis for the request for reconsideration of
48 Fisheries Proposal 21-10, it's a supplemental document
49 and it's on the table at the west side of the room and
50

0481

1 it's also on our website.

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

This threshold analysis of the submitted request for reconsideration for Fisheries Proposal 21-10 is to provide information to you, the Federal Subsistence Board, to use in your determination of whether or not any of the claims found -- are found to have met the threshold based on three criteria. And the three criteria stipulated in regulation are that a request for reconsideration should;

1. Provide information not previously considered by the Board.

2. Demonstrates that existing information used by the Board is incorrect, or

3. Demonstrates that the Board's interpretation of information, applicable law, or regulation is in error or contrary to existing law.

Only information available and considered at the time of the Board -- 2022 Board decision on Fisheries Proposal 21-10 can be used to review these claims.

After your discussion and deliberation of this threshold analysis, the Board may decide to have a full analysis completed on any claims that are found to have met the threshold criteria.

MR. AYERS: This request for reconsideration was submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board by Ahtna Incorporated following the adoption of Fisheries Proposal FP21-10 at the April 2022 Wildlife Regulatory Cycle meeting. Adoption of this proposal set the parameters for a dipnet and rod and reel fishery in the lower Copper area for the rural residents of Cordova and Prince William Sound.

The Office of Subsistence Management reviewed the request, identifying substantive claims that met any of the criteria outlined in the request for reconsideration regulation. Again, the three criteria are:

1. Provides information not previously considered by the Board.

1 2. Demonstrates that existing
2 information used by the Board is incorrect, or

3
4 3. Demonstrates that the Board's
5 interpretation of information, applicable law, or
6 regulation is in error or contrary to existing law.

7
8 A total of eight substantive claims
9 were identified and summarized in the threshold
10 analysis. Half of the claims were categorized under
11 Criterion 1 and the other half of the claims were
12 categorized under Criterion 3. there were no claims
13 identified under Criterion 2.

14
15 As Robbin stated earlier, this analysis
16 of the submitted request for reconsideration is to help
17 determine whether or not any of the claims are found to
18 have met the threshold based on the three criteria.
19 Any claims found to meet the threshold may be
20 considered for full analysis. Only information
21 available at the time of the 2022 adoption of FP21-10
22 was used to review these claims for the purposes of the
23 threshold analysis.

24
25 MS. LAVINE: OSM's preliminary
26 conclusion is to oppose the request of reconsideration
27 of Fisheries Proposal 21-10 and my colleague will
28 provide that justification.

29
30 MR. AYERS: The eight substantive
31 claims submitted in the request for the Board to
32 reconsider their action on Fisheries Proposal 21-10
33 were not found to have merit based on the threshold
34 process. Most claims expressed by the requester were
35 outside the scope of Fisheries Proposal 21-10 which
36 only asked the Board to approve a salmon fishery on the
37 lower Copper River. The requesters primary concerns
38 are that the lower Copper River fishery will impact
39 subsistence users in the upper Copper River at a time
40 when they are failing to meet their subsistence needs.
41 The Board's purview is to provide opportunity for
42 Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest fish
43 and wildlife, to conserve these populations when
44 necessary, and to uphold the Federal rural subsistence
45 priority.

46
47 In the case of a conservation concern
48 or increasing competition among uses and users the
49 Board may close Federal public lands and waters to all
50

1 but Federally-qualified subsistence users. If the
2 closure is not enough to provide a meaningful priority
3 or if a conservation concern continues to exist the
4 Board may then prioritize among Federally-qualified
5 subsistence users through an ANILCA Section .804
6 analysis. Eventually, if warranted, the Board may
7 close to all uses.

8

9

10 The Board cannot allocate among
11 Federally-qualified subsistence users without first
12 limiting use by non-Federally-qualified users under
13 ANILCA, Title VIII, Section .804. Non-Federally-
14 qualified users harvest the vast majority of Copper
15 River salmon and no proposals have been submitted
16 requesting restrictions of that use. Federally-
17 qualified subsistence users who are unable to continue
18 their subsistence uses should first submit a special
19 action request or fisheries proposal to curtail non-
20 subsistence uses of the resource. Extra-Territorial
21 jurisdiction is the last resort and it should be
22 requested only when actions to limit non-subsistence
23 uses prove ineffective.

23

24

25 The OSM analysis of Fisheries Proposal
26 21-10 provided a thorough examination of salmon harvest
27 history and use patterns in the entire Copper River
28 watershed and contained an estimate of the potential
29 impact of adding a lower Copper River subsistence
30 salmon fishery to the continued viability of other
31 subsistence salmon fisheries in the watershed.

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

50

MS. LAVINE: As none of the claims
presented in this threshold analysis were found to hold
merit under any of the established criteria, OSM
recommends no further action on this request for
reconsideration.

0484

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. AYERS: This concludes our presentation and we're happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any questions from the Board for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, I would also note that per all of -- per out guidance on the website we have accepted public comment throughout the course of this meeting. We received one and that was forwarded to you.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And we also have one in the audience and I'll entertain that at this time. Karen, you have the floor.

MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record my name is Karen Linnell, I'm the Executive Director for Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission, again formed of eight Federally-recognized tribes, seven who live on this river and subsist off of this river and two ANCSA Corporations who are the land holders.

I do believe throughout this meeting we have heard that the Board was missing some information because the C&T was based on the supposed 2,000 people in Cordova that would be using this dipnet fishery but then the whole of Prince of William Sound, including Tatitlek and Chenega and other communities will also be eligible and those numbers were not put before this Board when they were considering this proposal. And when -- you know, we tried to get this -- even part of it is only just to Cordova, it was shot down and so there is information that was withheld from the Board although it might not have been in Ahtna's letter. And we've seen and heard it throughout this meeting, you can't give those blanket C&T findings based on one community.

0485

1 So I asked this Board to take this up
2 for reconsideration. You heard me all week regarding
3 this fishery. You heard me all week talk about the
4 inconsistencies that we face on this river when we talk
5 about how this process works. You can see it in the
6 removal of closures for the Tangle Lakes and the Delta
7 River, they wanted more data, only on that one when
8 there's a State fishery happening, not anywhere else.
9 And then we look at the amount of information needed to
10 provide for a C&T use for a community, the extra
11 lengths that we have to go to to prove connectivity to
12 that resource but other communities don't and we're
13 seeing it here with this.

14
15 It's frustrating.

16
17 It's frustrating beyond all means and
18 I'd ask you to ask the Staff, was all of those
19 communities included in that assessment because as far
20 as I know it was only for Cordova for them to be able
21 to dipnet but, again, it was open to all of Prince
22 William Sound.

23
24 I don't know.

25
26 I try to work the system here. I try
27 to work through and try to make sure that we cross all
28 our I's and -- dot -- cross all our T's and dot all our
29 I's, I'm getting them all mixed up now but we're faced
30 with an imbalance in process and an imbalance in access
31 to resources, you know, the increased competition
32 disenfranchises folks. And we heard that with the
33 folks from Southeast yesterday when they were talking
34 about the deer and now we're seeing it here on the
35 river. I just don't want to see this kind of imbalance
36 and inequity going on in process.

37
38 Liberalization of what defines
39 customary and traditional uses of resources is going to
40 create a strain on those resources, a strain that we
41 might not be able to bounce back from. And we need to
42 be more cautious of that and the thing that happened in
43 one of the proposals that we talked about just
44 yesterday and you had asked if any other RACs had had
45 any other opinion on that, and that was that proposal
46 regarding the same fishery, Eastern Interior wasn't
47 consulted and they have jurisdiction on the Copper
48 River. They were eliminated from the entire process
49 because they don't live in the area but the resource
50

0486

1 goes up -- there's an imaginary boundary line drawn.
2 That salmon goes from the headwaters down to the ocean
3 and back and that responsibility goes from there to the
4 ocean and back, you can't draw this line and say, well,
5 now Eastern Interior has no say because they're going
6 to intercept that salmon, you know, or -- I don't know,
7 I don't want to use intercept because that's an ocean
8 word, right, but there is going to be a taking of
9 salmon that could be headed towards the up river folks,
10 the furthest, that early -- and so for Eastern Interior
11 not to be able to provide comment or anything
12 yesterday, I thought that was -- that was pretty
13 upsetting when they do have jurisdiction on the Copper
14 River. And only Western minds would think that you can
15 draw a line on the river and say, well, now it's a
16 State fish, now it's a Federal fish, nope, it's back to
17 a State fish again, only Western minds would think that
18 way. That responsibility that Eastern Interior RAC
19 has for Mentasta, Tetlin, Tanacross, Dot Lake is the
20 same responsibility that Southcentral RAC has for
21 Chitina all the way up to Chistochina. And same with
22 the Cordova, the Cordova people, that responsibility is
23 there and so having these imaginary lines where they
24 can't participate in that public process and have a say
25 where they have jurisdiction on this river and the
26 salmon is an error on this process as well.

27
28 So I'm going to stop because I'm
29 repeating myself and I think you guys heard me
30 throughout the week and ask you to go back and rethink
31 back to what was said earlier this week regarding this
32 whole fishery and this process.

33
34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
37 Karen. Any questions for Karen.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
42 Karen. I do kind of have a statement. And I know it
43 seems in the last couple of years there's been an
44 inconsistency in the runs and in the other runs
45 InterTribal Commissions were formed to start to address
46 these so we don't pit user against user and river, up,
47 down, center, against each other because you know, I,
48 myself, having a hard time with such a small limited
49 fishery but also hearing the concerns and how it
50

0487

1 unfolds, right, and how those priorities get met and
2 pitting one against the other and not having a voice
3 across the river and I'd hope that we could encourage
4 some type of planning on that Copper River seeing as
5 it is becoming a concern and in the last few
6 presentations I've felt like it's almost a Federal user
7 against a Federal user situation. I'm just saying
8 that's how I feel just because we've created this new
9 fishery, based that there wasn't one there, but if
10 these situations continue and we don't have dialogue up
11 and down the river where there's, you know, that flow
12 from there to there to there.

13

14 MS. LINNELL: If I might, Mr.
15 Chair.....

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

18

19 MS. LINNELL:address some of your
20 concerns. We do work with Native Village of Eyak. We
21 actually are partnered on projects on the Klutina River
22 sonar where 33 to 54 percent of the sockeye return
23 comes to so that we can monitor escapement there. We
24 are working with Native Village of Eyak and have helped
25 them build fishwheels and get things ready for the
26 Miles Lake Sonar. We sat at the Board of Fish last
27 year in Cordova and were able to successfully stop the
28 commercialization of subsistence fisheries use of
29 guides and outfitters for that. We do work together.

30

31 And on this, Native Village of Eyak was
32 also opposed to this fishery.

33

34 So that-- you know, that's something
35 that happens.

36

37 And, again, throughout this process and
38 when those two committees -- the two RACs were to get
39 together and talk, the public input process was left
40 out. They were only left with the 2020 dialogue and
41 you had a whole new set of Council members on each RAC
42 that weren't familiar with the situation and, frankly,
43 not being able to have input at a new RAC meeting is a
44 violation of FACA. So us not being able to participate
45 -- we could listen but we could not talk to the
46 members, it was done virtually, they didn't know what
47 the agenda was going to be and how it was going to work
48 and they stayed with a standing vote -- they didn't
49 even vote again.

50

0488

1 So that's what happened with that
2 process.

3

4 And then it came to the full Board and
5 you guys passed it and that's why we put in another
6 request for reconsideration. That process was violated
7 and wrong. And there can be severe consequences to
8 this. And based solely on that this should be
9 reconsidered and brought back, taken off the table for
10 now and if they want to put it forward again, go
11 through the public process the right way.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
16 that Karen. Any other questions from the Board.

17

18 MR. COHN: Yes, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
21 the floor.

22

23 MR. COHN: Thank you. Karen, so, you
24 know, I'm new to the Board and so I wasn't here when
25 these deliberations happened the first time and if I'm
26 following you correctly you sort of the -- it sounds
27 like when this was first being discussed and decided
28 that it was proposed that this would be something that
29 would be available for the residents of Cordova and it
30 was not explicitly described that that would also be
31 available to all residents of Prince William Sound and
32 now you're saying that it is available to all residents
33 of Prince William Sound. Am I hearing that correctly
34 or I guess I would like to just learn a little more
35 about that and maybe ask the Staff at OSM if they could
36 also, you know, provide some clarification on that.

37

38 MR. AYERS: Through the Chair. Member
39 Cohn. This is Scott Ayers, again, for the record,
40 Fisheries Division Supervisor for OSM. I will say that
41 the Staff analysis for Fisheries Proposal 21-10 did
42 indicate that those eligible to harvest fish in this
43 location included all members -- or all residents of
44 the Prince William Sound area, this area is -- for the
45 purposes of C&T is labeled as Prince William Sound
46 remainder and that specific area is residents of Prince
47 William Sound are eligible under that C&T for salmon.

48

49 Thank you.

50

0489

1 MS. LINNELL: To answer you, it was
2 told to us that it would be Cordova, and it was told to
3 the RACs that it was Cordova residents. Because I went
4 to both Eastern Interior and Southcentral RACs.

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You got the
7 floor, Charlie.

8
9 MR. WRIGHT: If I may, when this first
10 came up we had a big concern about the extra fishery
11 and what it would do to the up river folks and limit
12 them and we thought that the Cordova area being so
13 close to the ocean and having so many other
14 opportunities, that this wasn't even important to them
15 and just for the record it was stated for Cordova;
16 that's all we heard. So I believe that she's right.

17
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
21 other questions. Discussions. This is all pertinent
22 information. Thank you.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I have another
27 public testifier if you're done, but if you're not
28 done.

29
30 MS. LINNELL: I'm done, thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
33 you. Appreciate that. Jim Simon, you have the floor.

34
35 MR. SIMON: Thank you. For the record
36 my name is Jim Simon. I am a consultant with Ahtna
37 InterTribal Resource Commission but I'm speaking on my
38 own behalf as a former Federally-qualified user from
39 the Copper Basin who grew up bartering and trading, you
40 know, with our Ahtna friends and relatives to get large
41 quantities in the past there that are no longer
42 possible because of the great demands by Alaskans on
43 the Copper River salmon resources.

44
45 This is -- I agree, that this is an
46 issue that is pitting Federally-qualified users against
47 one another and that's very unfortunate when really
48 what is at issue is, you know, that most of the harvest
49 of these resources is taken commercially even to the
50

0490

1 point where in a recent year, I can't remember, but
2 your Staff, I'm sure, would be able to clarify, I think
3 it was 2020 or 2021 when the chinook escapement goal
4 was not met but there was still over 6,000 chinook
5 harvested and commercially sold, you know, at the mouth
6 of the river.

7
8 But the issue here is, it is building
9 on what Karen was talking about some of the process
10 issues at play, you know, the two residents of Cordova
11 submitted this proposal and with the assistance of a
12 Forest Service employee, you know, doing this photocopy
13 exercise of soliciting public support to establish this
14 new fishery, you know, this happened, after decades of
15 the Ahtna people fighting to even have a Federal
16 subsistence fisheries opportunity in Alaska and, yet,
17 now that this sort of blanket wholesale approach to
18 providing customary and traditional use access to these
19 resources is still differentially applied. You know
20 when the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission
21 testified before the Southcentral Regional Advisory
22 Council over the Federal closure review of the Delta
23 River, which is in the Ahtna Traditional Use Territory,
24 the Southcentral RAC was told they couldn't even
25 comment on that request for closure because it's
26 outside of the Southcentral's jurisdiction. So, you
27 know, here -- and then if that proposal, you know, all
28 the focus is on Delta Junction as if they are the only
29 customary and traditional users under the Federal
30 program to utilize that resource and so if the Delta
31 people wanted then the Ahtna communities who actually
32 have stewarded those resources for, you know, thousands
33 of years as the archeological record demonstrates,
34 would then have to submit a proposal to establish
35 customary and traditional use within their own
36 traditional territory because of your imaginary lines
37 on the landscape.

38
39 So that's a problem that hopefully --
40 you know, maybe this is way outside the realm of this
41 request for reconsideration, but just hopefully will
42 give you a more clear understanding of where Karen is
43 coming from with this differential application.

44
45 You know all of these Federal uses and
46 State subsistence uses are born on the backs of the
47 generations of stewardship of Alaska Native people and,
48 yet, the doors are swung wide open for settlers and
49 newcomers to build off the backs of indigenous values
50

0491

1 and use histories, you know, that, yeah, it only took
2 30 years to get the Federal Program and the Katie John
3 decisions in place but now the doors are wide open
4 until we go to the Delta and now the Ahtna now have to
5 go through a lot more hoops than others and it just
6 seems peculiar.

7

8 Speaking to the issue of, you know, the
9 lack of public testimony, et cetera, the mother of my
10 cousin Dorothy is a new member of the Southcentral
11 Regional Advisory Council, she stated on the record she
12 did not know what was going on here and didn't have
13 sufficient information and, you know, so that's
14 something also that I have raised to many of you
15 recently about the problems with curtailing public
16 engagement at Regional Advisory Councils that seem to
17 conflict with the FACA obligations.

18

19 But in any event it's very unfortunate
20 that this has been a divisive issue and it's
21 unfortunate that Eastern Interior RAC's voice, for
22 whatever reason, was not really part of this and, you
23 know, maybe we should all be looking at how the Federal
24 Program can make sure that there are more fish that get
25 into the river so that the Cordova residents and the
26 rest of Prince William Sound who may end up utilizing
27 this fishery, the assumption is that it's only Cordova
28 who is going to take place and, you know, maybe we'll
29 have to go through an .804 process at some point if we
30 see all the other Prince William Sound opportunities
31 who are also struggling to provide for their
32 subsistence uses, they may end up showing up here. The
33 presumption is that they won't but there is -- we don't
34 know that that is the case.

35

36 So in the meantime, I will repeat, you
37 know, I think the Federal Program continues to tell us
38 regularly that amounts necessary for subsistence under
39 the State system have nothing to do with your
40 obligations here so my question to you is still, how do
41 you assess your success? How do you assess your
42 success at providing for the continuation of
43 subsistence uses when we have years of State identified
44 amounts necessary for subsistence not being reached,
45 yes, I still trade and exchange with my Ahtna friends
46 and relatives but we don't get a pickup truck full of
47 salmon anymore because there aren't that many. You
48 know my friends on the upper Copper now have to spend
49 all summer to get the numbers of fish that they used to
50

0492

1 be able to get in a day or two and I know none of you
2 were around here then in all likelihood except Rhonda
3 and Tony perhaps, but things are changing and -- and
4 subsistence users and especially Alaska Native rural
5 residents continue to bear a disproportionate brunt of
6 this sort of squeezing every bit of harvestable surplus
7 utilizing methods and approaches of maximum sustained
8 yield that are untested as to whether or not those
9 principles are still viable approaches to sustainable
10 management given the environmental regime shifts that
11 we are experiencing right now.

12

13 You know our elder, Nick Jackson, from
14 the Ahtna Region worked for the Department back in the
15 1960s 20 some years ago we identified the concerns that
16 he has about the declining fecundity of Copper River
17 salmon because of the dramatic decreases in fish size
18 that has an expedient impact on the number of eggs
19 and, yet, still that quality of escapement and
20 fecundity issues are not included in the recently
21 lowered chinook escapement goal for the Copper River.
22 And all of these things together you can't discount
23 that that is part of the reason why the tribes of the
24 upper Copper are -- keep telling you that their
25 subsistence needs are not being met and requesting your
26 assistance.

27

28 So with that, enough, thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
31 questions from the Board. Appreciate your testimony,
32 Jim.

33

34 MR. COHN: I do have a question.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have a
37 question, yes.

38

39 MR. COHN: Yes. Could you just share a
40 little more about the concerns about returning size of
41 fish. I've heard of this issue in other rivers, I
42 wasn't aware this was also something in the Copper
43 River.

44

45 MR. SIMON: Yeah, and, you know, maybe
46 Ben or Mark could give you more information about the
47 State's perspectives on declining fish. But I can tell
48 you as a boy, you know, who had a lot of fish cleaning
49 duties what, 43 years ago, for example, that what was
50

0493

1 once a sockeye salmon, a good size sockeye salmon when
2 I was a kid is now lucky to find a king salmon that
3 big. You know the fish are just getting smaller and
4 smaller and it's something -- like I don't remember the
5 details, but -- of the -- you know a certain inch --
6 certain set of like five inch decrease in size
7 represents some expeditious loss of amount of eggs and
8 size of eggs. And we do have some recent science as I
9 understand that smaller eggs are less viable and less
10 productive, there's more, you know, data coming in
11 about some of the thiamine levels of these smaller eggs
12 that also speak to their viability and all of these
13 things need to be started to consider as we set
14 escapement goals.

15

16 Because one big king salmon does not
17 equal one small king salmon and the eggs in the gravel.

18

19 And, yeah, we have production changes
20 and -- but we need to start paying closer attention and
21 if we -- if the State is not going to look at these
22 kind of quality of escapement issues then we encourage
23 the Federal agencies and your Federal Subsistence Board
24 to do that. Like I know Fish and Wildlife Service in
25 some of its comprehensive conservation plans from like
26 the Yukon National Wildlife Refuge 1988, there are
27 actual escapement goals in that plan for tributaries of
28 the Kuskokwim River that are not used by the Fish and
29 Wildlife Service in implementing and managing salmon in
30 the Yukon Delta Refuge. I have not gotten into the
31 details of the Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and
32 Preserve's existing plans but, you know, and the
33 assessment projects that have been done in the Park are
34 -- you know fortunately we have the Tanada Creek weir
35 back in operation, it's just soft funding provided.
36 But Long Lake, there's no longer any assessments there.
37 I mean it seems that dual management is here to stay so
38 it's time for the Federal Program to start fulfilling
39 its obligations under your various organic acts to
40 ensure the sustainable management of the resources that
41 you are charged with managing on Federal public lands
42 and waters.

43

44 And because the State of Alaska,
45 experiencing all of its budget woes just as we all are,
46 but we all need to be working together to make sure
47 that we have salmon for the future generations and I
48 just think that the information that we have presently
49 is inadequate.

50

1 But it's wonderful, you know, there are
2 a lot of opportunities to partnership between the
3 Native Village of Eyak, Ahtna InterTribal Resource
4 Commission and the Department of Fish and Game, you
5 know, in trying to monitor the Klutina River which is a
6 major producer of sockeye, you know, for the whole
7 drainage and we need to do more of that and we need the
8 Federal Subsistence Board's assistance in making sure
9 that we have more information, not less, given the type
10 -- the severities of environmental regime shifts that
11 we're experiencing with climate change, et cetera, and
12 ocean warming.

13
14 MR. COHN: Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Jim.

17
18 Robbin.

19
20 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 Members of the Board. I would just like to clarify for
22 the record and perhaps the Solicitor can back me up if
23 I'm incorrect. But FACA requires Advisory Council
24 meetings to be open to the public, it does not require
25 public testimony, however, that being said, we
26 recognize within the Federal Subsistence Program, that
27 this is a public process made better by public
28 participation and regardless of some of the challenges
29 we've recently faced in providing those opportunities
30 we are committed to offering up all possible
31 opportunities for public participation and comment
32 moving forward.

33
34 And I heard that from you just recently
35 so thank you, Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
38 the clarification.

39
40 Yeah, go ahead, Sarah.

41
42 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 I note Mr. Simon asked a question about Wrangell-
44 St.Elias fisheries and we have a fisheries Staff here
45 from the Park and Preserve and so I thought maybe he
46 could answer your question.

47
48 MR. SARAFIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair
49 and Members of the Board. I'm Dave Sarafin, the
50

0495

1 Fisheries Management Biologist at Wrangell-St.Elias
2 National Park and Preserve. And I could, you know,
3 agree with some of what Jim was just saying about size
4 at age, there have been studies, I don't have good
5 numbers before you, I'm aware of this has been a trend
6 occurring later that the size of age that has -- from
7 the catch sampled regularly by Fish and Game has had a
8 relatively recent reduction that they've observed. I
9 believe it was both in sockeye and chinook salmon and
10 that's primarily, I believe, from samples there in the
11 commercial fleet. Otherwise, you know, we are
12 monitoring. We got Tanada Creek salmon weir in to
13 monitor run strength there. And in the river, overall,
14 you know, it's a big glacial river and it's a tough
15 challenge for in-river management especially as well as
16 the marine waters but a lot of it is the Department of
17 Fish and Game does have, you know, a management plan
18 they've had in effect for a number of years based
19 primarily off of the Miles Lake Sonar. So through
20 that, based on numbers of fish it has been a pretty
21 successful program for managing the river where it
22 still has returns that are typically within levels that
23 provide for harvest opportunities as well as
24 sustainable escapements.

25

26 So it doesn't really account for the
27 size and how it impacts the aspects of it.

28

29 But if there are any other specific
30 questions or information I could provide I'd be happy
31 to.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
34 Thank you for taking the time to come up. Thank you,
35 Sarah, for the question.

36

37 Operator, we took testimony on the
38 floor here, is there anybody on the line who would like
39 to be recognized at this time for RFR22-01.

40

41 OPERATOR: Once, again, please press
42 star, one and record your name if you'd like to make a
43 comment.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 OPERATOR: We have no comment at this
48 time.

49

50

0496

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
2 We'll call on ISC for their recommendation.

3
4 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Members of the Board. The ISC provided their standard
6 comment.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
11 That opens up the floor for Board discussion with
12 Council Chairs.

13
14 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
17 floor.

18
19 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
20 guess my question isn't directed at a Council Chair but
21 there's been the discussion about some either confusion
22 or lack of knowledge about the customary and
23 traditional use determinations that was associated with
24 this proposal. And, Mr. Ayers, you indicated that this
25 was part of the analysis, the C&T included all
26 residents of Prince William Sound.

27
28 Could you reconfirm that this
29 information was in the documents when this was being
30 discussed by the Councils and others in the preliminary
31 stages of this process?

32
33 MR. AYERS: Through the Chair. Mr.
34 Chen. Yes, thank you, Dr. Chen. I'm just getting a
35 message here from my colleague Dr. Vickers that said
36 that the transcripts for that Eastern Interior meeting
37 were just checked from 2020 and that Milo Burcham, who
38 was with the Forest Service at the time said in his
39 presentation of FP21-10 that the customary and
40 traditional use was for all Prince William Sound but
41 that the fishery would probably be used mostly by
42 Cordova residents.

43
44 This is complicated.

45
46 The customary and traditional use
47 determinations, as has been stated by the others that
48 were up here earlier are lines on a map, for these
49 areas, and it presents a real challenge. It's
50

0498

1 done, again, by Mr. Milo Burcham who was with the
2 Forest Service at the time and has since retired and so
3 I cannot speak directly to that although, again, I'm
4 making an assumption here he was one of the primary
5 authors of the analysis and therefore was well aware
6 that the customary and traditional use determination
7 covered all residents of that area. My assumption
8 would be that, yes, that number that he came up with
9 did include harvest from all of that area, all of those
10 communities.

11

12 MS. KLEIN: Can you share -- I notice
13 Scott behind you, Karen has her hand up, just so you
14 know, but Scott can you share what other communities
15 we're even referring to or like what is the Prince
16 William Sound remainder, is that complex, I'm sorry
17 you're not making a good face in response to that
18 question. Thanks.

19

20 MS. LAVINE: I believe -- this is -- for
21 the record this is Robbin, and some of my colleagues
22 may have access to our fisheries regulations but those
23 might be the communities of -- of Chenega, Tatitlek,
24 maybe -- maybe -- maybe Valdez -- nope -- so any of
25 those communities, they are pretty far away and it
26 would require -- thank you -- oh, it should also say it
27 in the analysis -- oh, Page 68.

28

29 (Pause)

30

31 MS. LAVINE: Hang on just a moment,
32 folks.

33

34 (Pause)

35

36 MS. LAVINE: All right, thank you, Mr.
37 Chair. Thank you for your -- thank you for your
38 patience. So remainder of the Prince William Sound
39 area, C&T for salmon, it is residents of the Prince
40 William Sound area and that would -- I would imagine
41 encompass the actual geographic locations within the
42 Prince William Sound despite the fact that the Prince
43 William Sound area also can include -- ah, here we go,
44 thank you.

45

46 (Pause)

47

48 MS. LAVINE: The Prince William Sound
49 area, there we go, includes all waters of Alaska

50

0499

1 between the longitude of Cape Fairfield and the
2 longitude of Cape Suckling. These regulations apply on
3 inland waters within or adjacent to the Chugach
4 National Forest and Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and
5 Preserve and exclude marine waters. General domain
6 lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management are open
7 to fishing only on non-navigable waters and the Gulkana
8 River portion designated as a wild and scenic river.

9

10 (Pause)

11

12 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin
13 again. And I'm -- I'm -- at this point in time I have
14 not been an analyst on this proposal, on the Fisheries
15 Proposal 21-10 nor Fisheries Proposal 23-19 and so some
16 of my colleagues might be able to better address some
17 of the tricky things that we're talking about when we
18 talk about C&Ts.

19

20 You'll notice that for Map 12, the
21 Prince William Sound area, we have a number of areas
22 described in regulation that includes specifics on
23 residents. We have the southwestern district in Green
24 Island, we have north of a line from Porcupine to
25 Granite Point, and south of a line from Point Low to
26 Tongue Point, we also have the Chitina Subdistrict of
27 the upper Copper River district, we also have the
28 Glennallen subdistrict of the upper Copper River
29 district, and then we also have the Batzulnetas area
30 which includes waters of the Copper River and Tanada
31 Creek between National Park Service regulatory markers.
32 And those areas have the communities defined, their --
33 their boundaries and then the communities defined as
34 attached to those particular areas.

35

36 The remainder of the Prince William
37 Sound area, comes after those communities are defined.

38

39 And so maybe some of my colleagues
40 might -- from anthropology or elsewhere might be able
41 to help correct but, thank you, Mr. Chair. Go ahead.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think I just
44 got confused and so I could see where we heard
45 testimony from the Regional Advisory Council and we're
46 hearing it from the public who testified today, there
47 was a lot of confusion in this. Even me confused to
48 the point where I thought it was pitting user against
49 user but as we hear the public and how it plays out

50

0500

1 here it seems like there was confusion from the front
2 end of this to the end of it based on processes, public
3 input or not input, and also, yeah, and so I'd be
4 really -- probably strongly considering what we have
5 before us today.

6
7 Based on what I'm hearing here today
8 I'd like to, you know, just take that position that,
9 yeah, this seems like there could be some better
10 vetting on it with the public. If our Regional
11 Advisory Council Chair is sitting there telling us that
12 they thought it was Cordova, you know, then the
13 perception in the meeting was probably specifically
14 that, and maybe not so much encompass the entirety in
15 their minds of what the C&T was and so I don't know if
16 we're not doing diligence in presenting the information
17 or if it's just -- was just a miss-clarification at the
18 time but it seems like we have some -- you know a
19 conundrum here that probably warrants a request for a
20 reconsideration at this time. And what I'm going to do
21 is strongly encourage this Board to take action.

22
23 MR. COHN: Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. Steve.

26
27 MR. COHN: Do we have -- for the
28 specific request for a reconsideration, do we have a
29 position statement from either RAC that we've been
30 engaging with on this today?

31
32 (Pause)

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Well, those
35 guys just left but -- oh, here we go.

36
37 (Pause)

38
39 MR. AYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
40 is Scott Ayers again. We did not take the analysis for
41 the threshold of the RFR to the Regional Advisory
42 Councils. This document went.....

43
44 (Pause)

45
46 MR. AYERS: Yeah, it was not prepared
47 at the time, we were trying to go as quickly as we
48 possibly could to go -- once this request was presented
49 to us to bring it to the Board for this meeting.

50

0501

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we're
2 still under Board discussion. Deliberation.

3
4 Jill.

5
6 MS. KLEIN: So if the Board were to
7 recommend to move the process forward for
8 consideration, what would be the next steps and what
9 happens with the current regulation in place?

10
11 MR. AYERS: I'll let Mr. Lord fill in
12 the rest of this. But there were eight claims
13 identified in the threshold process, four of them under
14 Criterion 1 and four of them under Criterion 2 -- or 3,
15 excuse me. My understanding is that in order for this
16 to move forward to a full analysis, the Board will have
17 to find merit with one of those claims listed under one
18 of those criteria.

19
20 MR. LORD: At least one of those
21 claims, one or more. And also the current regulation
22 would remain in effect during that time.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I have a
25 question then, if we do move in a direction here, how
26 long does a full analysis take?

27
28 MR. AYERS: Through the Chair. The
29 last one that we did that I recall was for the Kenai
30 River gillnet RFR15-01 and that took multiple Board
31 cycles to get from start to finish.

32
33 (Pause)

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
36 Karen, what the heck.

37
38 MS. LINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 This is Karen Linnell. The person who wrote the
40 analysis for the fishery was the one that was
41 soliciting public comments. Just so you know that it's
42 not a fair and unbiased analysis. Because he called my
43 office asking me to write a letter in support of it and
44 then he asked me for the contact information for the
45 Chair for the Eastern Interior RAC. And so when I got
46 done I called Sue right away to let her know that I
47 just received a call from the guy that wrote the
48 analysis for the proposal in the first place and that
49 he was soliciting comments in support of the new dipnet
50

0502

1 fishery out of Cordova.

2

3 So there's that.

4

5 And I did end up speaking with Mr.
6 Schmid about it and then I was shocked that he was
7 actually presenting additional information when he had
8 an obvious conflict. And so, again, you know, that
9 kind of thing happened when we were trying to get our
10 community harvest hunt with the expansion of where
11 Copper Center was and the CDP -- or the Census
12 Designated Places that were going to be used to
13 incorporate Silver Springs.

14

15 So that happened because that was where
16 some of the Park Staff lived, you know, so it happens
17 and it happened here. I just wanted you to know that.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board
22 discussion. Questions. Yes, Sarah, you have the
23 floor.

24

25 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26 I'm going to try to articulate a few of the points that
27 I'm taking away here. It seems like OSM has found that
28 none of the points in the analysis meet the criteria,
29 correct, for the proposal of reconsideration.

30

31 MS. LAVINE: The request that OSM
32 received had a number of different claims in it and
33 those claims as submitted did not meet the three
34 criteria.....

35

36 MS. CREACHBAUM: Okay.

37

38 MS. LAVINE:to meet the threshold
39 to continue on for a deeper analysis.

40

41 MS. CREACHBAUM: And those are the only
42 criteria, I understand, Solicitor Lord, that we may use
43 for the reconsideration?

44

45 MR. LORD: We've never faced that
46 question before. If you're asking that if we could
47 consider a new criterion heard at this meeting for
48 reconsideration I know of no legal reason why you could
49 not.

50

0503

1 MS. CREACHBAUM: Okay. Because it
2 seems like a mess. And I -- it does seem like it
3 warrants further thought. I'm trying to thread the
4 needle between what's required from the process and
5 what we're hearing from the people who are affected.

6
7 Any ideas?

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I have an idea,
10 take it up today, the request. The element that I
11 think we all kind of got confused here and based on the
12 process being confusing all the way through and
13 testimony from the people who received the testimony
14 feeling like they didn't receive the adequate
15 testimony, that's the testimony from the people we base
16 our testimony off of, which is deference to the RAC.
17 And so I base it off of the deference to the RAC, that
18 the RAC said they were confused so if they were
19 confused and I'm confused, I think the precedent set is
20 that confusion can be a pretty good reason.

21
22 MR. LORD: Okay. So what are you
23 asking OSM to do?

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I would say we
26 would ask like the request for reconsideration asked,
27 that we go towards a full analysis based on that there
28 was just some inconsistencies in the process and that
29 we would like to get a clearer record for the public
30 and start to look at how we can have that engagement
31 elevated to a place where everybody feels like they're
32 part of it and that we're getting the thing right, and
33 that when we do present information it's presented in a
34 thorough manner that the people who are sitting there
35 can absorb it in a manner that they feel like they're
36 making the best guess for the resource and the people
37 they serve.

38
39 And so I think based on the confusion I
40 have that would be the best move forward for me, for
41 the record.

42
43 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead,
46 Glenn.

47
48 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
49 Mr. Lord pointed out, this is kind of a new situation
50

0504

1 that we've never faced before. I would mention that
2 all the other claims that are before us have been
3 thoroughly reviewed by the OSM Staff, analyzed and set
4 forth with the written record accompanying them. I
5 would be a bit concerned that we move forward and
6 accept this new claim that came to us during the
7 meeting without that thorough analysis and sound
8 written record to accompany our action.

9

10 I guess a question to Ken is what would
11 be your perspectives on this?

12

13 MR. LORD: I'm all about a clear
14 written record with reasons. So what you're suggesting
15 is we would ask OSM to now do another threshold
16 analysis based on what we've heard here today in
17 writing, is that what you're getting at Glenn?

18

19 MR. CHEN: Yes.

20

21 MR. LORD: I think that's a good idea,
22 it would slow things down, but from a record
23 perspective it's the best way to go.

24

25 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair. Question.
26 Would that analysis include the opportunity to talk
27 with the affected RACs for clarity?

28

29 MR. LORD: So as a matter of practice
30 we don't take RF -- threshold analysis to the RACs, it
31 doesn't mean that you couldn't decide to do that.

32

33 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin.
34 I would note that when a threshold assessment is
35 conducted we have a very specific claim or claims that
36 we -- that are -- that can nest under the criteria. So
37 we go back to the three criteria and I would actually
38 -- I'm -- I'm going to do this -- I'm going to walk
39 through this with you, it's to help me wrap my brain
40 around what we need from you and potentially the public
41 to help clarify how we might nest and where we might
42 nest a new claim.

43

44 So the three criteria we're looking at
45 is:

46

47 Provides information not previously
48 considered by the Board.

49

50

0505

1 Now, we might be able to say that while
2 C&T was provided within the initial proposal and that
3 it was described within the original proposal, it
4 wasn't the focus of the presentation, nor was it really
5 the focus on comment or Board action, really. So
6 having a better understanding of what -- what the C&T
7 for this particular fishery might mean in its
8 implications. That might help and that might be nested
9 -- that request for further -- further illustration of
10 -- of the C&T impacted by Fisheries Proposal 21-10 and
11 its potential use through the acknowledged C&T, that
12 might nest under Criteria 1.

13

14 (Pause)

15

16 MS. CREACHBAUM: I understand that one
17 of the criteria is that the information that the Board
18 has used for deliberation is correct.....

19

20 MS. LAVINE: Or incorrect, yes.

21

22 MS. CREACHBAUM: Or incorrect. I think
23 that's a good one. I think we might be able to make a
24 very rationale argument that the information before the
25 Board today being confusing as being the same as being
26 some inaccuracies. That makes sense to me.

27

28 MS. LAVINE: Thank you. Through the
29 Chair, thank you, Member Creachbaum.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

32

33 MR. COHN: Yeah, I would concur with
34 that. I think that we've received now oral testimony
35 that -- and I don't -- wouldn't want to, you know,
36 question anyone's intent but just the effect of the
37 communications it sounds like that went on when this
38 was initially vetted through the RACs was -- maybe not
39 -- not -- not transmitted in such a way that there was
40 clarity and so I think that also does seem to me to at
41 least trigger these -- perhaps one and two of these
42 criteria.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
45 Steve. And we also got to remember this is our first
46 in-Board meeting and so doing this stuff over
47 teleconference was super hard and I just want to put
48 that on the record, that we're talking about a time and
49 a space that was not a regular time and space, and I

50

0506

1 thought about that on every proposal we had going this
2 week, that the competition, the level was down,
3 everything and we're coming back to general activity
4 levels and so consider that as well is it's really
5 hard, you know, being a Chairman and a public figure
6 like this if you're sitting in a Zoom room trying to
7 acknowledge people, see everything and absorb
8 information and, you know, doing -- and thinking of the
9 timeframe that we went through and the struggle we had
10 as leaders here and as Staff and as public to engage in
11 the process. I was proud of our Board for continuing
12 the engagement and, of course, throughout that there
13 would be some of these areas where it just wasn't as
14 good as it could have been.

15

16 And, so, you know, leaning in that
17 direction, you know, and knowing that it's really hard
18 when you're just on a phone.

19

20 And so I'd just like to put that out
21 there and remind us that we were in a really trying
22 time and situation as we progressed through these and
23 had those meetings and tried to do the best diligence
24 for the public and to reach out and so just for the
25 record I want to tell the Staff, we appreciate that
26 and, you know, things happen.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 The floor is open without any more
31 discussion for a motion.

32

33 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, may we have
34 just five minutes to craft a motion.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Five minute
37 break, thank you.

38

39 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you.

40

41 (Off record)

42

43 (On record)

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we're
46 back from our break and we have a quorum here at the
47 table. The floor, again, is open, we broke for
48 discussion here and Sarah has a question -- no
49 question, sorry.

50

0507

1 So at this time I'd entertain that the
2 floor was open for a motion.

3

4 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, Sarah
5 Creachbaum, National Park Service.

6

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
8 floor.

9

10 MS. CREACHBAUM: I move that based on
11 the information provided at this meeting the Board does
12 not find that Claim 4.1 has merit and directs Staff to
13 complete a full analysis of that claim.

14

15 Justification is there was an erroneous
16 interpretation of information regarding the scope of
17 impacts and communities involved. This will allow for
18 greater input and participation by public and Regional
19 Advisory Councils.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22

23 MR. LORD: Ms. Creachbaum, I think you
24 said does not find, I think you meant does find.

25

26 MS. CREACHBAUM: Oh, I did indeed does
27 find, pardon me.

28

29 MR. LORD: Thank you.

30

31 MS. CREACHBAUM: Pardon me, it's been a
32 long week.

33

34 MR. LORD: Yep.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There's a
37 motion on the floor.

38

39 MR. COHN: Steve Cohn for BLM seconds.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
42 Motion's been made and seconded to reconsider to full
43 analysis, any more deliberation, questions, comments by
44 the Board.

45

46 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have it.

49

50

0508

1 MR. CHEN: As we pointed out earlier we
2 felt that our process would be strengthened by having a
3 careful analysis done of a new claim that was brought
4 up today, so this helps to accomplish that by advancing
5 this forward and having a written analysis and better
6 documentation.

7
8 I would point out that it was our
9 understanding that the Southcentral Council, when they
10 took action on this proposal did understand that the
11 C&T was for all Prince William Sound residents and that
12 was part of the analysis documents, it was part of
13 their understanding and part of the basis for their
14 action.

15
16 Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board
19 comments.

20
21 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, go ahead.

24
25 MR. RISDAHL: This is Greg Risdahl with
26 the Forest Service. I'd essentially just like to
27 reiterate what Mr. Chen has said over here. The Forest
28 Service also believes that the Southcentral did know
29 and understand who the C&T was, who that included at
30 the time. And I also think that OSM has done a good
31 job on the threshold analysis, but with the new
32 information that has come up it does make sense that we
33 move forward to dig a little deeper into this.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other Board
38 comments.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
43 question.

44
45 MS. PITKA: Question.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call,
48 please.

49
50

0509

1 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Sarah Creachbaum,
2 National Park Service.

3
4 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
5 supports as stated.

6
7 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Fish and
8 Wildlife Service, Jill Klein.

9
10 MS. KLEIN: Fish and Wildlife supports
11 the motion that claim 4.1 does have merit and including
12 information from the testimony that we heard today. We
13 support having a full analysis on that claim.

14
15 Thank you.

16
17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Steve Cohn,
18 BLM.

19
20 MR. COHN: BLM supports the motion on
21 the finding that the claim 4.1 has merit.

22
23 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Glenn Chen,
24 BIA.

25
26 MR. CHEN: BIA supports the motion.

27
28 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Greg
29 Risdahl, Forest Service.

30
31 MR. RISDAHL: Forest Service supports
32 the motion.

33
34 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public
35 Member Rhonda Pitka.

36
37 MS. PITKA: I support the motion.

38
39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Charlie
40 Brower -- Public Member Charlie Brower, are you on.

41
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, he's not
43 here this afternoon.

44
45 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

46
47 Chair Anthony Christianson.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

50

0510

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. The motion
2 passes with a vote -- unanimous vote of seven.

3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
5 Thank you to the Staff. Thank you to everyone taking
6 the time to craft a motion. We'll go ahead and move on
7 to Item non-rural determination proposal for Ketchikan
8 threshold assessment.

9
10 MR. VICKERS: All right. I was afraid
11 that everyone was going to fall asleep this afternoon,
12 so I'm glad it seems we're all awake and ready to hear
13 this last action item.

14
15 Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and Members
16 of the Board. My name is Brent Vickers, Anthropology
17 Division Supervisor at the Office of Subsistence
18 Management. I'm presenting threshold assessment of
19 Non-Rural Determination Proposal NDP25-01. You can
20 find the threshold assessment on Page 864 of your
21 meeting books. The proposal itself can be found on
22 Page 871.

23
24 Non-Rural Determination Proposal,
25 NDP25-01 was submitted by the Ketchikan Indian
26 Community and requests that the Federal Subsistence
27 Board rescind the non-rural determination of the
28 Ketchikan area which would result in a rural
29 designation of the Ketchikan area. A threshold
30 assessment is the evaluation of the merit of a non-
31 rural determination proposal.

32
33 If the Board determines that the
34 proposal meets the four threshold requirements then OSM
35 will proceed with a full analysis of the rural
36 character of the community.

37
38 The first threshold requirement is:

39
40 The proposal is based upon information
41 not previously considered by the Board.

42
43 Ketchikan's non-rural status has not
44 been considered by the Board since it adopted the new
45 policy on non-rural determinations in January 2017.
46 Furthermore, the proponent claims that the
47 characteristics of the Ketchikan area have changed
48 since its previous non-rural determination, including a
49 reduced population level, less services and a less
50

0511

1 reliable food supply chain. Lastly, in March 2022, the
2 Ketchikan Indian Community tribal government declared
3 that the Ketchikan Indian Community's territory is
4 rural.

5

6 OSM conclusion is that the proposal
7 meets this threshold requirement.

8

9 The second threshold requirement is:

10

11 The proposal demonstrates that
12 information used and interpreted by the Board in
13 designating the community as non-rural has changed
14 since the original determination was made.

15

16 The proponent states that there have
17 been changes in Ketchikan since previous
18 determinations, including a smaller population, less
19 grocery stores and other services, inflation of fuel
20 and non-traditional food prices, and less reliability
21 in the non-traditional food supply chain.
22 Additionally, the proponent claims that other Federal
23 agencies, including the Department of Agriculture have
24 expanded their definitions of rural and that Ketchikan
25 qualifies as rural under these definitions.

26

27 The OSM conclusion is that the proposal
28 meets this threshold requirement.

29

30 The third threshold requirement is:

31

32 The proposal provides substantive
33 rationale and supportive evidence for determining the
34 rural status of a community or area that takes into
35 consideration the unique qualities of the region. The
36 proponent explained that Ketchikan is inaccessible by
37 the road system from the rest of the state of Alaska,
38 has limited access to non-traditional foods that can be
39 purchased through stores, has an unreliable supply
40 chain for importing non-traditional foods and that
41 depends on privately owned barges, and has limited
42 access to hospitals and other services, has a high
43 reliance on traditional foods in the area and has
44 active food sharing and trading networks among its
45 community members that are consistent with those in
46 nearby rural communities.

47

48 The OSM conclusion is that the proposal
49 meets this third threshold requirement.

50

0512

1 The final threshold requirement is:

2

3

4 The proposal provides substantive
5 information that supports the provided rationale that a
6 community or area is rural instead of non-rural.

6

7

8 The proponent provides substantive
9 information on community boundaries, demographics,
10 services, subsistence harvest practices and resource
11 sharing and a declaration by the Ketchikan Indian
12 Community tribal government that Ketchikan Indian
13 Community is a rural territory.

13

14

15 The OSM conclusion is that the proposal
16 meets this threshold requirement.

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

In closing, OSM has found that the
proposal meets all four threshold requirements.

Thank you, and let me know if you have
any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions for the Staff from the Board.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
thank you.

We'll go ahead and provide for public
comment at this time.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No questions.
So we'll call on Trixie Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: Good afternoon, almost
evening. I'm happy to be here on Den'ina land here
talking about this with you today.

(In Tlingit)

Greetings, Honorable Members of the
Board. Mr. Chair. Staff. Everyone in the audience.
Gunalcheesh, thank you for being here and engaging in
this work.

0513

1 My name is Trixie Bennett (In Tlingit)

2

3 My Tlingit name means Leaf Woman.

4

5 (In Tlingit)

6

7 I said I'm Tlingit. I belong to the

8 (In Tlingit) people. A Raven/Frog Clan out of

9 Wrangell, Alaska where I was born and raised.

10

11 Gunalcheesh for the opportunity to

12 speak here today.

13

14 Today I'm here on behalf of the

15 Ketchikan Indian Community, one of the two Federally-

16 recognized tribes in Ketchikan from the traditional

17 homelands of the Taanta Kwaan and the Saanya Kwaan

18 people. I'm here to speak in support of KIC's proposal

19 to make Ketchikan the subsistence hunting and fishing

20 community that it should be.

21

22 I've spent my career in primary health

23 care administration for the KIC people. I'm a past

24 President and the current treasurer for our tribe. I'm

25 also a grandmother, a mother, an auntie, and a plant

26 medicine teacher and a student. At KIC we are finding

27 ways to increase our access to our foods and our way of

28 life because we know the culture is the medicine, our

29 foods are the cure.

30

31 Since the 1890s the Tlingits have been

32 appealing to the United States due to White intrusion

33 on subsistence resources and in seeking title to our

34 lands, seeking food sovereignty, seeking food justice.

35 In fact in the year 1890 it was my great-great-great

36 Grandfather Chief Shakes (In Tlingit) Clan at Wrangell,

37 he was selected to represent the Tlingit people in a

38 lawsuit regarding the Native land. The Tlingit asked

39 the United States to recognize their hereditary rights

40 of ownership to the land and the streams. On behalf of

41 the Tlingits, my grandfather also asked that we be

42 allowed to govern ourselves in our local affairs, these

43 requests were largely ignored. Today over 130 years

44 later, after many appeals to Congress and with the

45 evolving rules of ANILCA that means today you have an

46 opportunity to begin to help right this wrong for the

47 Ketchikan people.

48

49 On that subject, another point I think

50

1 is important to make is Ketchikan was left out of
2 ANCSA, meaning our people in Ketchikan didn't gain
3 access to land, to develop, to subsist, to hold
4 ceremony, to gather firewood, art, medicine or our
5 foods, to be Tlingit.

6
7 Subsistence as codified in ANILCA helps
8 sustain not only the physical but the spiritual culture
9 of Alaska Native peoples, Congress has established that
10 local rural residents be given precedence for using
11 fish and wildlife resources prioritizing subsistence
12 uses over other uses such as sporthunting and fishing.
13 However, in Ketchikan, where there is a huge influx of
14 tourism in the last couple of decades the pressure on
15 our traditional foods just continues to grow making it
16 exceedingly difficult as there's no priority given for
17 subsistence over these commercial uses. As you know
18 other similar Southeast Alaska communities are already
19 designated rural. Sitka is similar in size, economy
20 and population to Ketchikan and they have rural status.
21 The city of Saxman and Saxman Tribe located on the same
22 island as Ketchikan is located and relying on the same
23 food supply chain, they enjoy rural status. These
24 designations further support our proposal for rural
25 status. As President Williams of Saxman testified at
26 the past Southeast RAC meeting in Ketchikan, he said
27 Saxman not only supports our proposal but points to a
28 great imbalance on our island which is contributing to
29 a loss of culture and hindering the ability of
30 Ketchikan's Native people to thrive in a subsistence
31 lifestyle.

32
33 In my 20-plus years of health care
34 administration for the tribe I've watched and
35 participated in the progression of our people, and our
36 sovereignty to run our own programs. We are also
37 building up our capacity to co-manage on the Federal
38 lands. We have our boots on the ground, observing
39 returns of eulachon on the Unuk River and we even
40 fought for a limited opening so Native people can
41 subsist on eulachon but as non-subsistence users we
42 were not allowed to harvest any eulachon. Still, we
43 are finding ways to increase access to traditional
44 foods through our tribal conservation district and
45 through creative efforts as part of our food
46 sovereignty programs. We are growing leaders like Mr.
47 Keenan Sanderson and we aim to raise more leaders like
48 Keenan, archaeologists, biologists and ethnobotonists.
49 We need to be a part of this. We do this because we
50

0515

1 have found at the center of our best programs, the ones
2 that really bring together hearts, the ones that have
3 had the most healing are the programs that get our
4 people out on the land and bring us together around our
5 foods.

6
7 Recently I read about research which
8 shows our Tlingit people traditionally ate over 400
9 different kinds of foods. The research also showed we
10 now only eat on the average of less than 30 kinds of
11 foods. Even though there are traditional foods all
12 over our islands and the surrounding islands in
13 quantities sufficient to sustain our population.

14
15 At KIC we have also grown to provide
16 our own health care and other services. We are
17 resilient people but we struggle with generational
18 trauma, multi-generation trauma as well as trauma we
19 are seeing today with the opiate epidemic and our
20 people struggle from high rates of diabetes, heart
21 disease, cancer, hopelessness, addiction, overdoses, so
22 many last year I almost lost count. With addiction
23 comes domestic violence, abuse, neglect and all that
24 goes with that. We have 86 children in our school
25 district right now who are not set to graduate and just
26 as many of our Native kids are in the State foster care
27 system. Our school climate culture scores are among
28 the lowest in the state. Many of our young people are
29 in jails or out on the street, but it's not the schools
30 who teach us this culture, the land teaches us and the
31 foods. They remind us of these lessons. Why do I
32 share this, it is because we know we need more than
33 education, health care, and the programs that we
34 provide, we need the culture we have lost through our
35 loss of customary and traditional use.

36
37 You all know and we know that regaining
38 that lost connection to the land and our foods is
39 essential for our healing and for culture regeneration
40 to happen.

41
42 Many of our people count heavily on
43 harvesting of wild fish, animals and plants, however,
44 the commercial interests continue to trump our
45 subsistence areas. We need better access to our local
46 foods and the large indigenous population I proudly
47 represent should have access to these foods just as our
48 ancestors have relied on since time immemorial.

49
50

0516

1 In summary, I know we all agree that
2 customary and traditional foods are important to our
3 individual and our collective well-being. We are
4 grateful for this opportunity to address the imbalance
5 that is in Ketchikan with the Federal Subsistence Board
6 and I'm here asking you to vote in support of KIC's
7 proposal, agree that we meet the thresholds so we can
8 work together with the Federal Subsistence Board
9 towards making Ketchikan the subsistence hunting and
10 fishing community that it should be.

11
12 (In Tlingit)

13
14 Again, thank you so much for hearing me
15 today. And thank you for the work you all do
16 throughout our communities and Alaska.

17
18 Gunalcheesh.

19
20 (In Tlingit)

21
22 Gunalcheesh.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
25 questions from the Board for Trixie.

26
27 MR. CHEN: Mr. Chair, BIA.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Glenn, you have
30 the floor.

31
32 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms.
33 Bennett, we really appreciate the efforts that your
34 tribe has done on behalf of the entire Ketchikan
35 community to try to get a rural designation. We
36 understand that you've worked extensively with the
37 city, with the Borough as well as your neighbors there
38 in Saxman, and have even gone over to Prince of Wales
39 Island and consulted and discussed with tribes about
40 the potential of Ketchikan becoming rural. We know
41 that it's been a potentially divisive issue in the past
42 -- with the potential of Ketchikan folks going over
43 there and harvesting deer and other resources.

44
45 So, Gunalcheesh, for all your efforts.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 MS. BENNETT: You're welcome.

50

0517

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
2 appreciate it.

3
4 MS. BENNETT: Uh-huh.

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, very
7 much, next we'll call on Charles Edwardson. The funny
8 thing is is everybody stays in Ketchikan to hunt now
9 because Gravina is loaded.

10
11 (Laughter)

12
13 MR. EDWARDSON: I was going to say that
14 but you already did, we are loaded down there.

15
16 (Laughter)

17
18 MR. EDWARDSON: for the record my name
19 is Charles Edwardson and I will try to keep this brief
20 but I've been waiting for four days to get my hands on
21 this mic and it's going to be hard to rip it out of my
22 hands.

23
24 (Laughter)

25
26 MR. EDWARDSON: But I do appreciate
27 your time, I do have some prepared statements. But if
28 you would indulge me for a few moments before my
29 prepared statements, I'd like to introduce myself the
30 way I was taught.

31
32 (In Tlingit)

33
34 What I've said is good people,
35 greetings, my name is One Raven. I belong to the Raven
36 Clan, I'm from the Shark House and my crest is double
37 fin killer whale. My grandmother is Nora Cogo. My
38 grandfather is Robert Cogo. And my mother is Verna
39 Skili (ph).

40
41 It was told to me that we greet people
42 in this way, coming into somebody's camp or to their
43 home and we're coming into your camp today and your
44 homes, you identify yourself this way so if the
45 individuals that you're approaching didn't recognize
46 you they might know your grandmother, or they might
47 know your mother or they might know your clan or your
48 crest, one or the other they might know you. And when
49 they recognize one of those features about you you
50

0518

1 would be recognized and treated with hospitality, and
2 that's what I was told and this is a setting where I
3 thought that would be appropriate as we are coming into
4 your homes and your camp.

5

6 I do have some prepared statements.
7 I'll just read through them really quickly.

8

9 I'm here in a government-to-government
10 capacity. I speak on behalf of my tribe as an elected
11 tribal council member. We do have Staff here with more
12 technical aspects of our discussion today as well as
13 several tribal members who wish to speak also. I do
14 want to say to the FSB Board I appreciate the
15 respectful and professional manner that the business
16 has been conducted here, even through contentious
17 issues. I'm very impressed with the professional and
18 respectful attitude of the Board. It's a very heavy
19 task you all have taken on and we appreciate the hard
20 work you all do for us so I wanted to acknowledge that.

21

22 We look forward to the FSB considering
23 our Southern Regional Advisory Committee's assessment,
24 as well as the OSM concurrence that we do meet the
25 thresholds to be considered rural.

26

27 Southern Southeast Alaska is an island
28 community that the Tlingit and Haida people have
29 occupied for thousands of years. We have well
30 documented burial sites, we have settlements, seasonal
31 fish camps, totem pole sites, with extensive
32 archeological verifications of these areas. We live in
33 a temperate Rain Forest much different than the
34 northern region of our state. We live in one of the
35 largest old growth Forests left in existence on the
36 planet of which we are striving to be co-stewards of.

37

38 Ketchikan Indian Community is a
39 Federally-recognized tribe and acknowledged as a
40 sovereign government. We consider food sovereignty to
41 be encompassed in that status. We are recognized as
42 the indigenous occupiers of our island and adjacent
43 areas close to our island. We are acknowledged by our
44 non-Native brothers and sisters, by their respective
45 city and borough assemblies in their meetings and
46 functions as the traditional occupiers of the land.
47 Our language, our art, our history is taught in our
48 schools to both Native and non-Native alike. We are
49 the essential fabric of the community in many ways.

50

0519

1 Our sister tribe in the rural community of Saxman
2 occupies the same island, our governments collaborate,
3 we share the same health facility and support each
4 other in cultural and traditional preservation efforts.

5

6 Today we are requesting that the FSB
7 concur with the Southeast RAC and the OSM to be allowed
8 to move forward to participate in the allowable process
9 to evaluate our position with data collection of all
10 our food resources and to conduct studies to assure
11 sustainable harvest of these resources.

12

13 Most importantly to me, to be granted
14 the concurrence of the FSB, the most important aspect
15 of this is to collaborate with our neighboring tribes
16 and the members of the community. I would like to
17 mention it is good to see Mike Jones, the President of
18 the Kasaan Tribe here so he can also hear our words as
19 well because we are here to assure our neighboring
20 tribes of consultations to support their efforts in
21 resource conservation and utilization. The
22 consultation, to us, is important to ensure that clear
23 guidelines and regulations will be implemented to
24 responsible harvest as a rural community. These
25 collaborations will be key to our efforts.

26

27 Glenn mentioned some concern about
28 overlap in these collaborations with neighboring tribes
29 is our key focus. We support them in their rural -- in
30 their preferential use for -- and customary and
31 traditional use of their land and we support their
32 efforts in conservation and sustainable harvest over
33 there as well.

34

35 Given that we have a neighboring tribe
36 that is considered rural, occupying the same island,
37 using the same road system, the same health care
38 facility, we share the same schools, we have the same
39 transportation limitations in and out of our community,
40 it would, to me, have to be a very compelling position
41 to hold that we, as a tribe, the Ketchikan Indian
42 Community do not warrant the same status.

43

44 That's the end of my written remarks
45 tonight and I'm available for any questions.

46

47 Thanks.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Howaa. Any

50

0520

1 questions from the Board for Chad. (In Haida) from
2 your clan brother -- we share the same grandmother.

3

4 Next we will call on Tony Gallegos.

5

6 MR. GALLEGOS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 Yeah, my name is Tony Gallegos, we'll work on your
8 pronunciation. But it doesn't bother me one way or
9 another. I am fortunate to serve as Staff for the
10 Ketchikan Indian Community. I've -- my job title is
11 Cultural Resource Director. I work with part of the
12 team that prepared the proposal, or the request for
13 reconsideration and I think that pretty much outlines
14 some good basic information, again, for you to make the
15 decision as you've seen your Staff has recommended
16 spending time for a full consideration.

17

18 One of the key things that has been a
19 mission of our department and is a strategic directive
20 of the tribe is to remove barriers to access to the
21 natural resource that the tribe depends upon. And so
22 one of the things that was identified several years ago
23 was not being considered Federally-recognized
24 subsistence users as a tribal community and, of course,
25 this was because we were incorrectly, I believe,
26 considered urban many years ago. So hopefully we can
27 spend some time really exploring this further and can
28 come to a conclusion that really provides better
29 justice to the Ketchikan Indian Community and we
30 realize that this is being looked at as a urban/rural
31 issue, not just a tribal issue but the tribe is
32 bringing this forward, in particular, because, again,
33 this is -- the tribal interests are directly impacted
34 by not being considered Federally-recognized
35 subsistence users.

36

37 I would like to go ahead and thank,
38 again, Staff, who have worked educating me for pretty
39 much since I moved to Alaska and started to attend this
40 Board and ask questions about rural status so I
41 appreciate a lot of Staff that are still present
42 provided information to me years ago that helped us to
43 come to this place where we can make our case with you.

44

45 I also want to especially thank Mr.
46 Chen with BIA, Subsistence -- Office of Subsistence
47 Management who has granted us \$97,000 award to help us
48 collect additional information that is lacking, that
49 will help this Board make a decision as time goes on,
50

0521

1 so we are looking forward to the next two year process
2 of gathering additional information so that you can
3 feel comfortable making a decision that Ketchikan is
4 truly a rural community.

5

6 And with that I'm going to go ahead and
7 limit my comments at this time. The case, I think, is
8 going to be made by several other people that we
9 brought here to testify. We know at this point we
10 don't need to make our full case but we wanted for the
11 record to get additional information forward so that
12 others that did not read our initial application can
13 have at least an oral explanation of some of the issues
14 and arguments that we will be bringing forward over the
15 next two years.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
18 Tony.

19

20 Any questions.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. And
25 we'll call on Keenan Sanderson.

26

27 MR. SANDERSON: Good afternoon
28 everybody. Keenan Sanderson for the record. This is
29 my third hat that I'm going to be wearing for this
30 meeting. It might be a new record for me but I am here
31 as the Indigenous Food Sovereignty Specialist for the
32 Ketchikan Indian Community in the Cultural Resources
33 Department. And I'll do my best to keep my comments
34 brief but I just want to cover a few things that may or
35 may not be within our proposal and/or OSM comments on
36 threshold requirements for this proposal.

37

38 I first want to actually go to the
39 proposal first and specifically outline the end of our
40 proposal because I think this is one of the really
41 important parts of why the Ketchikan Indian Community
42 really thinks that non-rural status should be
43 rescinded. It's on Page 10 within our proposal, and we
44 gathered a number of quotes from a number of our tribal
45 citizens and I'll read just a couple of them but I
46 think it's important that they be read into the record
47 because this is truly how people feel about what it is
48 to be a subsistence user on traditional foods within
49 our lands and waters in and around Ketchikan.

50

0522

1 We've had people that, you know, it
2 means life, it means everything to me, it's our
3 culture.

4
5 Family, tradition and passing
6 information on to the next generation.

7
8 It means food, stability in the
9 wintertime and pride in knowing you are able to provide
10 for your own family and others if needed.

11
12 Survival.

13
14 Community.

15
16 It means that my ancestors won the
17 fight to keep our ancestral traditions alive and strong
18 so that I can provide for my people.

19
20 It means the place we belong.

21
22 That last one really resonates with me.
23 I was born and raised in Ketchikan and while I'm not
24 technically a Federally-qualified subsistence user
25 everything that I harvest is to basically keep me
26 alive. Sure, I eat a lot of stuff from the grocery
27 store. You know I go to McDonald's every now and then,
28 but, you know, if I had to choose anything to eat, if I
29 had full access to anything, I would choose to eat
30 salmon all the time. If would choose to eat halibut.
31 I would choose to eat deer. I'd choose to eat beach
32 asparagus. Black seaweed. You know, anything and
33 everything that we can find in our area is something
34 that I would prefer to eat.

35
36 Part of the reason why I'm up here and,
37 again, I'm going to try to keep this short.

38
39 You know we had a number of people work
40 on this document, Tony, who is a pretty good speaker,
41 Irene Dundas, our attorney with the Ketchikan Indian
42 Community, Steve, and then the tribal council as well
43 as had a lot of input into this, but I did a lot of the
44 heavy lifting on this -- I'm not done with my comment
45 quite yet, but if there's any questions after I'm done
46 speaking, to at least the application itself, I can
47 answer any of those.

48
49 One other thing that I'd like to read
50

0523

1 into the record and I'd like to thank Heather Bauscher
2 again for being such a really strong leader with these
3 youth back here behind me. During the Southeast RAC
4 one of her students did an analysis and a summarization
5 of our rural status issue in Ketchikan a few months ago
6 and I think it's a great document and with Heather's
7 permission I definitely think that document should be
8 shared with everybody because I think it's really good
9 but I'm going to read into the record the summary
10 comments from that.

11

12 Although this is a small step in a long
13 grueling process and it won't solve anything
14 immediately, I do think that it is what was needed to
15 kick start the process in the first place.

16

17 I'm sorry, my phone is not wanting to
18 cooperate with me.

19

20 I think in the current system that is
21 in place the decision was handled very well, however, I
22 definitely think there is room for improvement in the
23 system itself. I mainly think that the amount of time
24 it takes for these things to be determined is far too
25 long but I understand the number of things that must be
26 considered in these processes. I fully support the
27 decision of the Council and will be following this
28 progress of this proposal. I hope that Ketchikan can
29 eventually be considered rural even if it does take a
30 long time. I think when the day comes and a decision
31 is finally made the residents of Ketchikan will greatly
32 benefit from the decision. In conclusion I am
33 incredibly grateful to have been able to witness this
34 process in person, especially with the topic as
35 community driven and as important as this one.

36

37 I think that's pretty powerful coming
38 from a high school student. I believe it was a high
39 school student -- yeah.

40

41 So with that, I mean there's definitely
42 a lot more I could say but I think I will leave it at
43 that and let the other speakers cover other areas.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
46 Keenan. Any questions from the Board here.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

0524

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, for
2 your continued leadership there in Ketchikan and
3 connections with the youth and learning. Thank you for
4 expressing that here, that's a really important aspect
5 of what we're hoping for here is to continue to
6 educate, outreach and build a program.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 MR. SANDERSON: Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Next we'll call
13 on Irene Dundas.

14
15 MS. DUNDAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
16 name is Irene Dundas. I am Tlingit. I am (In Tlingit)
17 from the house that anchored the village in Kake. My
18 Tlingit name is (In Tlingit). And I am here
19 representing Ketchikan Indian Community, Cultural
20 Resources Department. I am the Cultural Heritage
21 Specialist. But first I need to explain who my
22 father's people are.

23
24 I did say I'm from Kake. I was raised
25 in between Saxman and Kake. My fat her's people are
26 from Saxman, or are from Cape Fox Village, they are the
27 Saanya Kwaan Tlingit people. My grandfather's people
28 are the Taanta Kwaan Tlingit people, the Tongass Tribe.
29 The whole Tongass National Forest is named after my
30 grandfather's people, the Tongass people. Their area
31 was originally (In Tlingit), which the whole Tongass
32 National Forest is named after those people, my
33 grandfather's people.

34
35 So like I said, I am the Cultural
36 Specialist for the tribe and a couple years ago the
37 tribal council made a decision to make culture a
38 priority, not like a priority as like No. 1., because
39 education is before that and health care, but it is a
40 priority and I am tasked to infuse culture into all
41 aspects of the tribe and the community. And some of
42 the things that I do is I help our tribal citizens
43 learn who they are. So for many, many years I worked
44 for Cape Fox Corporation doing family trees and also
45 doing (indiscernible) so we repatriate artifacts back
46 from museums across the country. I currently serve on
47 the Smithsonian Board for Repatriation. And so with
48 that I learned some unique history by researching the
49 artifacts that return back to Ketchikan and Saxman.
50

0525

1 And while doing family trees I -- on a day to day basis
2 I have youth, elders, adults, I assist them to learn
3 who they are. So I help them research their families,
4 learn their clans, learn their clan family lines and
5 their cultural history. And over the years I have
6 learned that actually more recently there has been a
7 resurgence of people wanting to know who they are, they
8 want to know their family lines, they want to know
9 their family history, what clan they belong to.

10

11 Ketchikan not only, you know, the
12 Ketchikan area is traditionally -- was owned by my
13 father's people, the Taanta Kwwa -- or the Saanya Kwaan
14 and the Taanta Kwaan people and over the years there
15 has been people who moved into Ketchikan and we welcome
16 the Haida people from Prince of Wales, we welcome the
17 Tsimshian people from Metlakatla, we have many tribal
18 citizens that are not from the Ketchikan area. We have
19 the Aleut people who had been relocated to Ketchikan
20 during World War II. We want those people to also
21 learn who they are. And, you know, with that
22 resurgence of learning who you are we want an
23 opportunity for our young people and our adults to go
24 out and gather the foods off their land. We want them
25 to be able to acquire new clan crests, acquire clan
26 songs, acquire new Tlingit names, new Haida names, and
27 new Tsimshian names and acquire new clan stories. And
28 our people did that when they went out hunting and
29 fishing, there is a strong connection to the land, a
30 strong connection to the animals, and being one with
31 the land and the animals and for that reason I came
32 here today to ask because I am tasked to infuse culture
33 into all aspects of the tribe. Because I also see
34 culture is healing. And for our people, our youth and
35 the adults to go out and to gather off the land helps
36 them reconnect, because creating a love of place so
37 that our people can sit at this table and talk about
38 all those precious things that our ancestors have done
39 and we want to continue that.

40

41 So I hope that you all take into
42 consideration Ketchikan Indian Community's proposal for
43 reconsideration -- or consideration of rural status.

44

45 Gunalcheesh.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
48 Irene. Any questions.

49

50

1 (No comments)

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, hearing none we'll call on Naomi Nickelson. Oh, you're good, okay, Naomi's good. We'll just go ahead and call on Steven Hartford -- oh, she's going last, okay.

MR. HARTFORD: Good afternoon and thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Steve Hartford and I am the tribal attorney and general legal counsel for the Ketchikan Indian Community. As you know, Ketchikan Indian Community is a Federally-recognized Alaska Native Tribe and it's co-located on Revillagigedo Island in Ketchikan with Saxman -- the Organized Village of Saxman, the other tribe on Revillagigedo.

We represent Ketchikan Indian Community has about 6,400 members, of that about half or a little over 3,000 reside in Ketchikan. And so we're here today representing the interest of our tribe, of course, and I'd like to make three points this afternoon if you'll bear with me.

The first point is the support that we have locally in Ketchikan. This is not the first time we've attempted this as many of you may know. When this structure was put in place in 1992 Ketchikan Indian Community and the greater area of Ketchikan was left out of the ability to subsistence hunt and gather and fish. Ketchikan Indian Community filed an application for reconsideration of that in 1997 and again in 2008 and this is our third try. Of course, we feel like the conditions are better for us now given the changes in the regulations in 2015. But what's significant -- there's many significant differences from the previous two times. One of them is the unanimity of support we have locally and as was mentioned we got a resolution from the Ketchikan Borough Assembly, the City of Ketchikan, City Council and the Tribal Council of the Organized Village of Saxman. And I just want to cite a couple of brief excerpts from those resolutions.

From Ketchikan Gateway Borough:
Whereas many Alaskan Natives and non-Native residents of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough utilize subsistence resources to alleviate food scarcity issues and financial pressures due to inflation; and

1 Whereas a subsistence lifestyle is part
2 of the ethos of the community and the Alaska Natives
3 maintain a subsistence way of life to protect their
4 traditions and culture for future generations; and

5
6 Whereas it is in the best interest of
7 the Ketchikan Gateway Borough and in recognition of the
8 value and importance of tribal and cultural customs in
9 the Ketchikan community to support the KIC in this
10 endeavor.

11
12 That is from the unanimously adopted
13 resolution by the Ketchikan Gateway Borough Assembly.

14
15 From the city of Ketchikan.

16
17 Our city council agrees that the
18 current urban designation threatens the subsistence
19 needs of Native Alaskans and our residents and the
20 change in designation would increase opportunities for
21 affordable food in a community where access to
22 affordable locally sourced food is challenging or
23 absent. This change in designation benefits us all.

24
25 That is from the letter from the city
26 manager based on a unanimous vote to support our
27 proposal by the city council of Ketchikan.

28
29 And from Saxman.

30
31 Whereas the needs of our population
32 include the ability to be able to support our way of
33 life through our dietary needs established millennia
34 ago by indigenous tribes and earliest settlers of the
35 area; and

36
37 Whereas the tribal council of the
38 Organized Village of Saxman recognizes that a large
39 part of the population outside of the Native community
40 supports their dietary needs and their families through
41 harvesting, waters and Forest just as we have for
42 millenniums, harvesting fish and wildlife species; and

43
44 Whereas the Organized Village of Saxman
45 supports the change of designation to rural recognizing
46 that all of Ketchikan's residents will benefit by
47 increased food security, sustaining a way of life,
48 supporting physical and mental well-being.

0528

1 Again, language from the unanimously
2 approved resolution from the Organized Village of
3 Saxman.

4
5 One of the things that I'd like to
6 underscore about the support, particularly of the
7 Gateway Borough governments and the city council
8 governments, is these are organizations, these are
9 governments that represent multiple interests in the
10 area including sportfishing interests, including
11 commercial fishing interests, including the tourist
12 industry interest and, yet, they have said resoundingly
13 that they support giving a priority to their local
14 residents for subsistence needs despite those other
15 multiple interests that they represent.

16
17 Second point.

18
19 We did make the point in our
20 application about the other rural designations by other
21 Federal agencies. And, of course, we understand and we
22 recognize that each department or agency within the
23 Federal government has different responsibilities and
24 different purposes for designations of rural status,
25 but just so you know, if you do and when you do,
26 hopefully, approve our application, our proposal in two
27 years, you'll be in good company. Ketchikan is
28 determined to be rural at various levels by the
29 Department of Agriculture, by the Indian Health
30 Service, by the National Libraries of Medicine, by the
31 U.S. Census Bureau, by the U.S. Department of
32 Transportation, by the U.S. Department of Treasury, by
33 the Department of Health and Human Services, and just
34 recently, just within the last month the Alaska -- the
35 State of Alaska Housing Authority granted a large --
36 funding a new large scale housing project which scored
37 highest on the list based on the IRS, Internal Revenue
38 Service criteria, scoring it as rural. So, again,
39 multiple, multiple government level agencies at levels
40 consider Ketchikan to be rural and we urge, of course,
41 the Board to take all of that into account when you do
42 make your final decision.

43
44 Last point.

45
46 Is the change in regulation in 2015
47 that gives -- as you know gives this Board broad
48 discretion to look at the unique characteristics of the
49 community. This is no longer a numbers game. It's not
50

0529

1 about a mathematical algorithm, how many people do we
2 have, how many gas stations do we have, how many fire
3 stations do we have, access to hospital, and other
4 transportation and other things that you can count on a
5 spreadsheet. No, it's not about that anymore. The
6 Departments of Interior and Agriculture have made clear
7 in the changes in 2015 that this Board should take a
8 broad look at the unique characteristics, the unique
9 qualities, the unique needs of each community and in
10 this case we feel confident that we can establish that
11 to your satisfaction as we go through this process.

12

13 And what you'll do today by approving
14 this move to the next stage in the process, it gives us
15 a chance. IT gives us a chance. A chance to develop
16 the data. A change to do a community assessment. A
17 chance to meet and talk with our neighbors, our
18 neighboring tribes, the industries in our area that
19 could be potentially affected by this. It, again, it
20 gives us a chance. A chance to make our case which is
21 all we're asking for today. And in giving us this
22 chance there is another chance that this may be another
23 opportunity to right a wrong that has been too long in
24 place against the Native community of Ketchikan.

25

26 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
27 That concludes my remarks.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
30 Steve. Any questions from the Board.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you for
35 your thorough presentation, appreciate it.

36

37 MR. HARTFORD: Thank you. I also
38 wanted to point out that I plan to submit these three
39 resolutions for the record.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
44 Finally we'll call on Naomi Michalsen, you have the
45 floor.

46

47 MS. MICHALSEN: Is this on, yes. Good
48 afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board.

49

50

0530

1 Gunalcheesh for allowing me to share
2 today.

3
4 I'd like to start by acknowledging my
5 relatives the Den'ina, as I am a visitor here today.

6
7 (In Tlingit)

8
9 My Tlingit name is (In Tlingit) means
10 Higher Voice. I am Eagle, Wooshkitaan from the Shark
11 House. I originally come from (In Tlingit), Berners
12 Bay.

13
14 For the last 35 years I have lived in
15 Ketchikan, the beautiful land of the Saanya Kwaan and
16 the Taanta Kwaan peoples. This is the place where I
17 raised my five children and today I am blessed to have
18 nine grandchildren. I am here as a Ketchikan Indian
19 Community tribal member but most importantly as a
20 Tlingit grandmother. I am here in support of the
21 proposal from KIC for rural status.

22
23 We are living in a time of great change
24 where most of our tribal members, elders, children no
25 longer have access to their traditional foods and
26 plants. This lack of access contributes to poverty,
27 inequity and a wide variety of social issues. After
28 working over nine years for the tribe in economic
29 development and nine years as the director of our local
30 domestic violence shelter I started a business, Kaasei
31 Indigenous Food Ways to help inspire people to learn
32 more about traditional foods, plants, the land and each
33 other. I look at this work as prevention and this is
34 what I'm going to be doing for the rest of my life.
35 Prevention of violence, suicide, addiction, health
36 diseases, et cetera.

37
38 (In Tlingit)

39
40 It is as we are lost without our
41 culture.

42
43 I try to learn as much as I can about
44 my language, the culture, but in a lot of ways it's
45 been stomped out of us, or tried to stomp us, to take
46 it out of us but we are still here and we are strong
47 and we are seeing the results of when we come together,
48 the beautiful things that can happen. Right now I try
49 to use some of the Tlingit language, because our
50

0531

1 southern dialect, we have no more birth speakers. So
2 it's also an indicator when the southern Tlingit
3 dialect of our language is gone, there's no birth
4 speakers, it's an indicator of a community that has
5 suffered great losses.

6
7 As indigenous peoples of Alaska we are
8 on a journey of healing. Lack of truthful and
9 culturally appropriate education and narratives around
10 our Alaska Native peoples, the land and foods have
11 harmed us and has contributed to the suppression of our
12 identity. Continuing limits on accessing our lands and
13 foods through policies still threaten the health,
14 stability and growth for our indigenous communities and
15 ultimately all people, yet we are reestablishing and
16 healing ourselves. It has been an honor to be a part
17 of bringing back some of the foods and plants and the
18 medicines by helping support traditional workshops on
19 plants and foods and medicines in Ketchikan, Juneau and
20 Southeast. And what I see is just really amazing and
21 as Trixie mentioned before there were over 400 foods
22 that we used and we -- most of us don't remember them.
23 There are reasons why. Because our parents were
24 separated and disconnected from this land, our
25 languages, our songs, our stories and each other and so
26 when we come together for these workshops, culture
27 camps, symposium, and just every day life and
28 harvesting and gathering we've been able to bring many
29 foods and plants and reintroduce these things to our
30 communities. And many of them didn't know they even
31 existed, you know, the assortment of the berries that
32 we have and things that our parents didn't know so they
33 just said they were poisonous. So we really have such
34 abundance.

35
36 What we have are the best foods and
37 medicines that we can put into our bodies. We know
38 that this is going to help us spiritually, physically,
39 emotionally and that healing process is really
40 beautiful and I think we see that in a lot of our
41 Alaskan indigenous communities today.

42
43 When we come together and learn about
44 our foods or learning our Native languages, the
45 traditional names of these foods, the ancient names on
46 the land, how to harvest them respectfully,
47 sustainably, how to prepare them and how to share them,
48 we are learning to be ourselves again. And not too
49 long ago a clan leader in the community was determined
50

1 by how well the community was taken care of, not by
2 what they had. Everyone's basic needs were met for
3 food and shelter and we thrived. We celebrate our
4 opposite clans and the beauty of where we live.

5
6 In order for this balance to exist
7 today we must understand and move towards food justice
8 and sovereignty. And so you have the opportunity to
9 help our community. As Trixie mentioned earlier, we
10 suffer from the highest rates of these social ills that
11 we do not want. We all want wellness. You have the
12 opportunity to help us in our community, to really
13 strengthen and grow and to remember that we belong to
14 the land. Our history is recorded in stone. It's
15 recorded on the land. And on the surrounding
16 pictographs, petroglyphs, ancient fish traps, village
17 sites, the names on the land, we are fortunate to have
18 nearly 900 place names in just our small area with over
19 100 names referencing our foods and medicine in the
20 Ketchikan area. And science says as human beings we
21 have an innate need to belong and without it we can
22 feel lost and bereft.

23
24 And so as a grandmother, I'm here to
25 tell you that, nothing that you already don't know, but
26 just to reiterate that our children and grandchildren
27 need to belong. We really need to belong.

28
29 Science and data also align with our
30 cultural ways of knowing and are found in studies and
31 publications available regarding epigenetic and it
32 talks about the traumas that we've experienced as a
33 whole, as indigenous peoples around the world and the
34 brain development and the risk and protective factors,
35 which I believe getting out on the land and harvesting
36 and learning about our ways and ceremonies are all
37 protective factors. And risk factors is not having
38 those things. Prevention studies, studies of the
39 nutritional values of our foods and more. Our plants
40 and foods are essential to who we are as tribal
41 peoples. Protecting our lands, our plants, our
42 animals, our medicines, our languages, our ceremonies
43 is the best protection that we can give to our children
44 in our next generations.

45
46 The indigenous wisdom and teachings
47 about our connections to our lands and resources is
48 important for all. Our Native foods can heal our
49 bodies but they can also feed our spirit. Traditional
50

0533

1 foods are whole foods, organic, our wild plants are so
2 packed with nutrition that it makes some of our best
3 vegetables look bad, like kale and spinach, it's
4 superior. Overall, physical health can be improved.
5 And besides putting nutritious food on the table for
6 our families, discovering the wonders of plant and
7 animal life we also build skills and food security,
8 health, social and emotional intelligence and land
9 stewardship.

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

We are stewards of the land and it is our responsibility to take care of the land. Plants and animals are a part of our family and we are related. Our lands are so generous to us and providing us with abundance. These foods have always been here and when we take care of them, they, in turn, take care of us. It is important for our community to recognize this and ground ourselves again in the connectedness of eating this way by season from the land and from the waters.

Your actions today may be critical to our well-being.

Bringing together community is key to preserving indigenous wisdom of all types and is integral to realizing food security and food sovereignty. Protect what you love, the love for the land, the foods, the people, it's a wonderful cycle.

Our children need access to be well.

I would like to end with a quote from one of my mentors Valerie Seagrest and I think she says it so well here:

Food is a gift. Elders remind us that true wealth is having access to Native foods along with the knowledge of how to gather, prepare and serve them. Our values and food traditions are a living legacy that links us to the past, present and future generations. Several times a day we encounter opportunities to reflect on what we eat and how our choices change our world. When we harvest Native foods and incorporate them into our modern lifestyle we strengthen our cultural identity, our relationship to the land and tribal sovereignty. It will take all of us to feed the next seven generations.

0534

1 So cultural identity is another
2 protective factor we know -- we need to know who we are
3 and many of the people before me talked about learning
4 who we are, remembering who we are and we believe that
5 we -- the land remembers us.

6
7 Gunalcheesh.

8
9 I had a friend that passed away this
10 past year and he was a beautiful public speaker but he
11 would always -- he was always very quick and succinct
12 and I wasn't today but he would say things like,
13 blessed are the brief for they shall be asked back.

14
15 (Laughter)

16
17 MS. MICHALSEN: But thank you for
18 allowing me to take some extra time.

19
20 Thank you for all of your work as well.
21 It's my first meeting and I could see that it's very
22 difficult and so I appreciate it.

23
24 Gunalcheesh, again.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gunalcheesh.
27 Was that person Tlingit that told you that?

28
29 MS. MICHALSEN: Oh, no.

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I didn't think
32 so.

33
34 (Laughter)

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I'm
37 from Southeast so I might get away with that, maybe.

38
39 (Laughter)

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: My children are
42 Tlingit so I know how long they can go.

43
44 That concludes the testimony and I know
45 I appreciated that because it gives context to a lot of
46 what you heard all week and so it was a pretty good way
47 to just express what -- even in urban centers we're
48 challenged with social problems even as we are in rural
49 settings and a lot of that contributes to the overall
50

0535

1 ability for people to harvest and you heard that
2 throughout the week that there's a depression after the
3 pandemic in a lot of rural Alaska and then you add on
4 there the complication of competition for resources and
5 access to them and the whole nine yards you heard all
6 week and it complicates the situation. So we just
7 thank those leaders who can speak for their people and
8 bring those here to the Board and allow us to have some
9 insight to the hardships out there, but also the
10 inroads to what people are doing about it and how you
11 find success within your communities to bridge the gap
12 and create relationships that are lasting, so we
13 appreciate the leadership all week and just thank the
14 KIC people for their presentations.

15

16 Was there anybody online who would like
17 to speak to this. I think all of KIC is here.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Operator.

22

23 OPERATOR: Once again, please press
24 star, one if you would like to make a comment.

25

26 (Pause)

27

28 OPERATOR: Sir, we do have a comment
29 from Judy Guthrie. Ma'am, your line is open.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 OPERATOR: Ms. Guthrie, are you on
34 mute?

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 OPERATOR: We have no other questions.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. That
41 concludes the public comment. And, yeah, I'd just like
42 to reiterate what she said in Southeast, I like to tell
43 my kids we're millionaires because what we put on the
44 table, the access to that is what creates us to be the
45 rich people, and the reciprocity that we have with each
46 other, the care and the share and you shall receive
47 more, it's real. And so I like that, we've heard a lot
48 of that this week and, you know, that is a value that
49 is true when we live and engage in work in the
50

0536

1 environment and depend on it as a lifestyle and so
2 thank you for that message.

3

4 Council recommendation.

5

6 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Cathy Needham for the Southeast Alaska Regional
8 Advisory Council.

9

10 The Council voted to support the OSM
11 conclusion that the proposal has met the threshold
12 analysis and to proceed to the next steps in the non-
13 rural determination proposal process including a full
14 analysis.

15

16 The Council found, based on information
17 shared with them, at our meeting, that the proposal
18 provided sufficient details to warrant a full analysis
19 for determination of non-rural status for Ketchikan.
20 The Council received public testimony from area
21 residents in favor of non-rural status and the Council
22 looks forward to completing the rest of the steps in
23 the non-rural determination process should the Board
24 accept the Council's recommendation and find the
25 threshold criteria has been met.

26

27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
30 Cathy. Any questions for the Chair.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing and
35 seeing none we'll move to ISC recommendation.

36

37 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
38 InterAgency Staff Committee provided their standard
39 comment and it can be found in the meeting materials.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I don't see it
44 listed here but I don't -- does the State want to
45 comment.

46

47 MR. MULLIGAN: We're neutral on the
48 threshold determination.

49

50

0537

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
2 you, I just thought I'd offer at this time.

3
4 MR. MULLIGAN: No, appreciate that.

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
7 Board discussion with Council Chair and State Liaison.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
12 We'll open the floor for Board motion.

13
14 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chair. This is Greg
15 Risdahl with the Forest Service.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: (Nods)

18
19 MR. RISDAHL: Was that a nod to go
20 forward, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

21
22 Mr. Chair, I move to support NDP25-01.
23 Following a second I will explain why I intend to
24 support my motion to move forward with the full non-
25 rural determination threshold analysis for the
26 community of Ketchikan.

27
28 MS. CREACHBAUM: NPS. Second.

29
30 MR. RISDAHL: First of all I want to
31 reiterate what our Chair has said, I want to thank all
32 of you that have come here today to speak to the Board
33 about this non-rural determination. It's obvious that
34 people are very deeply passionate about this topic,
35 it's one that's been out there for a long time. We
36 hear you. I don't feel like I really need to add a lot
37 to my justification but I will give a few notes as to
38 why I support moving forward with the threshold
39 analysis.

40
41 This was just a preliminary assessment
42 and we do concur fully with the Council and OSM that a
43 full analysis is needed to be fully informed to make a
44 fair determination. We believe that more than enough
45 information was presented by the proponents to indicate
46 that a more thorough analysis is warranted. Through a
47 full threshold analysis process we are more likely to
48 be able to determine if the community of Ketchikan
49 which has long sought rural determination status is
50

0538

1 defensible.

2

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
6 other Board discussion.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question.

11

12 MS. PITKA: I'll second the motion.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, second,
15 please, yeah, sorry.

16

17 REPORTER: There was a second.

18

19 MS. PITKA: Oh, there was one.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There was a
22 second, yeah, we're in discussion and deliberation.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
27 the floor is open for a question.

28

29 MS. PITKA: Question.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll
32 call, please, Sue.

33

34 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to
35 support NDP25-01. Forest Service, Greg Risdahl.

36

37 MR. RISDAHL: Forest Service supports.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Sarah Creachbaum,
40 National Park Service.

41

42 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
43 supports.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Jill Klein, Fish and
46 Wildlife Service.

47

48 MS. KLEIN: Fish and Wildlife Service
49 supports.

50

0539

1 MS. DETWILER: Steve Cohn, BLM.

2

3 MR. COHN: The BLM supports moving
4 forward with a full analysis. And I would also like to
5 express my appreciation for all those who provided such
6 heartfelt testimony today.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. BIA, Glenn
9 Chen.

10

11 MR. CHEN: The BIA votes yes. We
12 support the decision to move forward with the full
13 analysis. And we recognize and appreciate the
14 Southeast Regional Advisory Council's decision to
15 recommend moving forward as well.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Public
18 Member Rhonda Pitka.

19

20 MS. PITKA: I support the OSM
21 recommendation. And I would like to thank everybody
22 for their testimony today and I look forward to looking
23 at the full analysis soon.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. And Charlie
28 Brower -- Public Member Charlie Brower is not online so
29 we'll move ahead to Chair Christianson.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. The motion
34 passes with seven yea votes.

35

36 (Applause)

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
39 to schedule of upcoming Board meetings 2023. Robbin.

40

41 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
42 Members of the Board. I understand your great,
43 probably mixed emotions leaving today we've spent so
44 much time together, I know you're going to miss us all,
45 we're all going to miss each other so very much but I
46 am here today to tell you that you have something to
47 look forward to.

48

49 We have three regularly scheduled

50

0540

1 meetings on the agenda in front of you, and, primarily
2 this is for your notice so we don't run into scheduling
3 conflicts. We have a regularly scheduled summer work
4 session which might be kind of anytime, we're looking
5 around two days and we usually address Council annual
6 reports and applies and Council appointments during
7 that meeting. And I would like to know kind of the
8 window -- a timeframe that works well for you on that.
9 I want to know a timeframe that works well for you for
10 our FRMP usually held sometime near the end of January
11 or beginning of February, that's usually two days and
12 then a good timeframe for our wildlife regulatory
13 meeting which should be another four day humdinger.

14

15 So please share with me any particular
16 dates that are no-gos or a window of time for any of
17 you and I will doodle poll you all.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Do
20 you need that right now, Robbin, or can we like get
21 back to you.

22

23 MS. LAVINE: You can -- you can get
24 back to me. This is primarily for your notice. If you
25 haven't already, review your schedules, talk to your
26 InterAgency Staff Committee members and I'll be
27 contacting you shortly.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Thank
32 you, Robbin. And, Steve, I know we had a discussion
33 about something happening this summer, is this the
34 meeting we were hoping we could do something out there
35 or was that a separate idea?

36

37 MR. COHN: Oh, I think that'd be great.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, so we
40 were kicking around, you know, and you can hear that
41 there's a recommendation by our constituents out here
42 that we try to meet in a rural setting and maybe
43 somewhere where one of these continuing issues arise
44 that we may have a little better idea on the ground so
45 we were just kicking that around here, too, as well for
46 the Board to consider. I know that when I did do a
47 Kuskokwim trip it drastically changed how I felt about
48 the fishery and the people and their buy-in to conserve
49 resources and fight for themselves. So just food for
50

0541

1 thought here, that maybe we take that suggestion.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 Motion to adjourn.

6

7 MS. PITKA: So moved.

8

9 MR. LIND: Quyana, see you all later.

10

11 MR. COHN: Second.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No opposition.

14

15 (No opposition)

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Have a good
18 day. Hearing none, motion carries to adjourn.

19

20 Good job, thank you all. Have safe
21 travels home, God Bless you.

22

23 (Off record)

24

25 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

0542

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

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing, contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING taken electronically by our firm on the 3rd day of February 2023;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 17th day of February 2023.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/26