

0323

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

SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME III

TELECONFERENCE
October 7, 2021
9:00 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Donald Hernandez, Chair
- Calvin Casipit
- Michael Douville
- Albert Howard
- Ian Johnson
- Harvey Kitka
- Cathy Needham
- Harold Robbins
- Robert Schroeder
- James Slater
- Frank Wright

Regional Council Coordinator, Katya Wessels (Acting)

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

0324

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

(Teleconference - 10/7/2021)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, it is just after 9:00 o'clock. This is Don Hernandez, the Chair of the Southeast RAC. We'll readjourn the meeting as soon as we find out if we have a quorum present. And for that I'll ask if Frank Wright is on the line yet to get an attendance.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I'm here, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, go ahead, Frank.

MR. WRIGHT: Roll call. Ian Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Here.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

Cal Casipit. I heard you on.

MR. CASIPIT: Here, yeah, I'm here.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Michael Douville is here.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you.

James Slater.

MR. SLATER: Jim Slater is here.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

Bob Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Bob Schroeder is here.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Bob.

0325

1

Albert Howard.

2

3

MR. HOWARD: Albert Howard's here.

4

5

MR. WRIGHT: All right, thank you,

6

Albert.

7

8

Mr. Hernandez.

9

10

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm here.

11

12

MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

13

14

MR. ROBBINS: I am here.

15

16

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

17

18

Harvey Kitka.

19

20

(No comments)

21

22

MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

23

24

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka's here.

25

26

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Harvey.

27

28

Larry Bemis.

29

30

(No comments)

31

32

MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

33

34

(No comments)

35

36

MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

37

38

MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy is here.

39

40

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Cathy. Mr.

41

Chair, we have a quorum.

42

43

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.

44

I'll call the meeting back into order. And we'll start

45

to pick up where we left off yesterday although we did

46

have those phone issues and I know some people got

47

dropped out of the call and probably missed some of the

48

meeting so we'll try and keep that in mind as we

49

resume. We may have to cover some old material. I did

50

0326

1 want to check, kind of ended the meeting somewhat
2 abruptly there, and I did want to go back to the record
3 and find out exactly where we were in the procedure. I
4 know we were discussing Wildlife Proposal 22-07, deals
5 with a closure on Admiralty Island. And just for the
6 record so everyone will know, I'd like to check and
7 make sure whether or not we had a motion already on the
8 floor that we were discussing.

9

10 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, this is Katya.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, Katya, go

13 ahead.

14

15 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, I checked with the
16 court reporter and also with our leadership lead Ameer
17 Howard, and you only got to the WP22-07 presented to
18 you and just started asking questions. So, you know, I
19 think it would be in good order if you hear the
20 presentation from the analyst again and kind of start
21 the process with 22-07 from the beginning.

22

23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Okay, it
24 sounds like some people may have missed the
25 presentation. So, okay, I guess we can do that.

26

27 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
28 Albert.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

31

32 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33 Do we do the public comments on non-agenda items on Day
34 3?

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes. Yes. Yes, we
37 would start with that.

38

39 MR. HOWARD: Okay, thank you, Mr.
40 Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That's before we
43 start our other business. So, yep, I will announce
44 that first now that I know where we're going to get
45 started on our agenda with the proposals. We do have,
46 first off in the morning, a public comment period open
47 to the public on non-agenda items. And I'm going to
48 request that folks who may be calling in, if you are
49 wanting to testify on one of the three proposals that
50

0327

1 are coming up first in the meeting, I would ask that
2 you could hold those comments until we call for the
3 public comments on those particular proposals, and
4 we'll try and just stick to non-agenda items right off
5 the bat here at 9:00 o'clock. That might really help
6 us keep our minds a little more focused on the
7 proposals when we get to them, if we have all the
8 public comments at that time dealing with the
9 individual proposals.

10

11 Also we have the opportunity here, I'd
12 just kind of like to remind the public that we did have
13 some, you know, personal attacks against Council
14 members yesterday during the public testimony. Those
15 types of personal attacks aren't really appreciated by
16 the Council. If we had been meeting in person, you
17 know, I do have the option of turning off people's
18 microphones if they kind of get, kind of what I feel is
19 out of bounds. Of course being over the phone I don't
20 have that option and I don't like to shout people down,
21 and maybe I should have yesterday, but I just want to
22 remind people we don't really appreciate those things
23 and our Council is quite confident that we'll never
24 engage in personal attacks. I've never heard it from
25 this Council, and I know they won't in this meeting.
26 So we'll keep it on a civil level here.

27

28 So with that said, maybe one more
29 before we go to public testimony, maybe I'll ask if our
30 Council Coordinator, Katya Wessels, has any
31 announcements that she needs to make this morning
32 regarding procedures or anything else.

33

34 MS. WESSELS: Yes, thank you, Mr.
35 Chair. The only announcement that I have is the same
36 announcement I was making the other days, that if you
37 have written public comments on any proposals please
38 submit them to the email subsistence@fws.gov. And
39 please submit them before the proposal will be
40 presented to the Council and indicate in the subject
41 line the number of the proposal you're commenting on.

42

43 That's all I have, thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
46 A good reminder to folks that want to submit testimony.
47 Okay, with that, I'll open up the phone lines and see
48 if there's people out there that want to give testimony
49 this morning and I will ask that people just kind of
50

0328

1 have to speak up. First, I'd kind of like to get an
2 idea of who's on the line and wants to testify and I'll
3 jot down names and organizations and then I'll go back
4 on people in the order that I have names written down.
5 So people that want to give us some public testimony
6 this morning on non-agenda items. Go ahead.

7

8 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
9 Albert. Did I miss the roll call?

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: We had the roll
12 call, yes, we have a quorum.

13

14 MR. HOWARD: Okay, thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So anybody on the
17 line who would like to testify at this time on non-
18 agenda items.

19

20 (Teleconference interference -
21 participants not muted)

22

23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm not
24 hearing anybody this morning. So we will go back to
25 proposals. And with that I guess we're going to start
26 with the Staff analysis on Wildlife Proposal 22-07. I
27 think that was Jake Musslewhite yesterday, are you
28 there Jake this morning.

29

30 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, good morning,
31 Mr. Chair. I am on the line.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, go ahead and
34 present.

35

36 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: All right. It's
37 going to be even better the second time, I promise.
38 For the record my name is Jake Musslewhite, I'm a
39 Fishery Biologist for the Forest Service in Juneau.
40 I'm here today to present you the draft Staff analysis
41 for WP22-07.

42

43 Wildlife Proposal 22-07 requests that
44 the Federal public lands of Admiralty Island draining
45 into Chatham Strait between Port Marsden and Point
46 Gardner in Unit 4 be closed to deer hunting September
47 15th through November 30th except to Federally-
48 qualified users. It was submitted by the Southeast
49 Regional Advisory Council, and the Staff analysis of
50

1 the proposal begins on Page 84 of your meeting book.

2

3

4 The proponent states that it's become
5 more challenging for subsistence hunters in Angoon to
6 harvest sufficient deer to meet their subsistence needs
7 due to increased hunting pressure from non-Federally-
8 qualified users. They state that regulatory change is
9 needed to protect the deer population from further
10 depletion and increase opportunity for Federally-
11 qualified subsistence users.

12

13 The portion of Unit 4 covered by the
14 proposal consists of the majority of the west coast of
15 Admiralty Island. The area is primarily Federal public
16 lands within the Admiralty Island National Monument and
17 the Kootznoowoo Wilderness with the exception of lands
18 surrounding Angoon and a strip along the shoreline of
19 Mitchell Bay area. Rural residents of Units 1 through
20 5, customary and traditional use determination for deer
21 in Unit 4.

22

23 The current Federal season for deer in
24 Unit 4 is August 1st to January 31st with a limit of
25 six deer. Antlerless deer may only be taken after
26 September 15th. The State general season runs from
27 August 1st to December 31st and also allows antlerless
28 deer to be taken only after September 15th. In 2019
29 the State bag limit was increased from four to six
30 deer.

31

32 Based on the available data, deer
33 populations in Unit 4 and the proposal area appear to
34 be healthy. To assess the deer population, ADF&G uses
35 pellet count transects and aerial surveys. While no
36 pellet counts have been done in the proposal area
37 recently, counts in adjacent areas have shown an
38 increase in trend and population. Data from aerial
39 surveys also indicate an increasing trend in deer
40 populations with Admiralty Island having the highest
41 aerial survey counts within Unit 4.

42

43 We used data from ADF&G harvest reports
44 between 2000 and 2019 to assess the patterns of deer
45 harvest within the proposal area. Harvest and effort
46 data were grouped by wildlife analysis areas, or WAAs
47 which roughly correspond to major watersheds or other
48 distinct geographical areas. A map of the six WAAs
49 within the proposal area is on Page 92.

50

50

1 The amount of deer hunting effort
2 within the proposal area was measured using both the
3 number of hunters and the number of hunter days.
4 Graphs of the hunting effort data are on Page 95. The
5 amount of effort has been relatively stable over that
6 time period. The majority effort is by non-Federally-
7 qualified users, most of which reside in Juneau and
8 most of the Federally-qualified hunters using the area
9 reside in Angoon.

10

11 The success rate and harvest was
12 measured using the number of days hunted for deer
13 harvested and the number of deer harvested per hunter.
14 And graphs for those measures are on Page 96. The days
15 per deer has been variable to stable with Federally-
16 qualified hunters consistently taking less time to
17 harvest a deer. The number of deer per Federally-
18 qualified hunter has declined somewhat over the early
19 2000s but has been stable for the last decade and is
20 roughly comparable to the non-Federally rate.

21

22 Overall the number of deer harvested
23 within the proposal area has been fairly stable over
24 recent years as shown in Figure 10 on Page 97. There
25 appears to be a decline in the total harvest by
26 Federally-qualified users since the early 2000s but
27 that's largely the result of Angoon users shifting
28 efforts out of the proposal area into other areas as
29 shown in Figure 11. Timing-wise, the majority of
30 harvest in Unit 4 as a whole occurs during the proposed
31 closure period. Nearly half occurs during November and
32 two-thirds occurs from September to November. Since
33 the data were compiled on a monthly basis we couldn't
34 calculate how many were harvested before and after that
35 September 15th, beginning of the proposed closure
36 period.

37

38 This proposal would restrict non-
39 Federally-qualified users hunting deer on portions of
40 Admiralty Island during the month of peak effort and
41 harvest. Currently non-Federally-qualified users
42 represent roughly 60 to 70 percent of the hunting
43 effort and harvest in the proposal area, which is
44 compromised almost entirely of Federal public lands.
45 The proposed September 15th to November 30th closure
46 for non-Federally-qualified users would likely
47 eliminate over half of the hunter effort and harvest of
48 deer in the proposal area. Non-Federally-qualified
49 users would likely shift their effort to other areas of
50

1 Unit 4 leading to increased competition with hunters in
2 these other areas. It could also lead to increased
3 effort in the proposal area during the month of
4 December after the closed period is ended.

5
6 The intent of the proposal is to
7 increase opportunity for Federally-qualified
8 subsistence users by limiting competition from non-
9 Federally-qualified users. However, there's little
10 evidence that the proposed regulation would provide
11 much benefit for Federally-qualified subsistence users.
12 Deer populations within the proposal area appear to be
13 healthy and close to carrying capacity and, therefore,
14 the elimination of a substantial portion of the harvest
15 is likely to result in a significant increase in the
16 deer population and may even increase the risk of the
17 population exceeding its carrying capacity. Thus, the
18 proposal does not appear likely to significantly
19 improve the ability of Federally-qualified subsistence
20 users to meet their needs for deer. The proposal may
21 also have the unintended consequence of preventing non-
22 Federally-qualified users with local ties to the area
23 from participating in subsistence activities. Many
24 people from Angoon and other rural areas move to Juneau
25 to seek employment but return to these communities to
26 participate in subsistence harvesting with family and
27 friends. Under the proposed regulation these users
28 would be prevented from hunting deer in the area during
29 the closed season.

30
31 The OSM preliminary conclusion for
32 WP22-07 is to oppose the proposal. Section VIII of
33 ANILCA provides that the Board may restrict non-
34 subsistence uses on Federal public lands if necessary
35 for the conservation of healthy populations of fish and
36 wildlife, or to continue the subsistence uses of such
37 populations. Based on the available data, hunting
38 effort and harvest success rates of subsistence users
39 have been stable and favorable over the last 20-plus
40 years suggesting that the closure is not necessary to
41 continue the subsistence uses of the deer population.
42 Deer populations within the area are healthy and there
43 is no conservation concern for deer on the west coast
44 of Admiralty Island indicating a closure is unnecessary
45 for conservation reasons. Thus, the proposed
46 regulation does not meet the criteria identified in
47 Section .815-3 of ANILCA for a closure or a restriction
48 of non-subsistence users.

49
50

0332

1 So that's the end of my presentation.
2 I'd be happy to take any more questions.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jake.
5 So we'll open it up to questions from the Council.

6
7 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

10
11 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey Kitka.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Cathy first
14 and then Harvey. Go ahead, Cathy.

15
16 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Jake I asked this question yesterday so I just want to
18 put it back on in case the record wasn't -- I know the
19 court reporter was still going, but since we started
20 the analysis over I kind of wanted to kind of put my
21 point back on the table.

22
23 And that was during your analysis,
24 whether or not you had looked at or how you may have
25 qualified or quantified any user conflicts from the
26 past. I had pointed out that Sill and Koster had -- I
27 saw in another analysis that they had shown you the
28 conflicts in some of the household survey work and I
29 was wondering whether or not that was true for Angoon,
30 and then whether or not the OSM preliminary analysis
31 looked at past, or other documents in order to start
32 summarizing user conflicts that have been expressed in
33 the past regarding competition for deer in the analysis
34 area.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
39 Chair. Member Needham. Yes, so I did go back to that
40 Sill and Koster report that was for, you know, looking
41 at uses in Angoon, I believe from 2012, and in there a
42 section called local comments and concerns. They note
43 for under a large land mammals -- I can actually read
44 to you, it's just a couple of sentences. Because of
45 perceived changes in weather and harsher fall and
46 winter weather conditions many respondents commented
47 they would like to see the deer season dates be more
48 flexible. Stormy weather prevents most residents from
49 hunting because of hazardous water conditions. And
50

0333

1 several respondents would like managers to extend the
2 deer season by two weeks in years with severe weather
3 conditions. So those were the local concerns that were
4 noted in that report.

5

6 MS. NEEDHAM: Great, thank you. And
7 thanks for doing your homework since yesterday, I
8 appreciate it.

9

10 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: I also looked through
11 some other -- there was like a 1988 report that, you
12 know, looked quite a bit at deer use and stuff in
13 Angoon and I did not see any other kind of similar user
14 concerns noted in that report either. I'll have to
15 pull it up. There was use of fish and wildlife in
16 Angoon.

17

18 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
21 Harvey you had a question, go ahead.

22

23 MR. KITKA: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 I don't know if it's more of a comment than a question
25 but it might be a question in here somewhere. Back in
26 the old -- back in the 1960s, late '50s, almost into
27 the 1970 logging took place in some of our hunting
28 areas. You know it wasn't long before our local people
29 couldn't find the deer in their areas because the
30 loggers would find these areas and the deer would be
31 hunted out. They would be moved, not to the places
32 where we hunt, but moved to the higher elevations and
33 make it more difficult for local people. These were
34 not in areas where there were roads but there were
35 valleys where the deer would come down and we knew
36 about these spots. I was wondering whether the
37 conflict between Juneau and Angoon had something to do
38 with that, not only that but now with the more powerful
39 boats that they got now and the cheaper fuel in Juneau
40 than Angoon has any effect on how many people can hunt.
41 These are some of the things that I'm thinking about.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
46 Chair. Member Kitka.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jake.

49

50

0334

1 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, thank you for
2 that. In terms of the impacts of logging, I think, on
3 the patterns of deer hunting in that proposal area, the
4 only really major logging that has occurred is in, you
5 know, Wildlife Analysis Area 4044, the Shee Atika
6 drainages. So -- and I'm looking right now at numbers,
7 so since between 2000 and 2019 a very small proportion
8 of Angoon harvest and effort, 3 percent of the hunter
9 days and 2 percent of the harvest occurs within that
10 WAA. However, it's actually quite a popular one with
11 the Juneau area, kind of the major effort from Juneau
12 hunters is actually -- that's the largest right there.
13 So, yeah, almost half of the harvest occurs within
14 that, that's sort of the Cube Cove area as we would
15 call it. So I think folks are using that road system
16 there, the Juneau folks are. So it's heavily used by
17 Juneau hunters but very lightly used by Angoon hunters
18 according to the data.

19
20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
21 Jake.

22
23 MR. KITKA: Could I have a little
24 follow-up.

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
27 Harvey.

28
29 MR. KITKA: Follow-up. Like I told you
30 when the loggers got through hunting in these areas and
31 moved the deer out of the areas, basically what
32 happened is the people in Angoon having to run that far
33 from Angoon to Cube Cove is very expensive because the
34 price of fuel in Angoon is probably up to about between
35 \$ and \$8 a gallon, whereas the people in Juneau it's
36 probably a lot cheaper, probably half that price. But
37 the distance of running is both the same but the price
38 of fuel is so much higher and the bigger boats that run
39 from Juneau down to Cube Cove are probably there and
40 the people from Angoon probably don't want to go that
41 far and find the place has already been hunted and the
42 deer are really skittish about that time because of the
43 hunting pressure that's already taken place.

44
45 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
46 Albert.

47
48 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
49 Chair. This is Jake Musslewhite again. Yeah, I would
50

0335

1 echo what Mr. Kitka is saying. Looking at just sort of
2 the distribution of hunting effort almost all of the
3 Juneau effort is on the north end there. It's the kind
4 of Cube Cove area, what they call Central Admiralty
5 Lakes, you know, there's cabins and stuff there that
6 folks use. It fades off pretty quickly as you go from
7 north to south in terms of Juneau effort and then we
8 see the reverse with, you know, mostly effort from
9 Angoon residents being in the Angoon area and then
10 fading off pretty quickly as you go north from there.
11 If that makes sense. So just like you say, it's
12 farther to go.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
15 Jake. Albert, I believe I heard you with a question.

16

17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Musslewhite,
19 where's Jim's Cove on this map that you're looking at?

20

21 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: On the wildlife map,
22 here, yeah, I'd have to pull it up here real quick.
23 I'm not actually sure, Jim's Cove, is that like pretty
24 close to Cube's Cove, I'm not familiar with it?

25

26 MR. HOWARD: I'm asking you. I know
27 where it is, but I'm asking you if you know where it
28 is?

29

30 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: No, I'm not sure
31 where it is.

32

33 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman. I grew up
34 with a World War II Veteran, hunted with him, retired
35 magistrate, commercial fisherman on Admiralty Island.
36 My dad's thought process was let's go as far away from
37 Angoon as we can and leave it for people that can't
38 afford the gas or they don't have the boat to go as far
39 as we can. But that was our thought process and it's
40 always been my thought process and I passed that on to
41 my boys. The people that can afford to hunt away from
42 Angoon we do that and leave it for the guys that are
43 hunting in 14 foot Lunds with 9 horse motors on them.
44 We do that because the price of gas is \$6 a gallon.

45

46 What I don't see in your analysis is
47 the ferry service. In 1988 we had ferry service you
48 could rely on. The price of food was reasonable.
49 Every home in Angoon had a commercial permit so we were
50

0336

1 able to support ourselves with financial opportunity
2 through fishing. We had food security because we could
3 go out and rely on the resources our elders decided was
4 here when we stopped in and decided this is where we're
5 going to be. In 1988 you mentioned, I was going into
6 basic training, I came home in December and when I came
7 home we flew over what Shee Atika had taken away from
8 us, we believe. And in that area was what my dad loved
9 to call Jim's Cove. This is local knowledge and
10 something I've learned since 1978 when I was 10 years
11 old and started hunting with my dad. And Jim's Cove
12 kind of held a special place for us and I've always
13 wanted to show my sons that special place but you can't
14 now because there's no trees there. My dad said, okay,
15 be ready. We were deer calling and so many deer came
16 in you didn't know which one to shoot at and it was
17 more chaos than it was anything, and you don't see that
18 anymore.

19

20 And now you're saying -- taking a
21 different approach, I'm listening to what you're saying
22 and you're making my case for me. Whether you think we
23 should oppose this or not, 60 percent of all hunters on
24 Admiralty Island are non-residents according to your
25 analysis.

26

27 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Okay. What's
28 that got to do with.....

29

30 MR. HOWARD: Other areas is people like
31 me that have jobs and we go far enough away from Angoon
32 to leave it from the rest -- I'm here speaking for the
33 rest of everyone else, I'm here speaking for the guy in
34 the 14 foot Lund with a 9 horse on it. I'm not here
35 speaking for a Juneau resident or a Sitka resident that
36 has twin 200 Yamahas hanging off of their bow pickers.

37

38 Admiralty Island was created into a
39 National Monument and in that language, and I'm sure
40 you should look this up because it's part of the Forest
41 Service's responsibility to co-manage Admiralty Island.
42 That's part of the Forest Service's responsibility.
43 And in the language of the Monument that was signed by
44 Jimmy Carter, Proclamation 4611 states: For the
45 protection and well-being of the indigenous people of
46 the island. Now, ANILCA includes non-Native and I
47 agree with that, that takes any hostility between
48 Natives and non-Natives. If you live in Angoon you're
49 one of us. You're an Angoon resident that qualifies
50

0337

1 you for a subsistence user.

2

3 A lot of things that you said in your
4 analysis helps justify why this is being done. Have
5 you seen -- when's the last time you came down here and
6 actually seen the people here.

7

8 I have a lot more, Mr. Chairman, but
9 I'm thankful for taking a recess, I was able to calm
10 down and gather my thoughts and put some notes down.

11

12 So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I'd like.....

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.

17

18 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
19 remind Council members that this is the time for
20 questions on the analysis. And, while, Mr. Howard
21 asked a question in the beginning then he spent time
22 giving information that we really should be going over
23 during deliberations. So I'm really hoping that we can
24 get through the analysis and get through these
25 proposals. So I'd just like to put that point of order
26 on the table.

27

28 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
31 I was just going to say.....

32

33 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is.....

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second,
36 Albert. I have a whole list of questions that I kind
37 of want to put to you during the deliberations because
38 I know you're really the best person to answer those
39 questions so I'm kind of holding off and I think we
40 need to get to deliberations to get into a lot of this
41 stuff. So let's.....

42

43 MR. HOWARD: So, Mr. Chair, that was
44 all addressed to his analysis.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Okay.
47 Yep, and you did make that clear. So any other
48 questions from the Council for Mr. Musslewhite.

49

50

0338

1 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal. I
2 do have some questions on the analysis and I'll just
3 get into it here.

4
5 Mr. Musslewhite, on Page 88, it talks
6 abou -- under regulatory history it talks about the
7 2019 decision by the Board of Game to increase the
8 State harvest -- it says bag limit, but the State
9 harvest limit from four to six deer in Unit 4
10 remainder. And this cuts directly to the reason why
11 the next three or four proposals are in here. And I
12 just wanted to know, did the Federal Program -- you
13 probably don't know, maybe a Staff up there in
14 Anchorage knows, maybe you can get Mr. Pappas on, but
15 was there any comment to the Board of Game about this
16 increase in terms of changing the meaningful priority
17 that's on the books for all rural residents in the
18 remainder of Unit 4. You know you're going to hear me
19 again talk about meaningful priority here. But that
20 difference in harvest limit between non-qualified and
21 Federally-qualified in my mind was an important part of
22 that meaningful priority. And it went away when the
23 Board took this unilateral -- the Board of Game took
24 this unilateral action. And that's why we're seeing --
25 I think that's one of the major reasons we're seeing
26 these three proposals here -- or why we put in these
27 three proposals.

28
29 So that's my first question.

30
31 Mr. Musslewhite, you probably don't
32 have the answer but maybe folks up in Anchorage can get
33 me that answer soon. Was there any comments provided
34 to the Board of Game on that change from the Federal
35 Program and what were those comments. Now, I'm not
36 sure the Council prepared comments for that Board of
37 Game meeting but if I understand right, that was right
38 during the time that the previous -- the previous
39 Administration was not appointing Council members so
40 there was probably a lot of chaos going on and a lot of
41 stuff going on that maybe Council members missed that.

42
43 Anyway that's my question. That's my
44 first question.

45
46 My second question had to do with that
47 Wildlife Area 4044 [sic] and I just wanted to make sure
48 I understood what you said there in answer to a
49 question, that half the Juneau harvest in the entire
50

0339

1 area comes out of that one wildlife analysis area.

2

3

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
4 Chair. Member Casipit. On your first question, yes,
5 you're absolutely right I do not know what comments or
6 anything that were provided to the Board of Game. I'd
7 have to defer to other Staff on that one.

8

9

10 Yeah, and as far as the second
11 question, I'm not sure I got it right but I'm looking
12 right now at a spreadsheet of, you know, sort of the
13 Juneau hunter effort. And so we've got -- of all those
14 wildlife areas we've got roughly 35 percent of the days
15 and 49 percent of the harvest comes out of -- by Juneau
16 hunters comes out of that 4044 analysis area, that Shee
17 Atika drainage, sort of Cube Cove area.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. CASIPIT: Okay, thank you. That's
what I thought I heard. Thank you. That's it.....

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, and, Mr.
Chair.....

MR. CASIPIT:for now. If I can
get follow-up from OSM up there in Anchorage on that
question of whether or not there were Federal comments
provided to the Board of Game on that issue and what
they were.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Through the Chair, this
is Lisa Grediagin with OSM. And, yeah, I'm looking that
up and I'll get back to you as soon as I get that
information which should be a couple minutes. And I
also would like to remind Council members that this is
an OSM analysis, the analysis and the position, it
comes from the Office of Subsistence Management, it's
not Jake's personnel opinion. So just a reminder to
everyone public and Council members and Staff to, yeah,
be respectful, treat each other kindly when we're
dealing with these controversial issues. And, yeah,
just remember it's an agency position. And, yeah, I'll
get you that information shortly.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Lisa. Any other questions from the Council on the
analysis.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair.

0340

1 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair. Yes, go
2 ahead, Frank.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, I heard
5 Frank first I think. Go ahead, Frank.

6
7 MR. WRIGHT: We probably need to have
8 whoever's going to be speaking address the Chair first
9 so that this doesn't become a I'll talk next thing.

10
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Okay,
14 thank you, Frank. And then I heard somebody else, I
15 think it might have been Bob Schroeder.

16
17 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, this is Bob
18 Schroeder. Will you recognize me.

19
20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,
21 Bob.

22
23 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Jake, thanks for
24 going through this material. And, also, Cal, for
25 flagging that Board of Game change. Some of the
26 history on how their was a meaningful priority,
27 meaningful preference provided for Angoon came from the
28 really excellent work done by Angoon residents, Gabe
29 George and Matt Kookesh, many, many years ago going
30 before the then Board of Game to increase the bag limit
31 for Angoon and also establish a January hunt. That's
32 just by way of background.

33
34 I've got a question for you, Jake, but
35 I really think it probably should be preferred to legal
36 at OSM. We have a number of closure proposals before
37 us which would restrict non-subsistence users hunting
38 on Federal public land. The Council has been through
39 this territory quite a bit. We've spent, oh, gosh,
40 probably two or three years to establish closure --
41 partial of closure for non-subsistence deer hunters on
42 Prince of Wales Island and that was pretty much an
43 excruciating effort. I think we really need a briefing
44 from OSM on what the criteria are that need to be met
45 before restrictions on non-subsistence users may be
46 made. I, for one, definitely prefer preference for
47 local communities and subsistence users and hopefully
48 if we had more of a co-management and a tribal
49 management in place that would be a little bit easier
50

0341

1 to do. However, our Council is governed by the rules
2 of ANILCA and the interpretations of ANILCA so perhaps
3 we can put in there, since we're going to spend the
4 rest of the day talking about these things, if we can
5 get some kind of authoritative briefing on what
6 criteria need to be met before non-subsistence users
7 are restricted that would be most useful.

8

9 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
10 Chair. Member Schroeder. I also believe referring that
11 question to OSM Staff is an excellent idea so we'll let
12 them address that as they can.

13

14 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, is this Lisa
17 again?

18

19 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, this is Lisa
20 Grediagin with OSM. And I can address the ANILCA
21 criteria question as well as the OSM comments on the
22 Board of Game proposal of increasing from four deer to
23 six deer.

24

25 So first of all, comments on Proposal
26 18 to increase the bag limit for deer in Unit 4
27 remainder from four to six and the comments were as
28 follows: Impact to Federal subsistence users and
29 wildlife. This proposal allows for additional harvest
30 opportunity on non-Federal public lands for Federally-
31 qualified subsistence users, however adoption of the
32 proposal may increase competition for deer with non-
33 Federally-qualified users on all lands. The OSM
34 recommendation is to oppose this proposal. Adoption of
35 the proposal would allow for additional harvest
36 opportunities for Federally-qualified subsistence users
37 on non-Federal public land within the portion of Unit
38 4. However, competition with non-Federally-qualified
39 users has been an issue in this area and this proposal
40 would likely exacerbate the problem. This area has
41 experienced severe declines in deer numbers due to
42 harsh winter conditions. Although deer populations
43 have largely recovered, increased competition during
44 times of reduced deer population would be especially
45 problematic for Federally-qualified subsistence users.

46

47 So that was the OSM comment on the
48 Board of Game Proposal 18 to increase the bag limit.

49

50

0342

1 And then reference to the criteria for
2 closure to non-Federally-qualified users under Section
3 .815 of ANILCA. Authorizing a restriction on the
4 taking of fish and wildlife for non-subsistence users
5 on public lands is -- well, not authorized -- unless
6 necessary -- for the conservation of healthy
7 populations of fish and wildlife for the reasons set
8 forth in Section .816 to continued subsistence uses of
9 such populations, or pursuant to other applicable law.

10

11 And for reference, Section .816
12 discusses closure to all users including Federally-
13 qualified; for reasons of public safety, administration
14 or to assure the continued viability of a wildlife or
15 fish population.

16

17 And I'll take any further questions,
18 thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
21 Ms. Grediagin. I guess in the course of this analysis
22 maybe I'll open it up to the Council if they have any
23 questions to Ms. Grediagin on those points specific.

24

25 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

28

29 MR. CASIPIT: Not so much a question --
30 can I have -- okay, thank you. I wanted to thank OSM
31 for providing a really good comment to the Board of
32 Game on that. I listened to it and that's exactly what
33 I would have said if I would have -- I would have
34 probably thrown in meaningful priority there too, but
35 that's just me. But I want to thank OSM for looking
36 out for subsistence users on that one. It's
37 unfortunate that the Board of Game didn't take our
38 advice on that because we're seeing the results of it
39 now.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.

44

45 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any other Council
48 members with questions.

49

50

0343

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

4

5 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
6 appreciate that OSM went back and found the
7 information. I, for, one, though have -- that's the
8 first that I've heard OSM's opinion on the Board of
9 Game proposal. And, you know, this Council actually
10 hears Board of Game proposals -- or we don't hear them
11 but they're brought before us for us to comment on and
12 to provide comment back to the Board of Game. And so I
13 think I would ask the same question, is whether or not
14 the Regional Advisory Council made any recommendations
15 regarding that proposal. As we all know the Office of
16 Subsistence Management has, you know, a lot of Staff,
17 so I'm just curious -- like I don't remember, and I
18 could just not be remembering because we do so much
19 work, but I don't remember having that specific
20 discussion in the past with the Regional Advisory
21 Council. So I'm wondering if we provided comments
22 during the Board of Game process.

23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
27 Lisa, do you see any comments from the Regional
28 Advisory Council along those lines on that proposal.

29

30 MS. GREDIAGIN: Through the Chair, I'm
31 looking it up right now so I'll get back to you in a
32 moment. Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. While
35 you're doing that, any other questions from Council on
36 this analysis.

37

38 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, I have a
39 question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

42

43 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 This is for Mr. Musslewhite. Do you hunt Sitka black-
45 tail?

46

47 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.
48 Mr. Howard. Yes, but not very well quite honestly.
49 I'm one of those guys who sends in those crucial skunk
50

0344

1 cards harvest reports at the end of the year, most of
2 the years it seems like.

3

4 MR. HOWARD: Okay, I was asking just in
5 case you hunt on Admiralty. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Albert. Any
8 other questions.

9

10 MR. HOWARD: I have another one when
11 others have gone.

12

13 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second, I
16 think I heard Albert with a question and was there
17 somebody else as well.

18

19 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, it was Jim from
20 Pelican.

21

22 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
23 Albert.

24

25 MR. SLATER: I'll defer to Albert.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Albert you
28 first and then Jim Slater. Go ahead Albert.

29

30 MR. HOWARD: I guess my question could
31 be for anyone. Say a Native Corporation owns land, are
32 they allowed to shut that property off for hunting for
33 anybody?

34

35 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: He does not know
36 that.

37

38 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Mr.
39 Chair. Mr. Howard, I'm not sure if that was directed
40 at me. I mean I'm not absolutely certain but I think
41 that before the Forest Service purchase of Shee Atika
42 lands in the Cube Cove area that those areas were
43 closed to public access for the most part, to some
44 degree, but I'm not absolutely certain of that.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Albert,
47 maybe somebody during the course of our discussions can
48 answer that question later. Jim Slater, you had a
49 question, go ahead.

50

0345

1 MR. SLATER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 This question is for Mr. Musslewhite. Mr. Musslewhite,
3 yesterday as you were presenting, I think I heard you
4 mention that you didn't have numbers for the Federally-
5 qualified subsistence users as far as how their hunts
6 were distributed amongst the different regions that you
7 have numbered here on Page 94 because they.....

8
9 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: I lost you there, I
10 think.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, it sounds
13 like you got cut off there, Jim.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Mike Douville. I
20 think we may have lost Jim Slater mid-question there.
21 Go ahead, Mike.

22
23 MR. DOUVILLE: In answer to Albert's
24 question about corporation lands. Here a few years back
25 the Heenya Corporation just barred everybody from their
26 lands. What they said, we're not saying you can't hunt
27 there, we're saying you can't be there period. So they
28 can do that.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
33 Any other questions.

34
35 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair, this is
36 Lisa.

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Lisa.

39
40 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you. I just
41 wanted to report back to the Council that I did not
42 find any comments from the Council on Proposal 18 to
43 increase that bag limit under State regulations. The
44 only comments the Council submitted that year were on
45 Proposals 42/43 dealing with Unit 2 wolves.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
50

0346

1 Lisa. I think that answers Cathy's question. So any
2 more questions.

3

4 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is this Jim again?

7

8 MR. SLATER: Yeah, yeah, sorry. The
9 connection dropped, I had to connect back in, I
10 apologize for that.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, good, I'm glad
13 you could get reconnected. So go ahead with your
14 question.

15

16 MR. SLATER: My question I was asking
17 Mr. Musslewhite, if he had data about how the -- number
18 1, how the Federally-qualified subsistence users,
19 especially Angoon hunters, how they were distributed
20 amongst the different numbered regions he has on Page
21 94. And then also how the balance of the non-
22 Federally-qualified hunters were distributed. I'm
23 getting at a point where I wonder that 4044 is a large
24 percentage of the Juneau hunters and then because of
25 proximity and access reasons, another large lump may be
26 through ferry access into Angoon directly, and I'd like
27 to understand if that's the case.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

30

31 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
32 Chair. Member Slater. Yeah, I wish I could do it
33 visually but I do have that information for both Angoon
34 residents, in particular, not all Federally-qualified.
35 I mean I could get that, but it'd take me a few minutes
36 to calculate that. But in descending order of those
37 wildlife areas I'll just give you the percent harvest.
38 So the biggest is 4042, this is for Angoon residents,
39 4042 the Angoon area is 41 percent of the harvest; next
40 is 4055 the Hood Bay and Chiak drainages at 27; next is
41 4054 the Fishery and Thayer Creek area at 25 percent;
42 and then the rest are Whitewater Bay, Wilson Cove at 4
43 percent; Shee Atika drainages at 2 percent; and Central
44 Admiralty Lakes at 1 percent. So, yeah, you know, just
45 as you would expect it's more heavily concentrated
46 closer to home.

47

48 And then give me a second and I'll tell
49 you the Juneau ones here. So for Juneau hunters the --

50

0347

1 and this is again the total number of deer harvest, the
2 highest is the Shee Atika drainages at 49 percent: then
3 Central Admiralty Lakes 4043 at 24 percent; Hood Bay
4 and Chiak drainages at 10 percent.

5

6 MR. SLATER: Jake could you list them
7 by number, it's hard to correlate and compare the two
8 because you started out.....

9

10 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Oh, sure, yeah,
11 yeah.....

12

13 MR. SLATER:giving us.....

14

15 MR. MUSSLEWHITE:so -- sure -- do
16 you want me to start over on the Juneau there. I'll
17 start over on the Juneau ones.

18

19 The highest at half 49 percent is 4044
20 Shee Atika drainages.

21

22 MR. SLATER: Okay.

23

24 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Then next is 4043 the
25 Central Admiralty Lakes. And then next is -- and
26 that's almost -- between just those two it's almost 75
27 percent. Then next is 4055 Hood Bay, Shieak at 10
28 percent. And then I actually mistakenly have Wheeler
29 Creek drainage 3837, I just realized, at nine percent,
30 so that kind of skews things. But next is the Angoon
31 area at 6 percent, 4042; and then finally 4041 and 4054
32 each have one percent of the harvest by Juneau area.

33

34 MR. SLATER: Okay.

35

36 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: I hope you were able
37 to follow all of that.

38

39 MR. SLATER: I was, for.....

40

41 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: But the -- the
42 pattern.....

43

44 MR. SLATER:the most part.....

45

46 MR. MUSSLEWHITE:the pattern for
47 both of them is almost all of the effort for Juneau
48 residents is in the north end of the proposal area and,
49 you know, and fading off quickly as you get south, and
50

0348

1 then kind of the inverse for Angoon, so everything's
2 close to home and fading off as you get farther from
3 home, you know, obviously.

4
5 MR. SLATER: Okay. The one number I
6 missed was the percentage you had for 4043, I wrote
7 that down incorrectly. It was.....

8
9 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Oh, 4043 the Central
10 Admiralty Lakes 24 percent of the Juneau hunter harvest
11 was in that WAA.

12
13 MR. SLATER: Okay.

14
15 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: So I think a lot of
16 that is there's, you know, cabins to fly into and that
17 sort of thing so that's pretty popular.

18
19 MR. SLATER: Got it. All right, well,
20 thank you very much.

21
22 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Certainly.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Other
25 questions from the Council on the analysis.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Perhaps we
30 have all questions answered so we can move on. Thank
31 you, Jake. Thank you, Lisa.

32
33 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Then we.....

36
37 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, one more
38 question.

39
40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, go ahead,
41 Cal.

42
43 MR. CASIPIT: Sorry one more question.
44 Sorry.

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

47
48 MR. CASIPIT: Now, this -- this
49 proposed regulation talks about Federal public lands of
50

0349

1 Admiralty Island draining into Chatham Straits between
2 Point Marsden and Point Gardner. Now, if I'm not
3 mistaken, which way does 4043 drain?
4

5 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Let me look at that
6 map here a second.
7

8 MR. CASIPIT: It looks to me that it
9 drains to the east towards.....
10

11 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: No.
12

13 MR. CASIPIT:Seymour.
14

15 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the
16 Chair. Mr. Casipit. Yeah, I think it goes a little
17 bit each way on that one. So -- but, you know, we
18 can't -- we have no way to split the data, so we're
19 kind of using the whole thing but I'm glad you picked
20 up on that.
21

22 MR. CASIPIT: Okay, gotcha.
23

24 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, so -- so.....
25

26 MR. CASIPIT: Right.
27

28 MR. MUSSLEWHITE:right -- right,
29 another anomaly of drainage while we're at it is that
30 that Wheeler Creek drainage which is the WAA just north
31 of 4044 is pretty heavily used by Juneau folks and a
32 lot of it is actually, you know, south of, you know,
33 Marsden but it all drains into like Hawk Inlet and
34 everything like that. So that's kind of another little
35 drainage anomaly. So a lot of that area, while it is
36 between those -- geographically between those two
37 points it's not actually -- not actually would be
38 considered within the proposal area. I just wanted to
39 point that out.
40

41 MR. CASIPIT: Gotcha, thank you.
42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody
44 else with a question.
45

46 MR. HOWARD: I have one, Mr. Chairman,
47 this is Albert.
48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.
50

0350

1 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 Do you have any data on usage of the east side of
3 Admiralty Island by Juneau residents?
4

5 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, I do. Because
6 it was out of the proposal area I haven't really run
7 much of an analysis on it. But if you gave me some
8 time I could probably answer a question with it.
9

10 MR. HOWARD: Okay, thank you, Mr.
11 Chair. Kind of my thought process was we're trying to
12 present some of the users in this area that they would
13 have all of east Admiralty to hunt if they would choose
14 to do that so it wasn't -- I wasn't trying to be
15 unreasonable, I'm trying to compromise and make sure --
16 the intent of what this proposal is trying to do
17 remains, without really causing harm to anyone else.
18

19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
22 Albert. Last call for questions from the Council.
23

24 (No comments)
25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I think
27 we're ready to move on. Thank you, Jake. Thank you,
28 Lisa. Next up is the report on consultation with
29 tribes or ANCSA Corporations, any reports there on this
30 proposal.
31

32 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
33 Wessels. Orville Lind, our Native Liaison should be
34 online. He should be able to report on this.
35

36 (No comments)
37

38 MS. WESSELS: Orville, are you online.
39

40 (No comments)
41

42 MS. WESSELS: Okay, since Orville is
43 not online I'm going to report that we did not receive
44 any tribal or ANCSA Corporation comments during the
45 tribal consultations on this proposal. Thank you.
46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, sounds good.
48 Now, we have agency comments, and do we have the Alaska
49 Department of Fish and Game to comment on this
50

0351

1 proposal.

2

3 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, this is Tom
4 Schumacher with the Department of Fish and Game.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, good morning,
7 Tom. Also I was hoping to be able to ask some
8 questions to Lauren Sill, is she available as well?

9

10 MS. SILL: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I am here.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, very good.
13 Thank you, Lauren. So Mr. Schumacher, you first, go
14 ahead with your comments.

15

16 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay, thank you. Good
17 morning, Don and good morning Council members. We
18 start out today noting that you have a pretty full
19 agenda and just one day left to complete it so in the
20 interest of time I'm going to offer the State's
21 comments generally on the next four proposals, so
22 Proposal 7, 8, 9 and 10. The proposals have a lot of
23 common ground. The goals are generally similar it's
24 some type of restriction on non-Federally-qualified
25 hunter opportunity either through a bag limit
26 restriction or a season restriction on areas of land.
27 So I plan to provide our general comments on all four
28 proposals and then if there are specific questions as
29 the Council takes up each proposal I'd be happy to
30 address those. Does that sound like a workable way
31 forward.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. As long as
34 you're prepared to take specific questions, that's
35 fine.

36

37 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay. So the
38 Department approached these proposals, you know, we
39 looked at the proposals what was written on them and
40 the issues appear to be, you know, the justification
41 for limiting non-Federally-qualified users opportunity
42 are competition between non-Federally-qualified users
43 and Federally-qualified users; limiting harvest
44 opportunity for Federally-qualified users and some
45 depletion of deer population. So some question about
46 the trajectory of the populations in Game Management
47 Unit 4. The Department does not monitor deer
48 populations in these relatively small areas affected by
49 the proposal, we monitor deer populations on a unit-

50

0352

1 wide level.

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

So I'd like to talk about the Admiralty, Chichagof, Baranof, ABC Islands Unit 4 deer population just to tell you what we know about them.

I think everyone there is probably aware that we monitor populations in several different ways. None are necessarily conclusive but if all those indicators are pointing the same direction, we think that's probably pretty convincing evidence that the population is stable, increasing, declining, abundant, not abundant. So one way that you're -- I think most people are familiar is that we monitor populations is through deer pellet group transects. You know, the transect's walked in the spring, it's a straight line through the woods, somebody starting at a beach and going up to 1,500 meters elevation, or 1,500 feet elevation, excuse me, and essentially counting all the deer poop within a half meter of either side of the line. The thinking is that if you have more piles of deer poop means you have more deer. And those pellet group transects are a relatively insensitive indicator of year to year changes. They're thought to be sensitive to roughly 30 percent changes in population from a year to year basis. So it's a big change and usually if that happens it's a change downwards that results from a hard winter. And, indeed, pellet group transects were a good indicator of the hard winter of 2006/07, the following year pellet group transects declined and then the gradually rebuilt. But another way to think of using pellet group transects is to indicate relative abundance of deer among game management units and we do that with other game management units where we do those transects.

Game Management Unit 4 has far and away the highest pellet group counts of any game management unit in Alaska. So in that -- according to that index of abundance, deer are more abundant in Game Management Unit 4 than they are anywhere in the state. And the trajectory for the Game Management Unit 4 population has (indiscernible - cuts out/muffled) 2006/7 and regained -- and it recovered relatively quickly and it's been high and stable since then.

Another way we monitor deer populations is through aerial Alpine surveys in the middle of summer when most deer are in the Alpine, or when the

0353

1 most deer. We don't know whether Alpine surveys
2 reflect trends in the larger population on an island
3 but to what degree their index of abundance, Game
4 Management Unit 4 has the highest counts of deer in
5 Alpine habitat. And south Admiralty in the area has by
6 far the highest quantity of deer in the Alpine, double
7 anywhere else.

8
9 And another way we monitor deer
10 abundance is through hunter harvest. And Game
11 Management Unit 4 is the deer producer in Alaska, it's
12 got the highest hunter harvest of any game management
13 unit in the state.

14
15 So looking at those three indicators of
16 abundance, Game Management Unit 4 historically has the
17 highest abundance of deer in the state and at this
18 point -- compared to other game management units, the
19 deer in Game Management Unit 4 is high and stable. So
20 abundance of deer does not appear to be an issue. So
21 that justification, according to the data we have just
22 doesn't support it.

23
24 And then we move on to, well,
25 difficulty harvesting deer relative to subsistence
26 needs and the role that competition from non-Federally-
27 qualified users may play in that. Presumably if that's
28 the case we will see a growing number of non-Federally-
29 qualified users, a growing number of days hunted by
30 those users, and increasing harvest by those users.
31 Those are the indicators that those users are competing
32 with Federally-qualified users and perhaps affecting
33 deer hunting for those users.

34
35 So we looked at hunter harvest data for
36 the areas in all four proposals broke down just like
37 the OSM analysis did by Wildlife Analysis Area, or
38 WAA, and we looked at hunter harvest broken down by
39 Federally-qualified and non-Federally-qualified users.
40 So the data that we're reporting to you -- by data
41 reported, largely by members of the communities of
42 Angoon, Hoonah and Pelican. And these data are trends
43 over more than 20 years. So the information I'm
44 presenting to you, it was presented by your friends and
45 neighbors. We found that, indeed, the number of deer
46 harvested in these areas has declined. The amount of
47 decline in each area varies but, indeed, there really
48 has been a decline in the number of deer harvested in
49 the three areas affected by the four proposals.

50

1 Depending on where you are, Federally-qualified users
2 may outnumber non-Federally-qualified users or in the
3 case of western Admiralty Island, Proposal 7, non-
4 Federally-qualified users may outnumber Federally-
5 qualified users. But the trend is the same. The
6 harvest by those user groups is declining.

7

8 So deer populations are healthy, why is
9 harvest declining.

10

11 You know, we looked at hunters, number
12 of hunters and hunter effort, and what do you know, the
13 numbers of people hunting in these areas and the days
14 of hunting effort by those people are declining, it's
15 been declining for 20 years. It's not only the steady
16 decline but the long-term trend is down. And in some
17 cases the decline is fairly dramatic. In the Angoon
18 area the number of Federally-qualified hunters hunting
19 in that area and the days of effort by those hunters is
20 half of what it was 20 years. So if fewer people are
21 hunting for fewer days it seems pretty obvious that
22 you're going to have fewer deer harvested. So that
23 seems to do a pretty good job explaining the decline in
24 harvest.

25

26 We also looked at, you know, for the
27 people who continue to hunt in that area, how is their
28 hunting effort, how are they doing. So the Federally-
29 qualified users could continue to hunt in all three
30 areas affected by the four proposals are all doing it
31 very well. How we measure that is days of hunting
32 effort requiring to harvest a deer and the number of
33 deer harvested per hunter. In general, actually in
34 every case Federally-qualified hunters take fewer days
35 than non-Federally-qualified hunters to harvest a deer
36 and they tend to harvest more deer per hunter. The
37 trends are either stable or improving for Federally-
38 qualified hunters in all three areas.

39

40 So the Department, using data provided
41 by the people in those three communities, Pelican,
42 Hoonah and Angoon, just can't find any support for the
43 proposal. The decline in harvest, which is real,
44 appears entirely related to a decline in hunter effort
45 and it seems that, you know, if you want to increase
46 the subsistence harvest of deer in those communities,
47 it's either, you know, we heard about hunters leaving
48 the area to go hunt elsewhere, you know, those people
49 can hunt closer to home because the number of non-
50

0355

1 Federally-qualified users in those areas has been
2 either stable for 20 years or declining, so there
3 really doesn't appear to be any increase in competition
4 or to recruit more young hunters into the hunting
5 community. At this point we can't see any -- the deer
6 population in Unit 4 is the healthiest in the state of
7 Alaska so there's no conservation concern. Harvest and
8 effort by non-Federally-qualified hunters in all three
9 areas is stable or declining so there doesn't appear to
10 be any change in competition and in some cases it's
11 declining. So it's really hard to see how these
12 proposals can fit under Title VIII of ANILCA.

13

14 So I guess with that I'll conclude my
15 comments, you know, general comments on these proposals
16 and I'll take any questions. And if you have specific
17 questions about Proposal 7 I'll answer those as well.

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
20 Tom. So we'll open it up to questions from the
21 Council.

22

23 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
24 Albert.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

27

28 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
29 keep hearing data from the '80s and '90s and so on and
30 so forth but you don't hear in that data of the price
31 of gas back then, you don't hear in that data the
32 economy of Angoon. I mentioned earlier that everyone
33 in Angoon had a permit hand troll, we all fished
34 halibut, it was a fun time. That stuff isn't here
35 anymore. So the hunter effort is based on the price of
36 gas. For example if I have five gallons of gas I'm
37 definitely not going to go out today and look for deer
38 because it's raining. Those things like that that are
39 missing from equation.

40

41 The thing I'd like to see is what's
42 happening on Prince of Wales with the wolves and the
43 effort that's being put into totally get a total
44 picture of what's happened there, everything's
45 included. We don't have roads here, so we got to get
46 in a boat and go get it.

47

48 So that's my comment, Mr. Chair.

49

50

0356

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
2 Is there anybody with a question for Mr.Schumacher.

3
4 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

7
8 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 Tom, at the beginning of your presentation you noted
10 one of the reasons why you wanted to talk about these
11 things in general for Unit 4 was because there were
12 some similarities regarding a number of proposals that
13 we have before us. And I was wondering whether or not
14 the Department of the analysis took into consideration
15 or looked at what the cumulative impacts if all the
16 proposals that are before us for Unit 4 were to go
17 through, what the cumulative impacts may or may not be
18 for separate user groups?

19
20 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
21 Member Needham. We address these proposals
22 individually. And some of them talk about, you know,
23 numbers of hunter days that might be lost during the
24 proposed closures and it's harder to predepict with bag
25 limits or, you know, and so is the number of deer that
26 could be not harvested through bag limit restriction
27 and the likely -- I think the restrictions -- achieving
28 the goal of the proposals, which is increasing harvest
29 by Federally-qualified users, in general you don't see
30 any of the restrictions -- any change to those -- to
31 harvest by Federally-qualified users.

32
33 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 Can I ask an additional question.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure, go ahead,
37 Cathy.

38
39 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr. Chair.
40 So, Tom, the way the data works, what I don't see in
41 the analysis is we have communities that are letting us
42 know that they have competition and may not be able to
43 meet.....

44
45 (Teleconference interference -
46 participants not muted)

47
48 MS. NEEDHAM: I'm getting feedback I'm
49 not sure if people can hear me okay.
50

0357

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: There was some
2 feedback but it's good now.

3

4 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you.

5

6 (Teleconference interference -
7 participants not muted)

8

9 MS. NEEDHAM: Some communities have
10 brought these proposals before us for us to put these
11 proposals in under our process. And to me it feels
12 like what they're stating is it's competition. And I'm
13 wondering why the analysis -- the analysis does a
14 thorough job of looking at.....

15

16 (Teleconference interference -
17 participants not muted)

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM:Federally-qualified
20 users versus non-Federally-qualified users, but it
21 doesn't necessarily partition competition between
22 Federally-qualified from other communities. And I'm
23 wondering if I'm missing that and if it's there,
24 whether or not we're able to actually make those
25 comparisons with the data, we just do that in any of
26 the analysis.

27

28 (Teleconference interference -
29 participants not muted)

30

31 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
32 Member Needham. The data we presented were meant to
33 address the proposal. The proposal was to restrict
34 non-Federally-qualified hunter season and bag limits
35 and so that's how we analyzed them. We didn't try to
36 partition out Juneau hunters, non-resident hunters, or
37 anybody else and at this point there doesn't really
38 seem to be an issue. The data provided to us by
39 hunters indicates that competition between Federally-
40 qualified and non-Federally-qualified hunters as
41 quantified by the numbers by those hunters is stable or
42 declining in all three areas and has been stable for
43 over 20 years. So the data do not reflect any increase
44 in competition. If Federally-qualified communities
45 perceive an interest in competition, you know,
46 everybody can have their own perception, you know, but
47 the data we get are from hunter reports, which are
48 mandatory, and so we assume most everybody turns those
49 in and they're an accurate reflection.....

50

0358

1 (Teleconference interference -
2 participants not muted)

3
4 MR. SCHUMACHER:of participation
5 and effort of both hunter user groups. So it seems
6 like the most objective information available to base
7 these decisions on.

8
9 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee
10 with OSM.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Amee, go ahead.

13
14 MS. HOWARD: I just wanted to remind
15 everyone on the line we are experiencing some feedback
16 so if you are not speaking and only listening, please
17 put your phones on mute, utilize star six, mute on your
18 phone. That will help limit the feedback that we're
19 experiencing so that we can be sure everyone can hear
20 everything.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
23 Amee. Yes, Cathy, do you have any follow-up on that.

24
25 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair, no
26 I don't. And, thank you, Tom, for your responses.

27
28 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, this is Bob.

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Bob Schroeder, go
31 ahead.

32
33 MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, Tom, I'd like to
34 thank you for a really even-handed presentation of the
35 harvest data based on the harvest reports which you
36 note are mandatory. And we really need to use -- use
37 those data because they're a (indiscernible - cuts out)
38 source of data, as when I used to work with the data I
39 did not that there was not.....

40
41 (Teleconference interference -
42 participants not muted)

43
44 MR. SCHROEDER:necessarily equal
45 reporting throughout the region.....

46
47 (Teleconference interference -
48 participants not muted - overriding speakers)

49
50

0359

1 MR. SCHROEDER:and in fact quite
2 a few communities seriously under-reported what their
3 harvest was so there were data accuracy questions. So
4 you might comment on those.

5
6 In previous times the harvest ticket
7 data was supplemented by Division of Subsistence,
8 studies that specifically asked way more detailed
9 information on the harvest. When those were done there
10 was not the best of correspondence particularly for
11 certain small communities. So I'm not -- I think we
12 need to recognize that there could be limitations in
13 that data set and not treated as if it has some level
14 of accuracy that it does not have.

15
16 That's to say that when we're hearing
17 things from community members that may not accord
18 exactly with the harvest ticket data we may question
19 the accuracy of the data as well as whether or not
20 people are giving us some sort of strategic testimony.

21
22 So perhaps you could comment on the
23 accuracy of the harvest ticket data, something that I
24 used to work with a whole lot with many many years ago.

25
26 Thank you.

27
28 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I got a
29 message that the court reporter is no longer recording.

30
31 REPORTER: I am. You guys can keep
32 going, I am. Thank you.

33
34 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay, sorry, Tina, had
35 texted me that you had stopped.

36
37 REPORTER: Yeah, I did, but no worries
38 I'm getting it from a different channel now.

39
40 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay. This is Tom
41 Schumacher and my understanding is we're okay to go
42 forward and I can answer Member Schroeder's question?

43
44 REPORTER: Yes, go ahead.

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Tom.

47
48 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Through the
49 Chair to Member Schroeder. Thank you for noting that
50

0360

1 since 2011 deer harvest ticket reports have been
2 mandatory. That means it's not optional for hunters,
3 those are mandatory reports. That means the Board of
4 Game expects every hunter to report. The Board of Game
5 in a recognition of a subsistence importance of deer in
6 Southeast Alaska did not attach a penalty to that,
7 similar like there is to a registration or drawing
8 permit hunts. But the expectation of the Board is that
9 every hunter who acquires a harvest ticket, whether
10 they hunt it or not would reply. And the reason for
11 enacting -- or for changing this from the old mailout
12 survey that we used to have to harvest ticket reports,
13 one, because users, particularly users in smaller
14 communities asked for more accurate data on deer and
15 deer harvest.

16
17 So if members of smaller communities
18 aren't reporting then they're not really helping
19 themselves because they were the primary reason that we
20 had harvest ticket reports. And everyone who gets a
21 deer harvest ticket has an opportunity to report,
22 reports can be made in person, over the phone, through
23 the mail, or on the State's website. There's ample
24 opportunity to report. So reporting, you know, you get
25 -- you know, I guess if people from some communities
26 don't feel that these data summaries reflect their
27 experience perhaps that's because they're not
28 reporting. You know that's the advantage of filing
29 complete and accurate reports is that, you know, it's
30 reflected in the data.

31
32 Let's see what else did Member
33 Schroeder ask about.

34
35 Throughout the region, on average,
36 these days we get reports from about 70 percent of deer
37 hunters region-wide. But response rates vary. And,
38 indeed, some smaller communities have lower response
39 rates, however, our area management Staff make every
40 effort to try to get 60 percent of the people in that
41 community to respond and if people don't respond during
42 the normal reporting period, they call them up and ask.
43 So the Department is doing everything it can to get
44 complete and accurate reporting data. However, if the
45 deer harvest reports do not give a comprehensive count
46 of deer harvested, that you need 100 percent accurate
47 reporting to do that. So we you don't have 100 percent
48 accurate reporting we need to expand the harvest data
49 we get to include for all hunters, including the ones
50

0361

1 who didn't report. You use a proportion of them so we
2 take the people from each community who reported and
3 thinking if there were 20 people in the community who
4 got deer harvest tickets and only 10 reported, you take
5 the data that they reported and we double it. That's
6 because we don't have any better way of doing it. The
7 only better way is for more people to report.

8
9 Member Schroeder is correct, household
10 subsistence surveys done by the subsistence folks at
11 ADF&G did show a difference between deer harvest,
12 information collected that way and deer harvest
13 collected through annual harvest ticket reports. The
14 surveys are conducted differently and they're bound to
15 show a difference. The deer harvest ticket reports,
16 you know, may have -- almost certainly have some
17 inaccuracies in them but I think what they are good at
18 is showing year to year trends. So even if more deer
19 are really harvested that people report, the trend, up
20 or down, we believe is accurate and is the same.
21 Because people's reporting habits really don't change
22 from year to year. So even if the higher the curve --
23 might be higher or lower, the trend the curve shows is
24 accurate is our belief. So the data I reported to you
25 in the trends and hunter harvest and hunter effort by
26 various user groups, I believe does reflect real
27 trends.

28
29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Tom.

30
31 MR. SCHROEDER: Just a quick follow-up.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Bob.

34
35 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

38
39 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Tom, we could have
40 a long conversation about data and I thank you for
41 being really, really fair and accurate in your
42 presentation and I'm in no way impugning your harvest
43 data, it's the best stuff we have. I'm just saying
44 that, you know, that there are some boundaries on the
45 accuracy there and I'd just leave it at that.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.

50

0362

1 Anybody else with a question.

2

3 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal
4 Casipit.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

7

8 (Teleconference interference -
9 participants not muted)

10

11 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Schumacher brought it
12 up, I just thought maybe I would bring this up because
13 it's something I notice on my deer harvest report all
14 the time. Is there a way you can -- I mean it's my
15 understanding that you report all your hunting trips no
16 matter if you get a deer or not. Am I correct in that,
17 first question.

18

19 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, that is the
20 intent.

21

22 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. It would be really
23 good on this report somewhere -- this little report
24 card that I got, that somewhere on there it highlights
25 that. Because in my community and this is something I
26 work on a lot with -- a lot as far as reporting and
27 writing everything down. I remember Dolly Garza, years
28 ago, saying, subsistence users should be writing
29 everything down, you got to document it, you got to
30 document your use to protect it. This is what I do.
31 And so I tell people, no, you got to put down your
32 unsuccessful trips, too, because sometimes in my
33 community people just write down the times that they're
34 successful. They think they're just reporting the
35 numbers of deer they're harvesting, not the time it
36 took them. Sure the time it took them to hunt that
37 deer on that day, to harvest that deer on that day, but
38 unsuccessful trips a lot of times don't get reported.
39 So I would make that suggestion for that report card
40 here, because it's -- you know, just looking at it it
41 doesn't -- it could be more apparent.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.

48

49 MR. SCHUMACHER: Chair Hernandez, if I

50

0363

1 may make a point please.

2

3

4 Tom.

5

6

7 MR. SCHUMACHER: I don't think that
8 that point really bears on the topic at hand. We
9 believe that the understanding of reporting
10 requirements is the same for Federally-qualified and
11 non-Federally-qualified hunters, we don't see that
12 injecting any bias into the data at hand. There may be
13 general confusion or misunderstanding, but we believe
14 that it's evenly distributed across user groups so
15 there shouldn't be any bias injected by that
16 misunderstanding.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. CASIPIT: Well, I'm not -- through
the Chair, follow-up.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

MR. CASIPIT: I'm not suggesting your
data is bias, I'm just making a suggestion to maybe
improve the data set, that's all I'm doing.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Thank you,
Cal. And, yeah, this is Don Hernandez, and I'd just
like to kind of state for the record that we've heard
testimony in the past of just how, you know, hunter
report efforts really are different experiences for
rural hunters compared to urban hunters. Urban hunters
tend to make a planned hunt of a specific number of
days in a specific area so they document their harvest,
whereas subsistence hunters are out doing all kinds of
different activities, it might involve, you know,
possibly encounter a deer and trying to document all
that is just, you know, really, really a challenge for
rural hunters. Especially when you get into this deer
per days hunted and all that kind of data, it's really
hard to, you know, tease it out. And that's why I kind
of wanted to bring Lauren Sill into this conversation
because she did do household surveys in Angoon in 2012.
And as we look at Page 90 of what those household
surveys found and what's recorded on Figure 11 for that
year on the table, there's a pretty good discrepancy.
And I just kind of would like Lauren Sill, if she could
maybe.....

(Teleconference interference -

0364

1 participants not muted)

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:comment on
4 how accurate she feels the, you know, the household
5 surveys are, what kind of information she's getting
6 there and participation and how those surveys are
7 conducted and kind of get a better idea of what the
8 accuracy of some of this data is.

9

10 So, I don't know, Lauren, do you think
11 you can kind of maybe run us through a little bit about
12 your household survey from 2012.

13

14 MS. SILL: Sure, Mr. Chair. This is
15 Lauren Sill with the Division of Subsistence.

16

17 (Teleconference interference -
18 participants not muted)

19

20 MS. SILL: So broadly I would say that
21 we feel confident in the estimates that we come up with
22 through our household surveys. The way that they're
23 conducted, in a community like Angoon, because of its
24 size, we would do a random sample of households. So we
25 find out every household that's in the community and
26 then just -- for Angoon in 2012, we sampled 40 percent,
27 sometimes we sample 50 percent, smaller communities
28 we'll talk to every household that's there. They're
29 all voluntary surveys, so people are free to decline,
30 which is usually a small percentage, maybe a couple
31 households in a community will choose not to
32 participate. Because it's a random sample we will miss
33 households that hunt deer.

34

35 (Teleconference interference -
36 participants not muted)

37

38 MS. SILL: That's just how it goes.
39 We'll talk to households that don't hunt anything, but
40 because we're looking at subsistence throughout the
41 community, about how it works, you know, talking to the
42 households that don't harvest but just receive from
43 other people, it's important to us and important to us
44 to try to kind of flesh out the whole idea of harvest
45 in a community.

46

47 So when we ask about large land
48 mammals, in particular, there are some surveys that we
49 have done where we ask about trying to get effort,
50

0365

1 about how many days people went out hunting and what
2 they harvested, these surveys in 2012 we did not ask
3 that question. When we have in the past we come across
4 the same of what Chairman Hernandez was just saying,
5 it's very difficult for people to tell us all the days
6 that they hunted because they go -- you know, they go
7 berry-picking and they're looking for deer, they go
8 fishing and they're looking for deer, and so it's a --
9 it can be pretty challenging to get that information.
10 But when we ask about the harvest, because they're
11 volunteer surveys and because we're not associated with
12 enforcement in any way and they're not -- we don't
13 report anything on an individual level, people who
14 harvest, you know, in every community, and I think
15 there are people who harvest for a large number of
16 people and they may harvest more than allowed on their
17 harvest ticket. And I found that usually people will
18 tell us when they -- you know, if they exceed harvest
19 limits because it's not a part of what we're really
20 trying to get at and because there's no -- you know, no
21 enforcement action is going to come from telling us
22 that. We ask for, you know, how many deer of
23 household's harvested, whether they shared it, whether
24 they received it, the time of year, and then we also
25 ask about how their deer harvest in the study year
26 compared to past years, you know, if it was less than
27 usual, more or about the same. And for people -- for
28 the households that ask us -- or tell us that they're
29 harvest was less or more we ask follow-up questions
30 about why they felt it was less or more and we also ask
31 households if they got enough of a category, like large
32 land mammals and if they didn't, how it impacted their
33 households.

34

35 Was there any other specific
36 information you'd like to hear or I'm not sure if I
37 answered your question completely.

38

39 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
40 Albert.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MS. NEEDHAM: I think that the Chair
45 has dropped off so I will continue to.....

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hello.

48

49 MS. NEEDHAM:move forward.....

50

0366

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sorry, Cathy.....

2

3 MS. NEEDHAM:until he comes back
4 on.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, it's all
7 right, I had muted during that and I forgot to unmute.
8 So Albert I'll get to you in a second. I just wanted
9 to follow-up there with Lauren and point out that, yes,
10 there's some pretty valuable information in these
11 household surveys that were not seeing presented to us
12 here. And, of course, a lot of the reason for that is
13 probably that one hasn't been done in nine years in
14 Angoon, so maybe the one that was done in 2012 isn't
15 all that relevant. But it does point out to me the
16 real importance of what a lot of what we hope to talk
17 about later in this meeting is, you know, indigenous
18 management and how to incorporate tribal and local
19 knowledge into our management and the value of timely
20 information that can be gotten from local communities
21 in regards to, you know, proposals such as this, would
22 just be invaluable. You know the data that we have we
23 have to recognize, as Bob's pointed out, that there are
24 gaps and, yeah, I would just like to make that point
25 and we'll deal with it as we can.

26

27 And as I said earlier, when we get to
28 deliberations I'm going to have rely a lot on asking
29 questions of our Council member from Angoon to try and
30 find out more about why we're seeing some of these
31 numbers that we're seeing here. So I'll hold off on
32 those until we get to deliberations.

33

34 Albert, you have the floor, go ahead.

35

36 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Questions for Mr. Schumacher. Do you have another
38 solution to this existing problem or is it just
39 something, based on the data you have, having nothing
40 to do with what we have and what we see here, is what
41 you're going to base your decision on. I'm always
42 looking for solutions to existing problems that I see,
43 so I guess I'm asking if you may have an idea on what
44 we can do here.

45

46 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
47 Member Howard. You came through a little bit garbled
48 on my end but I think I got the gist of your question.
49 You know all I'm doing is summarizing the information
50

0367

1 that hunters in Angoon provide to the Department and
2 the conclusions that can be drawn from that. I don't
3 think anyone's going to argue that deer harvest in the
4 area affected by this proposal by people who are
5 Federally-qualified has declined. The reason, the real
6 question is why. Information available to us and
7 reported to us by members of your community are that
8 there are fewer people hunting in that area, I don't
9 know if there are fewer people hunting in the
10 community, period, or if they're choosing to hunt
11 elsewhere, but the data available to us suggests there
12 are fewer people from the community hunting in that
13 area.

14
15 You would know better than I about why
16 that might be.

17
18 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, follow-up,
19 if I may (muffled)

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

22
23 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd
24 like to see this area managed in the same manner the
25 wolves in Prince of Wales. But everyone has my contact
26 information. I'm more than willing to have
27 conversations with someone on creating an area where a
28 community of 80 percent of the community.....

29
30 (Teleconference interference -
31 participants not muted - overriding speaker, and
32 muffled)

33
34 MR. HOWARD:in our area without
35 fear of being taken to court.

36
37 Mr. Schu -- this is based on a
38 gentleman that went to Shieak to hunt because he had 10
39 gallons of gas. He got there and there was already a
40 boat there with three or four people hunting in three
41 or four different boats. Your data probably doesn't
42 tell you that, but it just leaves a terrible season
43 when you have all your hopes on 10 gallons of gas and
44 you get there and someone's already there. And, you
45 know, I've prayed and argued forwards and backwards on
46 this subject and one gentleman decided to tell me, if
47 we get any extra deer we take it to Sitka. That was
48 his way of getting me to say, oh, okay, that's fine.
49 The reality is you're taking deer out of our freezers.
50

0368

1 And so I guess I'm trying to find a solution working
2 with you on this, if you have one.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
7 Is there anybody else, I would like to move on here.

8

9 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

12

13 MR. KITKA: I'd just had a question for
14 Tom. I don't know if I understood one part in his
15 presentation, having to do with not really getting the
16 numbers from Admiralty, but going unit-wide for the
17 number of deer, the deer population. Because we all
18 know that there's big areas where nobody really hunts
19 and the population is probably really big in those
20 areas, but were there -- where there's hunter pressure
21 the population has decreased considerably.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
26 Harvey. Tom, do you have an answer for that?

27

28 MR. SCHUMACHER: I'm afraid I didn't
29 quite get the question. I reported, you know, what we
30 do for deer population surveys and, you know, how we
31 monitor trends and abundance and the scale on which we
32 monitor trends. We do not monitor small scales, we
33 haven't tried to do that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. I think
36 that kind of answers Harvey's question, you just can't
37 do it on a smaller, more refined scale. Okay, so
38 anybody else.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think
43 we'll conclude the ADF&G comments and ask if there's
44 any other Federal comments or comments from tribes on
45 this proposal.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Apparently not.

50

0369

1 Did we have any comments submitted by Fish and Game
2 Advisory Committees or other Advisory Committees.

3

4 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
5 Wessels. To my knowledge no comments were submitted by
6 other Advisory Committees. Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
9 Katya. Summary of written public comments. And I know
10 there's like 62 comments in our book, I don't know if
11 you summarized those and if there are any more
12 submitted via email in the course of the meeting that
13 you would like to summarize.

14

15 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Mr. Chair, this is
16 Jake Musslewhite.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jake.

19

20 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, I got a quick
21 summary of written public comments for you. We
22 received 58 written public comments, of which 57
23 opposed the proposal, while one was neutral. But the
24 one neutral comment asked the Board only to approve the
25 proposal if it was supported by scientific evidence but
26 didn't really take a position one way or the other.

27

28 I kind of summarized a lot of the
29 concerns brought up in all of the comments opposing the
30 proposal in kind of a bunch of different themes so I'll
31 list now.

32

33 The proposal will force non-Federally-
34 qualified hunters into a smaller area leading into over
35 crowding and unsafe conditions.

36

37 The deer population is healthy making a
38 closure unwarranted.

39

40 The proposal is not based on sound
41 science or justified by data.

42

43 The proposal will further divide user
44 groups.

45

46 The assertion that Federally-qualified
47 subsistence users that have had trouble meeting their
48 needs is not supported by the evidence.

49

50

0370

1 Environmental conditions such as harsh
2 winter conditions are the primary drivers of deer
3 abundance rather than hunting so the proposal will not
4 increase the availability of deer.

5
6 The area covered under the proposal is
7 too large.

8
9 The proposal would exclude non-
10 qualified family members of qualified users from
11 hunting together.

12
13 And the existing January season for
14 Federally-qualified users provides them with a
15 sufficient priority for deer.

16
17 So those are the major points that kind
18 of came up again and again in written public comments.

19
20 Thank you.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
23 Jake. And I'd just like to add, you know, that I read
24 all of those comments and I'm sure that the other
25 Council members did as well and I want to thank people
26 for taking the time to write us comments. I know that
27 I gathered some information that I didn't see in the
28 analysis that was helpful and some suggestions and,
29 yeah, I appreciate people sending in their public
30 comments. So.....

31
32 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:now it's
35 time.....

36
37 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, Katya.

40
41 MS. WESSELS: This is Katya Wessels.
42 Yeah, we just received another written public comment
43 at our subsistence@fws.gov email on WP22-07. This
44 comment is from Patricia Phillips, Pelican. Is that
45 okay if I provide this comment to the Council?

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead.

48
49 MS. WESSELS: Okay. So her comment
50

1 reads, ANILCA Section .503(b) Admiralty Island National
2 Monument, C, shall be managed by Secretary of
3 Agriculture as units of the National Forest System to
4 protect objects of ecological, cultural, geological,
5 historical, prehistorical, and scientific interests.
6 ANILCA Section .506(2) Admiralty Island exchange.
7 Nothing in this section shall affect the continuation
8 of the opportunity for subsistence users by residents
9 of Admiralty Island consistent with Title VIII of
10 ANILCA. The indigenous people of Angoon, Alaska
11 Federally-qualified users of Angoon are totally
12 dependent on hunting and gathering and all the
13 availability of subsistence resources. Employment
14 opportunities are limited and bringing in food is
15 expensive. WP22-07 is not in consistent with the
16 conservation of healthy deer populations. And within
17 the National Monument, WP22-07 is not inconsistent
18 [sic] with conservation of natural and healthy
19 populations of deer. There is a very real potential to
20 have depleted resources with modern horsepower and
21 access. ANILCA is designed to protect local, rural
22 residents of Angoon who choose a subsistence way of
23 life and Federally-qualified subsistence users of
24 Angoon are the primary consumptive users of deer. Is
25 there a different interpretation and application of
26 ANILCA because this proposal addresses a concern within
27 a National Monument. The intent is the maintenance of
28 deer and its habitat in a condition that assures stable
29 and continuing deer resources and Federally-qualified
30 users the priority consumptive users. The status quo
31 disrupts the availability to Federally-qualified
32 residents of Angoon who are impaired, threatened by the
33 non-Federally-qualified hunters effort. Management
34 policy may require harvest methods to protect ANILCA.
35 ANILCA manages for healthy populations. Harvest by all
36 users must be managed for healthy populations of deer.
37 ANILCA provides Federally-qualified rural residents the
38 priority consumptive use. Angoon being totally
39 dependent on subsistence resources, the deer harvest
40 for Federally-qualified rural residents can be achieved
41 with a management strategy such as this proposal. This
42 venue, Southeast RAC meeting allows for cooperation and
43 participation by U.S. Forest Service, OSM, ADF&G,
44 tribes and communities and concerned stakeholders, and
45 stakeholders with traditional ecological knowledge. A
46 long-term strategy is needed to reduce hunter conflict
47 and support Angoon's effort to continue subsistence
48 activities they have culturally and traditionally --
49 there is a likelihood of irreversible or long-term
50

0372

1 adverse effects to deer populations and consequently
2 adverse effect to the indigenous community of Angoon.
3 WP22-07 is designed to address the potential adverse
4 effects. Patricia Phillips, Pelican, Alaska.

5
6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
9 Katya. So that's the only most recent written public
10 comment that we have then?

11
12 MS. WESSELS: Yes, that's the only
13 additional written public comment that we just received
14 a few minutes ago.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
17 very much. So that brings us to public testimony. So
18 now I'll go to the phone lines and ask if there's
19 people on the phone who want to testify on this
20 proposal.

21
22 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, can I
23 interrupt for just one more second, this is Katya. I
24 see here.....

25
26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Katya.

27
28 MS. WESSELS:in the notes on the
29 Teams meeting that there is a written comment from the
30 Juneau Advisory Council. Jake, if you have it would
31 you please read it.

32
33 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, certainly, I've
34 got about a million things open here. Yes, I can read
35 that into the record if you want. So, again, for the
36 record this is Jake Musslewhite. I'm reading a written
37 public comment from the Department of Fish and Game,
38 Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee.

39
40 Dear Federal Subsistence Board. The
41 Alaska Department of Fish and Game's Juneau/Douglas
42 Advisory Committee thanks you for the opportunity to
43 submit written testimony on WP22-07, WP22-08 and WP22-
44 09. Our 15 member citizen volunteer committee
45 represents diverse user groups and perspectives. We
46 have designated seats for people who represent
47 commercial fishing, sportfishing, hunting, personal
48 use, hunting guiding, charter fishing, trapping as well
49 as non-consumptive users. We strive to represent the
50

1 interests of our diverse constituencies holding a half
2 dozen meetings each year to discuss fish and game
3 issues as well as to create a public forum for
4 consideration of proposed regulations that impact our
5 region. Under the guidance of the Alaska Department of
6 Fish and Game, our body is charged with weighing
7 proposals that'll impact Game Management Units 1C, 1D,
8 4 and 5, but we pride ourselves in thinking inclusively
9 about our broader region. Like the Federal Subsistence
10 Board and the Regional Advisory Committee we believe we
11 need to support rules and regulations that create
12 equitable and sustainable fishing and hunting
13 opportunity. As a group we are thankful to have
14 abundant opportunity to fish, hunt and feed our
15 families from the land and for many of us to earn our
16 living from a well managed and abundant fish and
17 ungulate populations. We also recognize and celebrate
18 the cultural significance that fishing, hunting and
19 gathering have for so many people in our region. While
20 we live in Juneau and we recognize that there is more
21 pressure on our wild fish and animals close to town,
22 most of us travel region-wide to hunt, fish and work
23 and we are especially mindful of the incredibly
24 important role that hunting plays in rural Alaska.
25 Finally, all our discussions and recommendations are
26 underscored by a strong desire to ensure equitable
27 access to wild food well into the future.

28
29 We see there are legitimate concerns
30 raised by those who participated in meetings that led
31 to these proposals. Indeed, the lack of ferry service
32 and the broader impacts from the Covid19 pandemic have
33 created real impacts on food security in rural
34 communities. We are not convinced, however, that these
35 proposals best address the issues raised in the
36 comments. Instead of addressing these very real food
37 security hardships, we're worried that the proposals
38 could, instead, amplify (cuts out) as residents of our
39 region move between rural areas, and especially Juneau
40 for work and school and demographic trends suggest this
41 movement from rural to more urban areas has been
42 especially pronounced in the last decade, there are
43 significant numbers of now Juneau based hunters who
44 return home to villages to hunt with families. As such
45 these proposals could in fact reduce harvest success
46 for those who need it the most. That is the non-
47 Federally-qualified hunters who successfully harvest
48 animals in each of these areas are often former
49 Federally-qualified hunters who have returned home to
50

0374

1 help put up food for their families.

2

3

4 In each of these proposals we also
5 concur with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's
6 detailed and well researched position that the
7 proposals respective closures to non-Federally-
8 qualified users are not warranted for conservation
9 concerns. We, therefore, see these as allocative
10 proposals serving to limit opportunity for residents of
11 our region.

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 look forward to continuing to listen to and understand the concerns raised by Federally-qualified hunters and we stand ready to create a forum to discuss ways to address these issues. Such a forum or open dialogue between users across the region would strengthen our shared interest in sustaining the strong connections to the land provided by traditions of hunting and fishing. We would also be happy to work with the Regional Advisory Committee to propose and champion changes to the Alaska Board of Game process that could alleviate some of the problems. We urge you to maintain consistent access to deer hunting opportunity for residents of our sparsely populated region by voting no on these proposals.

Sincerely, Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee.

That's it, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Jake. And I just want to go back, they did say that their comments address 07, 08, 09 and 10; is that correct?

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, so that was addressing WP22-07, 08 and 09.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, very good. Thank you. I'll ask that the Council kind of keep these comments in mind when we got to the next proposal and maybe we wouldn't have to repeat the reading of those comments on the next proposals as well so, thank you.

So that's all the written comments that we have submitted; is that correct?

0375

1 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya.
2 As far as I know that is.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Now, we'll
5 go to the phone lines and ask if there are people on
6 the phone who want to testify in public testimony. And
7 once again I'd like to get a list of names in front of
8 me so I'll ask if you're on the phone just go ahead and
9 come on and tell me your name but I want to get an idea
10 of how many first before I start calling on people.

11
12 So the phone lines are open if anybody
13 wants to testify.

14
15 MR. ORR: Nicholas Orr from Juneau.

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Nicholas Orr,
18 thank you.

19
20 MR. ORR: You're just providing a list
21 at this time, so I guess I'm just going to hang back I
22 guess.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, just hang
25 back there and I'll see how many other folks first but
26 you're first on the list. Anybody else.

27
28 MR. BEASON: This is Ryan Beason with
29 Territorial Sportsmen.

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Ryan, what was
32 your last name, Ryan.

33
34 MR. BEASON: Beason.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Beason, okay,
37 thank you. Anybody else.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
42 else.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Not hearing
47 anybody, Mr. Orr, go ahead start your testimony.

48
49 MR. ORR: Yeah, can you hear me, I just
50

0376

1 want to make sure first.

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 HERNANDEZ: Yep, you're loud and clear.

MR. ORR: Oh, great. I guess I wanted to comment because when I read the transcripts from the March meeting it was a little -- it seemed like the author's proposal -- or the proposal's author, I should say, was concerned about bear hunters shooting deer off the beach and driving deer off the beach and now it's changed into concern over hunters from Juneau. And so it's a little -- I guess I'm confused because I was going off the last -- the testimony in the last meeting and now it's changed completely. With that said, I'm on the Juneau Advisory Committee for the Fish and Game, the local one and so I would parrot a lot of what was said there. But that was -- I guess I'm just confused on that one.

And then I would also point out that Mr. Howard makes a great point about the price of gas and I'd say, you know, because it limits the amount of Angoon hunters that are going to go up to the northern area just as much as it limits the Juneau hunters that are going to go much past, I'd say, I guess, what is it, like Hawk Inlet, really, I mean I'd say the vast majority of Juneau hunters are going to stay between Point Arden and Point Retreat and just don't have the capability to go that far. I know there's also some concern about some of the purse seine boats that go by there but those guys -- if they're shooting stuff off the beach, this proposal is not going to affect that.

So I guess in closing I would say that the Federally-qualified designated hunter -- the designated hunter program plus the extended season does meet the ANILCA requirement for providing rural preference. And I just hope you take those things into consideration.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Orr. Are you open to take questions from the Council if there's any.

MR. ORR: Sure.

0377

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

2

3 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is

4 Albert.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

7

8 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 Question. How many former Angoon residents are a part
10 of your committee?

11

12 MR. ORR: I don't know where everybody
13 is from on the Committee, I'll say that.

14

15 MR. HOWARD: Do you have a John
16 Crossman (muffled) Jr., on there.

17

18 MR. ORR: I don't believe that we do.

19

20 MR. HOWARD: Thomas Parken (muffled).

21

22 MR. ORR: No, I mean we could look up
23 the names of them but I don't think that those guys are
24 on there.

25

26 MR. HOWARD: Leroy (Indiscernible -
27 muffled voice) Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing that this
28 is going to affect former residents of Angoon and I've
29 had conversations with them and they agree with it, so
30 thank you Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
33 Any other questions for Mr. Orr.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hearing none,
38 thanks for your testimony Nick. We'll move on to Ryan
39 Beason from Territorial Sportsmen.

40

41 MR. BEASON: Thank you, Mr.....

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ryan.

44

45 MR. BEASON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
46 want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today.
47 I'm representing Territorial Sportsmen. We're on
48 record opposing Wildlife Proposal 22-07 and we support
49 ADF&Gs comments opposing this proposal. I won't go
50

0378

1 into every detail that they mentioned. But I'll just
2 reiterate the high pellet counts, high aerial surveys
3 of anywhere in Southeast are within Game Management
4 Unit 4.

5
6 What hasn't been discussed today,
7 previously discussed a little bit in the last couple of
8 days is non-Federally-qualified users can still hunt
9 below the mean high tide line. So if we force all of
10 the non-Federally-qualified -- Federal users outside of
11 -- out of the woods, there'll be more beach hunters
12 which can potentially increase the alleged conflict
13 between these user groups. Additionally, with these
14 mild winters we've had over the last nine or so years,
15 much less winter kill, the deer population is stable
16 but at the same time deer are not on the beaches. When
17 you have heavy snowfall deer are all over the beaches
18 and making it much easier for people to hunt deer, and
19 maybe the perception, that there is more deer, but in
20 reality in these heavy snow years kill much of the
21 population, and vice versa the low snow years do not
22 kill much of the population but we may not see as much
23 deer due to them being spread out.

24
25 I will also mention that, as previously
26 mentioned in ANILCA, the Section .815, I know this may
27 need legal interpretation, but what is the definition
28 of necessary for the conservation of healthy
29 populations. I mean that's the big question here. And
30 that's what gives this committee and the Federal
31 Subsistence Board the right to make this potential
32 proposal work, but if there is no conservation issue I
33 don't think there's any authority on this.

34
35 And then in the essence of time here I
36 won't go any further but in conclusion, the Territorial
37 Sportsmen opposes this proposal and we respectfully ask
38 that it's not adopted and if there are any questions I
39 can certainly do my best to answer those.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
42 Beason. Any questions from the Council.

43
44 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
45 Albert.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

48
49 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

50

0379

1 I'll ask the same question, how many former Angoon
2 residents are part of the Territorial Sportsmen.

3

4 MR. BEASON: Again, I do not know where
5 everybody's from and do not know if anybody is from
6 Angoon.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anything else,
9 Albert.

10

11 MR. HOWARD: No. I keep hearing the
12 same arguments, you know, it's like they're listening
13 on the phone to come up with an argument and now
14 they're saying they're going to hunt below mean high
15 tide and that's fine with me, that just means he can't
16 be up in the woods.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Thank you,
21 Albert. Any other questions.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I do have one
26 question that may be relevant. Mr. Beason, this
27 proposal is for a closure up through November, November
28 being, of course, one of the prime hunting months, do
29 you think many people from Juneau that you know would
30 take the time and effort to travel out to west coast of
31 Admiralty in December to hunt?

32

33 MR. BEASON: I mean it all depends on
34 the weather that time of year, as you're aware there
35 are very few days that are not nice, but I think the
36 biggest reason people like to hunt November, it's the
37 rut, calling deer in, likelihood of success. So
38 obviously December there's no deer call work and
39 obviously the weather gets worse and worse later in the
40 year you get, so it just depends on the weather.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. That
43 sounds like a logical answer so thank you. Any other
44 questions from Council.

45

46 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
47 Albert.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Albert.

50

0380

1 MR. HOWARD: The question is for the
2 gentleman on the phone, do you have a picture of the
3 map in front of you and area 4044?

4
5 MR. BEASON: I do.

6
7 MR. HOWARD: So in the interest -- and
8 I've been talking to people here in Angoon and I
9 appreciate the recess we had yesterday, that gave me an
10 opportunity to go house to house, so, sir, if we
11 decided to take 4044 off the map and 4043 off the map,
12 is that something you're willing to work with?

13
14 MR. BEASON: We oppose the whole area
15 in general is our stance on that.

16
17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
20 Albert. Any other questions from the Council to Mr.
21 Beason.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Not hearing
26 any, thank you for your testimony and taking questions
27 Ryan. I'll ask again if anybody has called in and is
28 on the line -- telephone line and wants to testify on
29 this proposal at this time.

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'm not
34 hearing anybody so I think we can conclude our public
35 testimony and move on and we're at the point it's time
36 for the Council recommend an action. That requires a
37 motion from the Council.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody prepared
42 to make a motion.

43
44 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: (Indiscernible)

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think I'm
47 hearing somebody but I can't tell who it is.

48
49 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
50

0381

1 Slater from Pelican.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

4

5 MR. SLATER: I move that we support
6 Proposal WP22-07.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jim.
9 Do we have a second.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Do we have a
14 second to the motion.

15

16 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey. I'll
17 second it if nobody else has.

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
20 Harvey. Okay, motion to support Wildlife Proposal 22-
21 07. Council discussion. What's the Council's thoughts
22 on this proposal.

23

24 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Keep in mind our
27 justifications and rationales listed on Page 27 to
28 address. So, Harvey, I think I heard you, go ahead.

29

30 MR. KITKA: Yes. The reason I asked
31 the question about the population of the deer on
32 Admiralty in the areas that are talked about and the
33 State says they do it unit-wide and not just the small
34 areas, realizing that so many things that could cause
35 populations to drop, not only winter or anything like
36 that. I know there's been studies over the years and
37 one of the studies was that if the population -- the
38 does get too big they tend to eat all the food that
39 comes -- that is available so when the bucks have to --
40 after rutting are in such sad condition they're trying
41 to eat anything so when they -- if the hunters were to
42 look at the lower jaw or the jaws of the deer and find
43 out if their teeth were broken then they'd know there
44 was no food for them when they're in that weakened
45 condition a lot of them die. So it's not only winter
46 that causes the die off of the deer but in this case it
47 seems like there is no real numbers on how much is
48 being taken by non-qualified. I realize there's some
49 other factors that come into play but I firmly believe
50

0382

1 that without having the complete data I would vote in
2 favor of this.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
7 Harvey. Anybody else from the Council want to weigh
8 in.

9

10 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, this is
11 Bob.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

14

15 MR. SCHROEDER: I've been mainly
16 focused on what justification would be -- or what
17 ANILCA allows us to do, and that's why I asked the
18 clarifying question of Staff. And on Page 99 of the
19 write up, we do note that Section .815-3 of ANILCA
20 provides that the Board may restrict non-subsistence
21 uses on Federal public lands if "necessary for the
22 conservation of healthy populations of fish and
23 wildlife, or to continue subsistence uses of such
24 populations."

25

26 What we've heard is that there are
27 plenty of deer around and that that isn't -- doesn't
28 appear to be the main question, or thing that's being
29 addressed, however, we are hearing from our Angoon
30 representative that continued subsistence uses of such
31 populations, in at least in some areas close to Angoon
32 is perhaps threatened or clearly has declined for some
33 reason and the harvest data, such as it is, does show
34 that Angoon's getting fewer deer than they used to get.
35 So this would seem to give us the standing to do
36 something to promote the continued subsistence uses of
37 deer populations that are used by Angoon.

38

39 So that's where I'm weighing in right
40 now. I'm not sure what the -- if we do act on this,
41 whether the area extensive boundaries are necessary but
42 I'd leave that to other people who are more
43 knowledgeable about this area than I.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.
48 Anybody else on the Council want to weigh in,
49 justifications.

50

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
2 Douville.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

5
6 MR. DOUVILLE: It's hard for me to
7 support restricting user groups either on the Federal
8 side, or non-rural, or rural when there is no
9 conservation concern. It sounds like a lot of the
10 restriction is caused by the price of gas. You know we
11 went through this similar sort of thing in Unit 2. And
12 it wasn't an easy thing to make any restrictions, it
13 took a considerable amount of time and effort with the
14 deer planning committee that involved all stakeholders
15 and it took a lot of effort to get what we think was
16 sort of right. And I think that's kind of where we
17 need to go here before we start making an effort to
18 restrict anybody, to get the stakeholders together and
19 review all the options before we even think about
20 restricting.

21
22 We did do a restriction here, I mean,
23 you know, if anybody's familiar with the Unit 2 part of
24 it, we just added earlier opportunity rather than to
25 make a restriction initially. As is I would not
26 support this until further effort is made to study and
27 resolve the issues in light of there not being a
28 conservation concern.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
33 Anybody else on the Council want to weigh in on this.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, I do have
40 some -- I do have some questions for Albert on this
41 proposal that he's probably best to answer.

42
43 So Albert I'm going to pose these
44 questions to you so it can help clarify some things in
45 my mind of what's going on there in the local area.
46 And I kind of -- Bob and I both kind of question some
47 of the accuracy of the data for Angoon presented in our
48 book. What I'm really focused on is on Page 97 there's
49 a table there, I referred to it earlier when talking to
50

0384

1 Lauren Sill about comparing the household surveys to
2 what's presented here, but what this table shows is
3 like prior to the severe winters of '07 and '08 we saw
4 a lot of -- from Fish and Game data we saw a lot of
5 effort by Angoon residents to hunt within this west
6 Admiralty area and then since then their table shows
7 that Angoon participation on the west Admiralty shore
8 has just really sharply declined and there shows that
9 there's a lot of use outside the area. And I don't
10 know if that's accurate, misrepresentation and if it is
11 accurate, in your opinion, why are we seeing that,
12 which is kind of the crux of the issue here before us;
13 is it competition or is there something else going on.
14 So I'll yield to you Albert if you can try and explain
15 to me some of what's happening there in your area.

16

17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 As this Council wells know we put in an extra-
19 territorial jurisdiction petition in the past and some
20 of those surveys were used against us and it wasn't
21 very accurate so the consensus of the community is
22 we're not going to do any more surveys that work
23 against us and this appears to be one of them.

24

25 The fact that there's less hunting in
26 the area is -- if you were paying attention to what I
27 said earlier, that some of us hunt outside the area
28 because we leave the area for people that are -- don't
29 have much gas. So now you have the people that don't
30 have much gas, they have even less gas now, so there's
31 less of an effort and then less than a population than
32 there was in the past. The population has been on the
33 decline over the years.

34

35 (Indiscernible - muffled)

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, Albert,
38 you're all of a sudden really breaking up.

39

40 MR. HOWARD: Yeah, I'm not sure why
41 that is, Mr. Chair. But I think the effort is outside
42 the area is by those that still have jobs and we're
43 trying to leave the other areas for people that are
44 struggling. So that's my interpretation of that data
45 and there's less of an effort because there's less of a
46 population here.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49

50

0385

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right, thank you.
2 I think we did gather that, that just the overall
3 population in Angoon is decreasing. And then the other
4 issue about, you know, how important is it to the
5 people in Angoon that relatives that have moved to
6 Juneau have the ability to come back and hunt with
7 family members. It sounds like you were kind of
8 alluding to that in some of your questioning, can you
9 give us maybe a better sense within the community if
10 that is a concern, or is that just a concern that's
11 being expressed by people that don't live in the
12 community looking for reasons. So any comments on
13 that.

14
15 MR. HOWARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
16 talked with people that have moved away and explained
17 to them what I'm working on and that's where we decided
18 to make an adjustment to the season. A lot of the
19 young men and women that have moved away will come out
20 when it's first opened so they can climb the mountain.
21 So that explains the September 15th date. They can
22 come and hunt from August to September 15th as they
23 please and climb the mountains if they want. So that
24 was part of addressing that and Juneau residents as
25 well. So we're trying not to be -- we're not being
26 unreasonable, we're just trying to make sure our needs
27 are being met as a community is all we're trying to do.
28 I tried to demonstrate that when I was talking to the
29 gentleman from Territorial Sportsmen when I asked if we
30 took 4044 off the table and 4043 and he said no, so we
31 have been trying to address those issues with people
32 that have moved away. And if you look at Figure 4, I
33 believe, on Page 91 it shows the areas we also hunt, so
34 they're okay with having to go across because they're
35 the ones that left Angoon. As an example, my son has
36 enough money and gas, he can go across to the other
37 side and hunt, and he knows how, he's known how since
38 he was 12.

39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
43 Albert. One other follow-up, would you say that the
44 Sitkoh Bay and the Katherine Island areas and Peril
45 Strait, is that probably the most common outside the
46 area of place that people from Angoon go to hunt?

47
48 (No comments)

49
50

0386

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are you still
2 there Albert?

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Did we lose
7 Albert.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Am I still on the
12 phone?

13
14 REPORTER: Yes, we're still on.

15
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: (Many) Yes, we
17 can hear you.

18
19 MR. HOWARD: Apparently I didn't
20 repress mute. But referring back to Page 91, if you
21 look at the map and we've learned this from our father
22 and our grandfathers that we hunt these areas because
23 there's always somewhere to hide from the weather in a
24 small boat and they've become important to us.

25
26 As an example, my son, he has enough
27 money and gas money, he can run across and hunt, he's
28 done that since he was 12. So there is -- I've looked
29 at this thing forward and backwards and I'm not trying
30 to be unreasonable but I am trying to look out for the
31 gentlemen in the 15 foot Lunds and the 9 horse kicker.

32
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: All right, thank
36 you for that Albert. Any other questions, or not
37 questions but any other comments from Council members.

38
39 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

40
41 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think I hear
44 Ian, go ahead Ian.

45
46 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
47 have a hard time thinking about the individual
48 proposals, you know, with the three proposals that are
49 on the table, of course, it's definitely -- I tend to
50

0387

1 think about them holistically. I am concerned that if
2 we think about squeezing the balloon as an analogy for
3 changing distribution of hunters.

4
5 You know, Hoonah has a moderate
6 proposal on the table to restrict non-Federally-
7 qualified users and we're surrounded by closures and
8 we're also highly accessible on the ferry system, so my
9 concern is that thinking about all the proposals
10 together, that kind of the impact that it could have
11 just the issue of competition, which I believe is very
12 high. The issue of competition is like at a -- but not
13 just competition but reduction of subsistence
14 opportunity is high and aren't probably accurately
15 reflected in the data completely. I have some thoughts
16 on that in the Hoonah specific analysis, which I won't
17 comment on until we get to that one, and WP-08 however.

18
19 So I guess what I'm saying is
20 ultimately is I would be more inclined to think about
21 the strategy that was alluded to by Mr. Douville, in a
22 larger context of this and since there isn't -- doesn't
23 seem to be an imminent conservation concern, I think we
24 have some room and time to think about that and
25 negotiate through that process, and can maybe come out
26 of the tunnel -- the train tunnel with a stronger
27 product that's going to be more durable ultimately.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ian.
32 Any other Council member comments on this proposal.

33
34 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

37
38 MR. KITKA: I had another thought and
39 that was what Patty brought out in her presentation.
40 It seemed like the National Monument had a little
41 different outlook on subsistence and conservation, it
42 seemed like they were both equal. It seemed like if
43 one or the other was not being met then not really
44 equal. So the conservation concern was not really on
45 the table at that point, it was more of subsistence
46 that was on the table. So something to keep in mind,
47 that we look at this as not really a conservation
48 concern, but as a subsistence concern.

49
50

0388

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you,
4 Harvey.

5

6 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, this is Bob.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

9

10 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd -- I'm not really
11 conflicted on this but I think if we do support this
12 proposal or a modification of this proposal we'd really
13 like it to go through and have the least adverse effect
14 on non-subsistence users as well. And in the interest
15 of getting something that may stand I'm wondering
16 whether Floyd -- excuse me, excuse me, of whether or
17 Angoon representative might consider amending --
18 proposing an amendment, a geographical amendment to
19 keep the areas that are really keyed for Angoon in this
20 proposal and perhaps dropping some of the other units
21 there. I'm just looking at the map and 4043 I think
22 includes a bunch of places on Hasselborg Lake, if I'm
23 not mistaken, and there may be other areas that are
24 used a lot by Juneau residents and not so much by
25 Angoon. But I will defer to our Angoon representative
26 on that, so perhaps you could respond.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.
29 Albert, would you like to respond to that.

30

31 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If
32 that will -- if I can get the support from the rest of
33 the Council on it, that's why I had mentioned it to the
34 Territorial Sportsmen, was, after having conversation
35 with a bunch of local area hunters they agreed if we
36 could -- if there was an opportunity to support the
37 rest of that we could take 4404 and 4403, so those are
38 -- we can make that amendment if it's something that
39 makes sense to the rest of the Council. Now, keep in
40 mind if a Juneau area hunter fails, like my brother
41 Dermott Howard, he can go to Costco, and he can go to
42 Fred Meyers. If an Angoon resident fails at hunting, I
43 don't know how else to say it, but -- we're a people
44 who don't like to depend on anybody and I don't want to
45 go ask anybody for help and a lot of people here are
46 that way.

47

48 So, thank you, yes, we're flexible and
49 I think 44 and 43 are something we can remove.

50

0389

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

6

7 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Let's see, I heard
10 two people, maybe was that Frank and Cathy.

11

12 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, this is Frank.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Go ahead
15 Frank first and then Cathy.

16

17 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I was just
18 thinking, you know, that ANILCA was put into to protect
19 the rural areas and you look at, you know, Angoon,
20 which I believe Howard said was 80 percent unemployment
21 and imagine trying to put gas in a tank to go anywhere
22 and, you know, the logging that happened near Angoon is
23 something that happened to Hoonah, a squirrel can't
24 even go through that stuff, but anyway I was thinking
25 that, you know, we could cut out some area that would
26 be beneficial to Angoon and keeping the non-subsistence
27 user out of their area so that, you know, because I
28 can't imagine spending 30 bucks for five gallons of
29 gas.

30

31 So when ANILCA was put there it was to
32 protect the rural areas. And when we've got a
33 community that is devastated by unemployment and they
34 can't afford to go anywhere because it's just too
35 expensive, that's not really subsistence, you're
36 spending everything that you have to try to get
37 anywhere and it just doesn't make sense. The State
38 doesn't know what subsistence is, when you live in a
39 small community, because they think it's all about
40 hunting, when the people in the community are trying to
41 survive to have something to eat. You know I love my
42 deer meat, you know, we just had some that was from
43 last year just a couple days ago and I've seen people
44 that come from out of town have no idea what it's like
45 to make chops out of a backbone, they just cut off the
46 strap and they throw the rest away. So it's different
47 than when a small community is struggling to survive.

48

49 So I agree with Bob, you know, I'm

50

0390

1 wondering if Mr. Howard would make an amendment to cut
2 off an area.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.
7 Cathy, do you have something to add.

8

9 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
10 I was just going to go through where I stand on the
11 proposal so I don't know if Frank was asking a question
12 directly of Albert that he wanted to respond to.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Would you like to
15 wait before you give your position to see if we have a
16 suggested amendment?

17

18 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah, I don't want to
19 distract from that discussion. I have my justification
20 and everything written down so it should be pretty
21 fairly straightforward.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Maybe we'll
26 hold off. I'll ask Albert directly, would you like to
27 put that forward as an amendment, Albert, to be
28 considered?

29

30 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, the answer
31 would be yes. But also I asked for information on data
32 for Juneau hunters on west Admiralty and I', not sure
33 if that's available yet or if they're still trying to
34 research it. But, yes, I'm in agreement with making an
35 amendment to this, that's fine.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. It's just a
38 matter of coming up with some wording for that
39 amendment, I guess.

40

41 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

44

45 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 What I've heard about the potential amendment so far
47 has been about cutting off Wildlife Analysis Areas and
48 I would just remind everyone that those analysis areas
49 were used for boundaries and those are the compiled

50

0391

1 data for the analysis, they weren't actually the
2 boundaries of what the current proposal encompasses,
3 and so if that amendment was going to go through we
4 would need some kind of landmark for that northern
5 boundary in the way that the Council members that are
6 discussing it. With that being said, also with an
7 amendment, I would throw out there if we're going to go
8 down the road of amendments, rather than restricting
9 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users completely,
10 whether or not Albert would consider a bag limit
11 reduction.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
16 Cathy.

17

18 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
19 Albert.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

22

23 MR. HOWARD: The southern end of 4044
24 doesn't have a name, the only thing I could think is
25 due west of East Point and Tenakee Inlet. And as far
26 as a bag limit, that kind of gets into the difficulty
27 of how can we prove they only got two deer within that
28 area when they have six deer on the boat. But, yeah, I
29 think I'm open to suggestions but I don't want to
30 totally throw it out and wait another two years to talk
31 about this again.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. It sounds
34 like we have at least one suggestion for a geographical
35 location. Might have to actually find, at some point,
36 a latitude, longitude or something along that shoreline
37 to put into official language but maybe we have
38 something we can work with for now. And I'm not sure
39 how to address the -- appears to be the Hasselborg,
40 Thayer Lake area that's 4043, that had very, very low
41 participation by Angoon residents and fairly high
42 participation by Juneau residents. So if we could
43 exclude that from the closure somehow as well, I think
44 that should be included. It's just a matter of coming
45 up with geographical descriptions of these areas.

46

47 So one option is to take a recess now
48 and if we could ask Staff, who probably has some really
49 excellent maps at their disposal, if they could look at
50

0392

1 the wildlife analysis areas and maybe try and find some
2 geographical landmarks that would be easy to use, come
3 back after lunch and if they had some suggestions there
4 maybe we could finish out this proposal.

5

6 How do folks feel about that.

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal in
9 Gustavus. I haven't had a chance to speak on this yet
10 for the first time, I would like my chance.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

13

14 MR. CASIPIT: And I think I can wrap
15 this up with my chance to speak here, if that's okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No, that's very
18 good, sorry Cal, go ahead.

19

20 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. Yes, as written, I
21 would probably have to vote against it just because we
22 can't pass that bar about necessary to continue
23 subsistence uses and the lease adverse impact to non-
24 subsistence users. So I'm prepared to propose a motion
25 to amend the closed areas and I will ask Staff to put
26 it into the proper regulatory language, but my motion
27 would be just to remove: Wildlife Analysis Area 4044
28 and 4043 from the area closed to non-subsistence --
29 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users. I think
30 that's clear enough for Staff to get the proper
31 regulatory language for the next version of this to go
32 the Board. And we can, you know, we can proceed with
33 voting on the amendment and the main motion if it gets
34 there.

35

36 So that's what I would suggest and I'm
37 making that motion to remove Wildlife Area 4044 and
38 4043 from the closed areas described in the bolded
39 language on 84 -- on Page 84.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
42 for that Cal. That is a motion. It does sound
43 workable to me. So this is a motion for an amendment,
44 do we have a second.

45

46 MR. HOWARD: Does the main motion
47 makers have to do this or just.....

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cal put forward an

50

0393

1 amendment to the main motion, so we need to have a
2 second on the motion to amend and then discussion.

3

4 MR. HOWARD: I'll second it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
7 Albert. So now the amendment to the main motion is up
8 for discussion. Go ahead, Council members.

9

10 MR. CASIPIT: Well, this is Cal, Mr.
11 Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

14

15 MR. CASIPIT: Since I was the maker of
16 the motion to amend I just wanted to put some
17 justification on the record for my amendment. This
18 would -- I believe that there is a reduction of
19 subsistence uses because of competition from non-
20 subsistence users in the analysis area that we're
21 looking at, however, I think to pass the high board for
22 closure that the Board is going to require of us, that
23 we need to do our due diligence to reduce adverse
24 impact on qualified non-subsistence users at the same
25 time trying to recognize that subsistence priority. So
26 that is why I am removing -- I suggest removing 4044
27 and 4043 from the closure area in that bolded language
28 on 84.

29

30 That's basically my justification. I
31 just think it will reduce -- it'll improve our chances
32 for betting approved by the Board if we do this.

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal. I
35 think that was pretty good justification. Anybody on
36 the Council want to add anything to that.

37

38 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
39 Albert.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

42

43 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 I agree with seconding this because the data showed
45 that 45 percent of the hunters in that 4044 are Juneau
46 residents so in hopes of alleviating any stress on them
47 and still serving the purpose of Angoon residents I
48 agreed with it based on that.

49

50

0394

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 Just trying to find a way so people can
4 hunt in peace here.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 (Teleconference interference -
9 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think we've got
12 somebody in the background unmuted.

13

14 (Teleconference interference -
15 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Somebody has to
18 mute their phone, I don't know who it is, it's
19 background talking.

20

21 MR. JOHNSON: Someone's talking about a
22 doctor's appointment if that helps.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, the line's
25 clear again. Other Council members want to weigh in on
26 this amendment.

27

28 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

31

32 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
33 am undecided about the amendment. What I struggle with
34 is is that I actually don't support the original
35 proposal so changing the boundary lines doesn't
36 necessarily change the outcome of my justification for
37 why I would oppose the main motion which I'll get back
38 to when we get back to the main motion. The other
39 thing that I feel is a little bit confusing by changing
40 the boundary lines is I guess perhaps I wasn't
41 following some of the more detailed discussion about
42 why those -- I understand that those boundary lines
43 that are changing are to the north and would, you know,
44 be where more non-Federally-qualified subsistence users
45 may be hunting but I don't actually see that in the
46 analysis so it's hard for me to track how that has
47 changed some of the -- how that actually changes the
48 analysis. So I guess it's hard for me, personally, to
49 be convinced that we've now met the threshold that
50

0395

1 Member Casipit has brought forward in order to bring
2 this proposal to be more favorable when it comes to
3 Section .815-3 of ANILCA.

4
5 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

8
9 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
10 Albert.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

13
14 MR. HOWARD: I know there's a lot of
15 concern over non-Federally-qualified hunters so moving
16 the boundary south and taking an area that non-
17 Federally-qualified hunters use out of the equation,
18 that addresses their concerns and that's the reason for
19 moving it. You got to also keep in mind that Admiralty
20 Island does fall under Monument language as well and
21 that's something that's never been tested and has the
22 possibility of being tested, I mean, through a process
23 like this when we can always go back and say well we
24 tried through the State process, we tried through the
25 Federal process, now we tried through the Monument
26 process, and I believe through that process you could
27 actually probably close the whole island. So there's
28 definitely room for negotiation now but at some point
29 there won't be.

30
31 You can't compare this proposal to
32 other proposals. I'll give you an example when I asked
33 the question, can a corporation close their land off.
34 Angoon doesn't have any land we can close off for our
35 residents, this is the only opportunity we have. The
36 other -- one other proposal has the option of closing
37 privately owned land off by the Native corporation.

38
39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40
41 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
44 Mr. Schroeder, I believe.

45
46 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. And I think I was
47 basically on the same page as Cathy, Mike and Ian a bit
48 when I first saw these proposals. Because what I was
49 remembering was the great effort they had to go
50

0396

1 through, well, it's now over 10 years ago, to get an
2 exceedingly minor restriction on non-subsistence users
3 on Prince of Wales. From my perspective and for those
4 of other Council members who are ANILCA buffs, ANILCA
5 is the law and the law hasn't changed, however, it
6 isn't to say that it isn't a live law such that it
7 evolves over time in how it's interpreted and
8 administered changes over time. And our previous --
9 the previous way that the restrictions on non-
10 subsistence users, the way we were directed, and this
11 was probably a couple of decades ago, was that you
12 really had to show that there was a major resource
13 scarcity so the earlier idea was that, hey, if there
14 isn't enough to go around for everybody then you cut
15 out non-subsistence users and then there's even a Tier
16 II possibility there if there's not enough to go around
17 for all the subsistence users, then you'd cut out
18 subsistence users based on the different criteria.

19

20 I think what I heard from Federal Staff
21 and from the analysis is that we do have this criteria
22 under .815-3, which is being highlighted right now,
23 that our obligation is for continued subsistence uses
24 of such populations, which is in the analysis on Page
25 99 and it was reiterated by Federal Staff in response
26 to our earlier questions. So I think we're part of the
27 evolution of ANILCA. And I'll point out that our
28 amazingly good work on fixing up the C&T determinations
29 for Southeast Alaska were also part of that evolution.

30

31 So I would be in favor of the
32 amendment. And what I have to say, what I've just said
33 should also apply to the general motion.

34

35 So that's just some of my perspectives,
36 thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,

39

40 Bob.

41

42 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody else --

45

46 Mr. Douville.
47 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, well, you know,
48 we're discussing an amendment but I think the main
49 motion applies here. It reads Federal public lands of
50 Admiralty Island draining into Chatham Straits between

50

0397

1 Point Marsden and Point Gardner are closed to the deer
2 hunting -- but, anyway, we're now -- we've inserted
3 these 4044 -- or anyway these other sections into it.
4 It's changing things considerable.

5
6 One thing I want to remind anybody
7 listening is that Title VIII of ANILCA provides a rural
8 priority but it also protects all other users. So, you
9 know, you just need to use some caution when you're
10 restricting other users. And for the most part, it
11 sounds to me like the restriction here is the cost of
12 gas and getting out from Angoon, but should that be
13 rationale enough to penalize all other users.

14
15 Anyway, that's some of my thoughts,
16 thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
19 Mike for those opinions. Other Council members want to
20 weigh in.

21
22 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Albert.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

25
26 MR. HOWARD: There's more to this than
27 the price of gas. The fact that, you know, I wish I
28 had all the money in the world so I could demonstrate
29 to everyone on the phone that, you know, if I find out
30 where you're hunting I'm going to go there and hunt
31 just to show you how it affects Angoon. I remember the
32 dialogue when we first started discussing this, Cal
33 talked about how this kept him up at night, and I said
34 now you know how I feel trying to solve Angoon's
35 problems with boats going in and out. Now, what
36 happens is -- and I say this because I go out there as
37 much as possible, and what I'm seeing was a boat go
38 through the area and then all of a sudden you don't see
39 any deer. This is something my dad taught me, his dad
40 taught him, and my mother's father taught me, my
41 grandfather. You shoot at a deer, you're never going
42 to see that deer again. So you guys aren't putting
43 that into the equation either. When that boat went
44 through here they must have been shooting at deer and
45 missing because I've gone out before the boat went
46 through here and I was able to get a couple of deer and
47 saw them and they didn't run away and after that you
48 couldn't get close enough, they would pick up and take
49 off. That's the nature of deer, and that's just how
50

0398

1 nature is.

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

So that part of the equation isn't there. This has nothing to do with the price of gas, I mean it's part of the equation, but it isn't the end all, be all, there's more to it than that. And the only way I could explain it is if you lived in Angoon. I appreciated local knowledge when we were talking about Area 2 wolves and I relied heavily on it because I knew there was feet on the ground and the opinions coming out of there were more than any analysis.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you for that Albert. And I would just like to add something to that topic. I recognize that competition is not always just about how many deer were taken and how many people hunted. I agree with Albert that, yes, there's a lot of factors involved in competition, you know, such as something Albert mentioned earlier, going to a favorite spot and, you know, seeing another boat there. It doesn't matter whether or not they're successful hunters or not, it's just the fact that they're there alters the way that you hunt.

And I remember one Subsistence Board meeting I went to up in Anchorage where a topic like this came up and there was quite a bit of discussion, very lengthy and heated about competition and it fell exactly along those lines, you know, what is competition.....

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted - overriding speaker)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:what are all the factors of competition and the Board did decide that the residents of Arctic Village were experiencing competition even though the numbers of game that were taken by non-subsistence users was not exceptional, so, yes, there's precedence there.

Passing a proposal like this on to the Board with Council support I think would initiate another good discussion at the Board level on this topic and I'm not opposed to that. I agree with some of the other Council members that my initial feeling on this proposal is that it was asking for too much, this

0399

1 amendment scaling back the area to more closely align
2 with areas that Angoon hunters hunt the most I think is
3 reasonable and I'm tending to vote in favor of the
4 amendment and, therefore, probably support the main
5 motion as amended.

6
7 So those are my feelings on the
8 proposal.

9
10 So does anybody else want to add
11 anything at this point.

12
13 MR. SLATER: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
14 Jim from Pelican.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

17
18 MR. SLATER: I wanted to acknowledge
19 Ms. Needham made a good point that we were only talking
20 geograph -- or Wildlife Analysis Areas that were
21 identified, there may be a more accurate way to dissect
22 the area that would further separate Juneau pressure
23 from Angoon pressure. You started to allude to that
24 about having people create a new map that might have
25 more direct input from Albert that might make sure that
26 he gets the regions that he needs, but avoid any high
27 pressure areas from Juneau. I would encourage that
28 that's maybe an option that might help everyone,
29 including the approval from the Board if it does make
30 it up to the Board.

31
32 Thank you, that's all.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
35 Jim. Anybody else on.....

36
37 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal
38 from Gustavus.

39
40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

41
42 MR. CASIPIT: A couple things just came
43 up but I just wanted to be clear about it. Ms. Needham
44 asked about the harvest numbers from those different
45 WAAs, and you're right those numbers by WAA are not in
46 the analysis itself, it was in answer to a question
47 that some members asked of Mr. Musslewhite. But the
48 reason that I suggested that 4044 and 4043 be excluded
49 as in the amended motion here, it basically takes 73
50

0400

1 percent of the deer harvest by Juneau, it would be
2 excised from the closed area without really impacting
3 -- negatively impacting Angoon anyway. So that's the
4 reason I included them, they're areas that Angoon
5 doesn't use very much according to those same numbers
6 that we got from Jake, and most of the Juneau harvest
7 now is in an open area for them. So that's the reason
8 that I did that. And I would hope, as far as the
9 mapping and this information by WAA area, I'm sure that
10 Staff will redo their charts and redo their maps for
11 the Board so they have a clear understanding of what --
12 and the public for that matter, have a clear
13 understanding of what's in this -- what hopefully will
14 be our modified recommendation.

15
16 I do appreciate the perspective of
17 closures and whether we meet the high bar, I think our
18 first step, you know, we're mentioned specifically by
19 ANILCA for giving our recommendations, they talk about
20 Councils directly in ANILCA so we're the only body that
21 ANILCA specifically talks about. So I think we start
22 it out, we come up with our best recommendation based
23 on the evidence and that includes scientific data as
24 well as TEK and we come up with our best
25 recommendation. I think this is the best we can do to
26 recognize Angoon's situation and recognize the concerns
27 of a big group of non-subsistence users and this is our
28 best recommendation we give to the Board and the Board
29 can do what they want with it and that's kind of how
30 the process works.

31
32 But I'm sure that Staff will have the
33 correct regulatory language as far as the closure area
34 ready for the Board and they also will modify the maps
35 as needed, so I have every confidence in Staff that
36 they'll do their job. Like I said, I was surely
37 impressed with their comments to the Board of Game on
38 that 2019 change.

39
40 Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
43 Anybody else on the Council want to weigh in again.

44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

48
49 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
50

0401

1 appreciate Cal providing me a little more context in
2 terms of why those specific WAAs would sort of help
3 reduce that so thank you for that Cal.

4

5 So I guess then it begs the question my
6 other concern would be by changing the boundary and I
7 want it to be clear, by changing the boundary doesn't
8 actually change my mind regarding opposing the main
9 motion. So that part is irrelevant.

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

But the other part about changing the boundary that somewhat concerns is that we had a lot of public comment and written comments that came in about this and so like I understand where Cal's coming from in terms of he's now shown me that the data shows that he's removing -- you know still providing some opportunity for Juneau and places that they are already kind of now utilizing more rather than south of that line, so we're changing a boundary to kind of do that, and we're doing that based on the numbers that we have in the analysis, even though the analysis does not break things down by WAA. But the part about changing the boundary has not been now publicly, you know, I have no idea how the public would feel about it, whereas, after reading all of our meeting materials I kind of have a feeling those that took the time to comment, where that's coming from. And so I could support -- I'd probably abstain on the amendment, I could support the amendment but I'm still not going to support the main motion. So I just wanted to provide that on there.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Cathy.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is Albert.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

MR. HOWARD: It seems like we used to be an organization that relied heavily on the Native organizations and their comments and not so much on everyone else and now we've become an organization that's relying on everyone else's comments and not so much on Native corporations or tribal organizations. I know we used to have a paper in front of us that asked

0402

1 what affiliation each person's speaking or giving
2 comments to any type of proposal, asking if they
3 represented a Native organization or a tribal
4 organization or if they come from a Federally-
5 recognized subsistence area and now we're not doing
6 that. We're weighing what's happening with this
7 proposal on people that aren't part of any of the
8 guidelines that we used to consider when we were
9 considering comments.

10

11 (Teleconference interference -
12 participants not muted - overriding speakers)

13

14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
17 I guess I do need to point out that we do ask for
18 tribal comments on all these proposals and we didn't
19 hear anything from the tribal entities on this
20 proposal. So I don't know why that is.

21

22 (Teleconference interference -
23 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

24

25 REPORTER: I'm having a really hard
26 time hearing you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sorry, go ahead,
29 Albert.

30

31 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
32 If my memory serves correct, our Angoon Community
33 Association, Kevin Frank made a comment on this and it
34 was a verbal comment, and I'm not sure if that's in the
35 record anywhere.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, I don't
38 have that in front of me, but if it's on the record it
39 will be reflected. Anybody else.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are we ready to
44 vote on the amendment.

45

46 MS. NEEDHAM: Question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
49 Question's been called for. So the motion to amend was
50

0403

1 to amend Wildlife Proposal 22-07 so that it would close
2 an area to non-subsistence users from September 15th to
3 November 30th and that area will be described roughly
4 to correspond with Wildlife Analysis Areas.....

5

6 (Teleconference interference -
7 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:through the
10 Forest Service designations of 4044 and 4043, south of
11 -- the closure would be south of those two Wildlife
12 Analysis Areas, just south of those areas. So -- and
13 like I say specific geographical.....

14

15 (Teleconference interference -
16 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:points would
19 have to be provided later.

20

21 So does everybody understand the
22 amendment. Closure to non-subsistence users south of
23 those to Wildlife Analysis Areas all the way to Point
24 Gardner on the west coast of Admiralty Island.

25

26 Okay. Frank, if you want to do a roll
27 call vote on the amendment.

28

29 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, did I
30 understand that you said the closure is 4043, that was
31 the amendment?

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: The amendment is
34 to close the non-subsistence users from September 15th
35 to November 30th, the area on the west coast of
36 Admiralty Island, you know, roughly.....

37

38 (Teleconference interference -
39 participants not muted- overriding speaker)

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:and west of
42 Wildlife Analysis Units 4044, 4043 south and west of
43 those units down to Point Gardner would be closed to
44 non-subsistence users from September 15th to November
45 30th.

46

47 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
48 Albert.

49

50

0404

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

2

3 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 I believe that the amendment was to remove areas 4044

5 and 4043 and Mr. Casipit can correct me if I'm wrong.

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Maybe

8 that's a better way to state it. We might have to go

9 back on the transcripts and see what the original

10 amendment was. I was trying to restate it from my

11 understanding but maybe we should go to the transcript

12 so there was no confusion, can.....

13

14 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:we do that,

17 is there.....

18

19 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Cal.

22

23 MR. CASIPIT: This is Cal.

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

26

27 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, my motion was to

28 remove 4044 and 4043 from the closed area that's in

29 bold on Page 84.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Let me look

32 at Page 84, it's the summary of -- executive summary.

33 Okay, that's probably better wording, that's just

34 excluding from.....

35

36 (Teleconference interference -

37 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:original

40 proposal those areas.

41

42 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

45

46 MR. CASIPIT: And Staff can figure out

47 the appropriate regulatory language.

48

49 MR. WRIGHT: So, Mr. Chairman.

50

0405

1

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,

2

Cal.

3

4

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

5

6

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So Frank.

7

8

9

MR. WRIGHT: The amendment was to
remove 4044 and 4043 from the original proposal, right?

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, that
would.....

13

14

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

15

16

17

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:be the best
way to state it, yes.

18

19

20

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.
Chair.

21

22

Bob Schroeder.

23

24

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

25

26

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

27

28

MR. SLATER: Yes.

29

30

MR. WRIGHT: Jim.....

31

32

MR. SLATER: Yes.

33

34

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

35

36

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

37

38

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

39

40

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

41

42

MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

43

44

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

45

46

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

47

48

MR. HOWARD: Yes.

49

50

0406

1 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

6

7 MR. ROBBINS: Yes.

8

9 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

14

15 MR. KITKA: Yes.

16

17 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

26

27 MS. NEEDHAM: I'll abstain.

28

29 MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes yes.

30 Motion carried on the amendment.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
33 Frank. And I apologize I was getting a little ahead of
34 myself on the voting there. So with the passing of the
35 amendment, now the main motion would essentially
36 reflect that area that I was trying to describe, the
37 closed area would not extend from roughly south of --
38 which is described as Wildlife Analysis Area 4054,
39 4042, 4056 and 4041. So now we need a motion to adopt
40 the proposal as amended.

41

42 MR. SCHROEDER: I think the motion's on
43 the floor right at this moment, Don.

44

45 (Teleconference interference -
46 participants not muted - overriding speaker)

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Frank, you're our
49 best parliamentarian, do you want to weigh in on the

50

0407

1 procedure.

2

3 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, you have -- this is
4 Katya Wessels. Mr. Chair. You're now voting on the
5 original motion as amended because you already have the
6 original motion, you voted on the amendment. Now
7 you're voting on the original motion as amended, so the
8 motion is on the floor.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
11 Katya. So further discussion on the main motion then.

12

13 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, this is Bob.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

16

17 MR. SCHROEDER: I think we've discussed
18 this quite a bit. Just putting our justification in
19 one place, the things we're supposed to respond to are:

20

21 Is the recommendation consistent with
22 established fish and wildlife management principles.
23 This proposal is not inconsistent with established
24 principles in that it basically changes seasons for
25 certain users with no particular effect on fish and
26 wildlife management principles.

27

28 Is it supported by substantial evidence
29 of biological or traditional ecological knowledge.
30 We've heard extensively from Albert and from other
31 community members that there is a problem getting deer
32 for Angoon. We've also seen that Angoon's harvest has
33 gone down, although the miracle data doesn't really say
34 why it's gone down.

35

36 Will this recommendation be beneficial
37 to subsistence users and needs, we believe so.

38

39 If a closure is involved, is the
40 closure necessary for conservation of healthy fish or
41 wildlife populations or is the closure necessary to
42 ensure continued subsistence users. We have no
43 evidence that it's necessary for conservation purposes,
44 however we've heard extensively that it may be
45 necessary to ensure continued subsistence uses by
46 members of -- of hunters in Angoon whose harvest levels
47 have fallen in recent years.

48

49 That's it for putting justification on

50

0408

1 the record, Mr. Chair.

2

3

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
4 Bob. That sounds like good justification for support.
5 Do we hear other Council members with any opposing
6 views.

7

8 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

11

12 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13 I'll be opposing this proposal. I want to preclude my
14 justification by saying on this seat I chose that I
15 represent subsistence users, rural qualified
16 subsistence users in the region. And when I say that I
17 say that for all subsistence users, so these are all
18 rural residents. I want it to be made clear that I am
19 an Alaska Native person, I take Alaska Native
20 viewpoints very strongly, I listen to them and I do
21 think that this Council also, you know, listens to some
22 of the needs from Alaska Native people within our
23 region a little more and I think we'll get into that a
24 little more when we talk about indigenous management,
25 which as a Council member I do support. However,
26 subsistence is for all rural residents, and I think
27 some of my justification also applies to other rural
28 residents throughout the region.

29

30 When I look at the feedback that we
31 have received on this proposal, I want to make note
32 that there are -- there's at least one Angoon resident
33 that opposed this proposal. And there are other
34 property owners from Angoon that opposed this proposal.
35 So I respect the fact that Albert is sharing a
36 viewpoint that he feels is a majority from Angoon, and
37 I appreciate his input into the process. So I want him
38 to know that I have listened to that and I am hearing
39 that Angoon definitely is -- and I'm not denying that
40 Angoon is feeling some, and is experiencing some
41 competition from other deer harvesters, and I have kept
42 that in mind.

43

44 Regarding my justification for opposing
45 this. The question, is the recommendation consistent
46 with established fish and wildlife management
47 principles. I'm not exactly sure how to answer that
48 completely but I do think that one thing I noticed in
49 this proposal is that this deer population is managed
50

1 by unit and this is Unit 4, which is a unit-wide area
2 which is -- we could see in our -- all of the data that
3 we have gotten and stuff, a lot of our analysis were
4 broader for the unit and this proposal starts to break
5 that up and call out like specific sections within Unit
6 4. And so for managers from a manger's perspective, I
7 feel like it's going to start being difficult when we
8 partition out specific areas, it would have been easier
9 for me to do this if it was by -- you know if we
10 actually managed by Wildlife Analysis Area, but really
11 only analyze by Wildlife Analysis Area, we don't manage
12 by it.

13
14 Is the recommendation supported by
15 substantial evidence such as biological and traditional
16 ecological knowledge. I mean I wouldn't say that it's
17 substantial evidence always but we do have a fair
18 amount of good information from both biological and
19 traditional ecological knowledge, but I'll note with
20 the biological stuff we -- you know, there were
21 questions, I think that they were all very well -- you
22 know we worked with the information that we have but
23 there is some definitely good questions that came to
24 light in our discussion and so I would be mutual on
25 that. When it comes to traditional ecological
26 knowledge, you know, I honestly feel like this proposal
27 came forth during our last meeting and we haven't
28 necessarily heard from a broader perspective of
29 individuals in our region regarding traditional
30 ecological knowledge specifically. I mean I do believe
31 Albert has a good handle on what is going on in and
32 around his community, but, personally, I think in order
33 to have substantial evidence, I would have liked to
34 have heard from other users as well around Angoon to
35 contribute towards traditional ecological knowledge.

36
37 Will the recommendation be beneficial
38 or detrimental to subsistence needs and uses. I
39 believe that this proposal would be a benefit for rural
40 residents in Angoon. However, I believe it will also
41 potentially be detrimental to other subsistence users.
42 I think that this proposal will shift non-Federally-
43 qualified users into other areas that may now create
44 additional competition into those areas. I think we
45 also saw some of that in the analysis and we certainly
46 saw it in some of the public comments in terms of
47 people feeling that they would now need to be hunting
48 in other areas that might be associated with other
49 communities within Unit 4 that would have a subsistence
50

0410

1 priority, so it shifts that competition and then it
2 becomes detrimental to those Federally-qualified
3 subsistence users.

4

5 If a closure is involved, is the
6 closure necessary for the conservation of healthy fish
7 and wildlife populations. I do not believe that there
8 is a conservation concern for deer in Unit 4. And I do
9 not see evidence of a conservation concern for deer
10 populations in and around the immediate area of Angoon.
11 That was not presented in the analysis.

12

13 Is the closure necessary for continued
14 subsistence uses. I don't feel like we have met that
15 threshold. I think we're only, again, meeting it for a
16 small portion of people when you compare it back to
17 region-wide. Again, I do hear Angoon, and I understand
18 that they feel like they're experiencing competition or
19 deer hunting within the region, however, I don't --
20 again, I would like to hear from -- I would like
21 additional comments.

22

23 I agree with Member Douville and Ian, I
24 would like to see a Unit 4 deer strategy. I would like
25 all users to come together and kind of discuss this
26 when it comes to all three of the proposals that we
27 have for Unit 4 deer. And so I think that would make
28 me feel like we are working together as an entire
29 region and support all user groups if we do that.

30

31 And I think I also would agree with
32 OSM's conclusion and justification, that the proposed
33 regulation just doesn't meet the criteria identified in
34 Section .815-3, that's of ANILCA, of course. I don't
35 believe it meets that at this time, and, so, again, I
36 would oppose the proposal.

37

38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
41 Any other Council members want to weigh in. We
42 have.....

43

44 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
45 Albert.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

48

49 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

50

0411

1 I appreciate everybody's comments and everything so on
2 and so forth. But like I said before, I've looked at
3 this thing forwards and backwards and every opportunity
4 for everybody else. I've even considered removing
5 areas for Juneau residents even though there's no
6 consideration when they're going through our area and
7 the impact they're having on our community. It's
8 interesting to hear a Council member really concerned
9 about other people and not paying attention to what's
10 being done. I live here. I respectfully ask Council
11 Member Needham if she's ever hunted the west side of
12 Admiralty to see what I've seen. She's basing her
13 knowledge on her -- what she learned in school, I'm
14 basing this on what I see, and what I've learned from
15 my father and grandfather.

16
17 I appreciate everyone's input but I'm
18 trying to solve a problem so we can go into the next
19 winter and for generations from now on with the feeling
20 that the State hears our call for help, that this Board
21 hears our call for help. We don't ask for anything but
22 an opportunity to hunt in peace off the resources that
23 our fathers and grandfathers decided was here when they
24 settled. We didn't settle in Juneau, we didn't settle
25 anywhere else, we settled here. So I'm just asking for
26 an opportunity to help us solve an existing problem
27 when we've exhausted all our other resources through
28 other boards and we're left with this opportunity to
29 try to fix something. We're not being unreasonable.

30
31 As this Board recalls I started it up
32 there at Point Retreat down to Point Gardner, then I
33 moved the line to Marsden, then I moved it to eliminate
34 4044. So this isn't to hurt any other user group. You
35 heard the gentleman from Juneau say they don't even
36 hunt down past Hawk Inlet because of the price of gas
37 in Juneau and it just doesn't make it feasible. We
38 also heard from Fish and Game that a lot of Juneau
39 hunting happens in 4044. So I'm giving more leeway to
40 a community that could care less about Angoon, and I
41 say that and I mean it.

42
43 The problem comes with Ms. Needham and
44 her take on everything and she's a Juneau resident, and
45 it's hard for her to understand my take. And a reason
46 to support Mr. Douville and his information on Area 2
47 wolves is because I know he's there, I know he's got
48 feet on the ground and I can trust what he's saying,
49 and all I'm asking is that this Council do the same for
50

0412

1 me, and what I'm trying to do and find a solution.
2 I've talked to property owners. I talked to a property
3 owner that lives in Juneau. He talked to me about
4 hunting up on the top of one of the mountains in
5 August, I was like, okay, so I'll move the timeline
6 back to September 15th instead of August 1st, which
7 gave him the opportunity to hunt on top of one of the
8 mountains and I'm mindful of mentioning any mountains
9 because there's people listening and they'll be, ah,
10 there's good hunting there, I'm going to go there, and
11 that's what you get from Fish and Game data. There's
12 good hunting there so I'm going to go there. This
13 isn't like the old days where we all earned our hunting
14 spots because we knew it from local knowledge, now we
15 go on Fish and Game reports. So we're living in a
16 different time.

17
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.

21
22 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, this is Harvey
23 Kitka.

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

26
27 MR. KITKA: Thank you. I tend to want
28 to support this measure because I can still hear rural
29 communities saying their needs are not being met. If
30 we can't solve this issue of their needs not being met
31 what about the other communities that are having the
32 same problems of their needs not being met. There's a
33 reason for that, in this case it's competition, and I
34 can see the competition but I don't know if anybody
35 else can, because I've experienced a lot of that as
36 well and I know we had to move to different areas
37 because competition had gotten too great in some
38 places. So I would support this because I can hear
39 Angoon saying their needs are not being met.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Harvey.
44 Anybody else want to weigh in.

45
46 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

47
48 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez.

49
50

0413

1 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I heard several.
4 I'll let Cathy go first and then I heard Mike Douville.

5

6 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
7 just wanted to add to my comment that I understand that
8 Unit 2 went through a very long process of coming up
9 with -- when people on Prince of Wales Island felt like
10 they were not getting their needs met, they went
11 through a very long process of outreach, education,
12 getting everybody that is a user in that unit together
13 and working together to try and find common ground and
14 solve things. And I think that that strategy, that
15 deer strategy that they did on Unit 2 really led to
16 some great regulatory changes in order to address
17 subsistence user's needs. And I honestly recommend
18 that we would do something similar like that for Unit 4
19 so that we are not pitting different user groups
20 against, like some Federally-qualified user groups
21 against other Federally-qualified user groups and
22 against non-Federally-qualified user groups. I feel
23 like a lot more conversation needs to happen.

24

25 I feel like, personally, this proposal
26 may have -- maybe the scales would have tilted for me
27 more if we had taken a baby step of reducing the bag
28 limit rather than a full closure for one user group.
29 And so I just wanted to add that in there that I highly
30 recommend that, regardless of where this proposal goes,
31 that residents from Unit 4, or group users in Unit 4
32 get together and start working on some of this together
33 before we try to hopscotch solve the problems by
34 putting together proposals that completely eliminate or
35 have closures or unnecessary closures for some user
36 groups.

37

38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
41 Cathy. Mike Douville, you had something to add.

42

43 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
44 I'm here.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

47

48 MR. DOUVILLE: Well, having gone
49 through the Unit 2 gyrations of trying to get it right

50

0414

1 without unnecessarily restricting other users, I do
2 have some respect for that process of sitting people
3 down and trying to figure out the best way to go about
4 it.

5
6 But it never was clearly answered or I
7 missed it as to why Angoon has got a declining success
8 rate. I mean Admiralty's got tons of deer on it, I mean
9 it's got no predators, brown bear, but it's got no
10 wolf, and success looks quite well. This was a hard
11 one for me to support and I do appreciate Mr. Howard's
12 expertise in his home ground but it's never been
13 clearly explained as to what is going on. Certainly
14 there was more competition during the logging heyday in
15 the '90s and so on but most of that's gone away. It's
16 hard for me to restrict somebody in a place that's got
17 more deer than anywhere in Southeast and no wolf. I
18 mean so what conditions could you ask for that are
19 better than that.

20
21 Anyway, thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
24 Did somebody else want to weigh in, I thought I heard
25 somebody.

26
27 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
28 from Pelican.

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

31
32 MR. SLATER: I just wanted to say that
33 I appreciate how Albert has tried to adjust his
34 proposal and take into account other non-subsistence
35 users. He's, I think, been quite reasonable. And also
36 I wanted to thank everyone else for their insight into
37 this on both sides of the proposal. I think there's a
38 lot of things to consider and it's not an easy
39 solution.

40
41 I, personally, tend to support Albert
42 in this and I just wanted to make sure that both sides
43 are well understood and well heard.

44
45 Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jim.
48 Any other Council members weighing in on this one.

49
50

0415

1 MR. HOWARD: Just a question for Cathy
2 or Mike, Mr. Chairman.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead,
5 it's.....

6
7 MR. HOWARD: I'm curious to whether
8 they seem to have Federally-qualified subsistence users
9 more than one community in that area are Federally-
10 qualified so naturally they're all going to sit down
11 and agree. When you look at this proposal it appears
12 the Federally-qualified community is trying to protect
13 our way of life and access to the resource, and the
14 only ones opposing it heavily is non-Federally-
15 qualified communities when, given the fact, if you look
16 at the map we just gave them about 60 percent of the
17 island to hunt off of but they still want the other 40
18 percent. So there's apples and oranges in all of these
19 proposals in comparing them to each other. The only
20 reason I stated Area 2 is I supported it because my
21 support was based on local knowledge and the fact that
22 Mr. Douville, I trusted what he's seeing on a daily
23 basis versus someone who's putting the data together
24 based on something that was handed to them in an
25 office.

26
27 So that was the only point I was
28 making, thank you, Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
31 Anybody else want to deliberate on this.

32
33 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Mr. Chair, I've
34 got a question, with the changes and the amendments, is
35 public comment going to be allowed on this topic?

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Excuse me, I don't
38 know who was talking but this is for Council
39 deliberation so I don't think that.....

40
41 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Yeah, I
42 understand that, but there's been amendments to the
43 original proposal and so people who had made comment --
44 public comment on it before now, now that there's
45 changes, are they going to have a chance to respond and
46 make some kind of comment based on those changes and
47 maybe provide some statistical information that might
48 answer.....

49
50

0416

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, hello.....

2

3 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION:some

4 questions that the Board has.

5

6 MR. WRIGHT: Point of order. We're in

7 deliberations.

8

9 MR. SCHROEDER: We're in deliberations.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: The answer to your

12 question is, yes, and for everybody's information this

13 is just a recommendation from the Council, the next

14 step is it goes to the Subsistence Board and they have

15 the same process of public testimony and written public

16 comments so yes you'll have opportunity to make your

17 case to the Board next in this process.

18

19 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Other Council

22 members.

23

24 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is

25 Ian.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I guess thinking

30 about the justifications. I think that just reflecting

31 back to our conversations yesterday about the moose

32 discussion, too, which, of course, ended up being a

33 split vote, I was just struck by how the effect of

34 scale in the conversation, again, whether we're looking

35 at the larger subsistence user base versus individual

36 community needs can really conflate things. And I

37 guess I would go back to, I'm very -- honestly I'm very

38 torn right now because I see the need from Angoon's

39 perspective and strongly believe that this would --

40 supporting this would directly benefit them and meet

41 the needs that Albert's identified. I still go back to

42 my concern that Hoonah has the same competition issues

43 that have been identified in the other proposals and

44 I'm very concerned that if we don't have larger

45 strategy, that support of this proposal will exacerbate

46 the competition issues which we have also addressed

47 here. So that's where my tear right now is between

48 what my instincts are telling me, to support Angoon and

49 their need, but also since we're looking at a

50

0417

1 community-based scale essentially for this proposal, I
2 also need to think about Hoonah's community-based scale
3 and we're experiencing the same issues here and I'm
4 concerned about competition based on support.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Thank you,
9 Ian. Any other input from the Council.

10

11 MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chair, this is
12 Harold.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harold.

15

16 MR. ROBBINS: I would like to echo
17 Ian's position completely. I'm very torn. I really
18 want to support Albert's community, I think it's
19 extremely necessary that we do that, but somehow, we
20 can't squeezing the balloon without having a problem
21 some place else. So I think we need to try to figure
22 out how to better solve the problem. And I'm not --
23 man I wish we could come up with some good answers.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
28 Harold. Anybody else.

29

30 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, Cathy.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

33

34 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
35 get the general feeling that people feel like I don't
36 support Albert and Angoon and I don't think that's the
37 case at all. So I think with what I struggle with the
38 most on this is that I don't think this proposal, this
39 specific proposal is the answer. I think that there
40 are other options, and I think that we need to spend
41 more time exploring other options. And that's why I'm
42 -- I'm opposing one proposal, I'm not opposing or even
43 refuting the fact that residents of Angoon are feeling
44 competition, or that residents of Angoon are
45 experiencing not being able to meet their subsistence
46 needs. That isn't a part or was not a part of my
47 justification for opposing the proposal. And I tried
48 to make that clear when I said that I appreciated the
49 input that Albert brings, his knowledge and experience

50

0418

1 that he brings to this Council.

2

3

4 But, again, I just don't feel this
5 proposal is the right proposal to address the concern
6 as we know it at this time and I think a broader
7 strategy, a broader conversation should happen before
8 we start really changing regulations to this point. We
9 have other tools. We can put a proposal before the
10 Board of Game that asks to reduce the bag limit. That
11 could be something that could be discussed outside of
12 this. We've never -- as a Council, we've never tried
13 to do that as far as I know. I mean I don't know so
14 I'm not going to speak on whether or not Angoon folks
15 or other people have tried to reduce bag limits, but
16 I'm just saying that I think there are options. I
17 would encourage users in Unit 4 to get together and
18 discuss those to come up with a way to satisfy that all
19 communities, all rural communities in Unit 4, if
20 there's a problem with competition and a problem with
21 not meeting subsistence needs, that they come up with a
22 collective solution.

22

23

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25

26

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Cathy. Is there.....

27

28

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman.

29

30

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Who was that?

31

32

MR. DOUVILLE: Mike.....

33

34

35

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike
Douville. Go ahead.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

But, anyway, I'll vote for it to send
it down the road but I'm not completely convinced that

0419

1 it's going to be successful.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.

6

7 (Teleconference interference -
8 participants not muted)

9

10 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
11 Albert.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

14

15 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 We've talked about this in the last meeting so any
17 conversation about maybe we could do something
18 different should have been considered after the last
19 meeting on how we could have solved this problem. So
20 I've been doing that since the last meeting and that's
21 where the idea of cutting back to September 15th from
22 August 1st and then moving it from the top of the
23 northern top of the island to Marsden and now we're
24 moving it further south is fine with me. I mean I'm
25 always looking for a solution but at the end of the day
26 my priorities are with the community members and the
27 Federally-qualified subsistence users of Angoon and
28 that's our responsibility, I believe, as a Council.

29

30 Now, this Council has heard in the
31 past, we pushed a big rock up the hill when it came to
32 the extra-territorial jurisdiction petition and that
33 was based -- they based a lot of what they perceived as
34 good information that they never really found a
35 solution to the problem. Now, if we pass this and it
36 passes the Federal Board that sets precedence for the
37 rest of the Federally-qualified subsistence users to
38 have a mechanism to bring their issues to someone, have
39 someone address the issues they're having versus, you
40 know, you heard I asked the State if they had a
41 solution, between the last meeting and now if they
42 recognized subsistence users as a user group they would
43 have helped found a solution so this debate wouldn't
44 keep going on and everyone would have been happy and we
45 would have walked away with a solution by now.

46

47 So I'd encourage the Council to vote
48 yes on this one and send a message that all Federal
49 subsistence users can come to this Council with their

50

0420

1 concerns and get action in a positive direction.

2

3

4 I've been reading lines and dates and
5 trying to find something that people would be happy
6 with. I even asked the Territorial Sportsmen if I gave
7 them the 4044, if they would be happy, and they said
8 no. And that's the majority of where they are and
9 another gentleman from Juneau said he doesn't even go
10 down past Hawk Inlet. So I'm being flexible. I really
11 appreciate having this dialogue and the opportunity
12 that was never given to Angoon before except for now.

12

13

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.

16

Anybody else.

17

18

(No comments)

19

20

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are we ready for a

21

vote.

22

23

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.

24

25

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy.

26

27

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I just have a
28 quick thing.

29

30

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

31

32

33

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
34 would hesitate to do something, to vote yes in order to
35 send this up the line and allow it to go to the next
36 level for the decision to be made at that point. As
37 you know the Federal Board, in a majority of cases will
38 give deference to the Regional Advisory Council because
39 they trust that we do our job, so I just wanted to make
40 that point, that there would be an argument at the
41 Federal Board level regarding deference and obviously
42 they can't give that deference to a Regional Advisory
43 Council if it goes against certain things. They have
44 their cases where they can't give deference. But I
45 guess just trying to push it up the line so that the
46 decision is made at t the next level, I just want to
47 caution and remind everybody that -- and don't get me
48 wrong, I think we've done a really good job doing our
49 job, we've spent hours working on this so -- and it is
50 a matter of putting it on the public record, but I just

0421

1 wanted to throw that piece in there.

2

3 And I appreciate it, thank you, Mr.
4 Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
7 Anybody else.

8

9 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, could we
10 take a break and come back and continue?

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, Mike I was
13 kind of hoping we'd be able to get to a vote here
14 before we took a break. I kind of felt like we were
15 getting pretty close.

16

17 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, you know,
18 like I said I'd kick the can up the road, that's
19 probably the wrong thing to say. I'm struggling with
20 this thing just like a couple other Council members are
21 and it's really been difficult, you know. I want to
22 see Angoon do well and have plenty of deer but on the
23 other hand I'm not willing to restrict other hunters
24 when there's no biological reason to do so. So part of
25 this picture is missing and I'm really having a hard
26 time sending it down the road with my approval.

27

28 Anyway, this is one of the most
29 difficult proposals I've dealt with in my 20-plus years
30 on the RAC.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
33 I'd just kind of like to add to that topic. Sending
34 this up to the Board, I don't necessarily think that's
35 a bad thing given the situation. You know with this
36 closure policy, and it was brought out by the State,
37 the wording in ANILCA is somewhat vague as to what
38 continuation of subsistence uses is. The situation of
39 competition, it's kind of becoming more in the
40 forefront, I think it's going to be more of a problem
41 in our region as well as other regions in the state.
42 It's an issue that's probably going to have to be
43 addressed. I think if Regional Councils, such as
44 ourselves, start sending some of these issues up the
45 Board they may have to come out with some policy ideas
46 of their own of how they're going to deal with these
47 issues and maybe they'll even take a close look at the
48 legal language and implications of that continuation of
49 subsistence uses as a justification for closures. So I

50

0422

1 don't necessarily think that's a bad thing so I
2 wouldn't vote against this proposal for that reason.

3

4 Those are my feelings. And I know it's
5 a very difficult decision, so a lot of factors involved
6 here.

7

8 So anybody else.

9

10 MR. HOWARD: Just real quick, Mr.
11 Chairman.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

14

15 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 I'm kind of with you, I'd like to get it to a vote and
17 then go to lunch. But when you look at the State's
18 numbers and they have me justify what we're saying
19 here. This wouldn't impact Juneau residents when you
20 look at their numbers. 4054 10 percent of the Juneau
21 people hunt in there. 4052 was 10 percent. By the
22 time you go down to 4041 it was one percent. But that
23 one percent doesn't tell you if there was one boat with
24 -- one big boat with five boats towed behind it. You
25 go into a bay you eliminate all the deer in that bay
26 with five users. So that's kind of where I'm coming
27 from. I represent Angoon and I'm trying to find a
28 solution to an existing problem. 80 percent
29 unemployment, high price of gas, we can't go to Costco
30 and we don't have any luck out hunting, there's just so
31 many things there that you don't see in the data.

32

33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
36 Anybody else.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: This is Bob. Mr.
39 Chair, we have quite a bit of stuff on our agenda and
40 we only have another couple hours or two so we could
41 spend all our time on Angoon or we could vote this up
42 or down. My obvious preference is to give the other
43 items on our agenda some time. I think we should move
44 the question.

45

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

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Bob.

50

0423

1 Thank you, Albert. Let's have the question and the
2 question will be on the main motion, as amended, for a
3 closure to non-subsistence users from September 15th to
4 November 30th in the areas that's been designated on
5 the map on the west side of Admiralty Island roughly
6 surrounding the community of Angoon. So those points
7 from Point Gardner north to a point that will be
8 determined by the Staff when they come up with the
9 exact location that roughly corresponds to their
10 wildlife analysis unit at the end of 4044. So I think
11 that's the best we can do for a description.

12

13 Frank, would you do a roll call vote,
14 please.

15

16 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chair.

17

18 Cal Casipit.

19

20 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

21

22 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

27

28 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville votes yes.

29

30 MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

31

32 MR. SLATER: Jim Slater votes yes.

33

34 MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

35

36 MR. SCHROEDER: Bob Schroeder votes

37 yes.

38

39 MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

40

41 MR. HOWARD: Albert Howard votes yes.

42

43 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I vote yes.

46

47 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0424

1 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

6

7 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

8

9 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM: Cathy votes no.

20

21 MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

26

27 MR. JOHNSON: Ian votes no.

28

29 MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes yes.

30 Motion carries.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
33 Frank. Okay, we got through that one. Let's see 1:00
34 so we'll recess until 2:00 and.....

35

36 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
37 Wessels.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,
40 Katya.

41

42 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, thank you, I just
43 want a couple of minutes. I would like to thank
44 everyone on behalf of OSM for this thoughtful
45 discussion that you had on record and thank you for all
46 your comments. I want to thank the public and the
47 Council members for being so considerate and very
48 detailed in your discussion. It was already mentioned
49 here that we still have quite a bit on the agenda and
50

0425

1 the Council at least needs to get to all action items
2 during this meeting. There's still 11 proposals left
3 and three additional action items. And I just want you
4 to consider that while you go to lunch and then start
5 the meeting after the lunch and just watch out for time
6 management. Thank you very much for this great
7 discussion.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you,
10 Katya. And I'm hoping that all of our lengthy
11 discussion and testimony on this proposal will help to
12 speed us along no the subsequent proposals. Obviously
13 we can't take five hours on every one so Council
14 members should keep that in mind, however, it's kind of
15 likely that we will be going past 5:00 o'clock this
16 evening so bear that in mind as well.

17

18 Okay, recess until 2:00 o'clock, I
19 guess. 2:00 o'clock.

20

21 (Off record)

22

23 (On record)

24

25 (Teleconference interference -
26 participants not muted)

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hello, everybody
29 on the line, I want to get the meeting back to order
30 and I do hear a little background noise, I think
31 somebody has their phone unmuted.

32

33 I'll ask Frank Wright, if he's back on
34 the line, if he'd like to take roll call.

35

36 MR. WRIGHT: I'm here, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hi, Frank, go
39 ahead and do the roll and see if you got everybody.

40

41 MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 MR. WRIGHT: You there Albert.

46

47 Bob Schroeder.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0426

1

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Schroeder.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

6

7

MR. SLATER: Here.

8

9

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Jim.

10

11

Michael Douville.

12

13

(No comments)

14

15

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

16

17

MR. DOUVILLE: Here.

18

19

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mike.

20

21

Calvin Casipit.

22

23

MR. CASIPIT: I'm here.

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Calvin.

26

27

Ian Johnson.

28

29

MR. JOHNSON: Ian's here.

30

31

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Ian.

32

33

Bob Schroeder.

34

35

MR. SCHROEDER: Bob Schroeder's here.

36

37

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Bob.

38

39

Albert Howard.

40

41

(No comments)

42

43

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

44

45

(No comments)

46

47

MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

48

49

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm here.

50

0427

1 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

2

3 MR. ROBBINS: I'm here.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

6

7 Harvey Kitka.

8

9 MR. KITKA: I'm here.

10

11 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Harvey.

12

13 Larry Bemis.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

22

23 MS. NEEDHAM: I'm here.

24

25 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Cathy.

26

27 I think I'm here.

28

29 MR. HOWARD: Albert Howard's here.

30

31 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Albert. Mr.

32

Chair, we have a quorum.

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.

35

We'll get back to session here and next up is another
36 proposal Wildlife Proposal 22-08.

37

38 (Teleconference interference -

39

participants not muted)

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So if we have a
42 presenter on that one we can get started. The analysis
43 is on.....

44

45 MR. DUNN: Mr. Chair, this is Greg.....

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Do we have
48 somebody ready to go there.

49

50

0428

1 MR. DUNN: Mr. Chair, this is Greg Dunn
2 can you hear me.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I hear somebody
5 but you're really weak.

6
7 MR. DUNN: Okay, thanks. Is this
8 better.

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, that's
11 better.

12
13 MR. DUNN: Hi, this is Greg Dunn, I'll
14 be presenting this.

15
16 (Teleconference interference -
17 participants not muted)

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
20 Greg. Go ahead.

21
22 MR. DUNN: All right. Hi, everybody,
23 my name's Greg Dunn, I'm a Wildlife Biologist for
24 Tongass National Forest and I'll be presenting WP22-08.
25 The executive summary for Wildlife Proposal 22-08 is on
26 Page 173 of your Council books and the analysis begins
27 on Page 174.

28
29 This proposal was submitted by the
30 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
31 and it requests that the Northeast Chichagof Controlled
32 Use Area annual deer harvest limit for non-Federally-
33 qualified users be reduced to two male deer.

34
35 The proponent stated that it recently
36 became more challenging for subsistence hunters in
37 Hoonah to harvest sufficient deer to meet their
38 subsistence needs due to increased hunting pressure
39 from non-Federally-qualified users. They stated that
40 regulatory change is needed to protect the deer
41 population from further depletion and increase
42 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users.
43 This proposal would restrict non-Federally-qualified
44 users on Federal public lands within the Northeast
45 Chichagof Controlled Use Area by limiting harvest to
46 two male deer. Restricting non-Federally-qualified
47 users could decrease both deer harvest and competition
48 with Federally-qualified users in the area. Lower
49 harvest by and competition with Federally-qualified
50

0429

1 users may result in more deer harvested by Federally-
2 qualified users.

3

4

5 Non-Federally-qualified users may shift
6 some effort to areas of Unit 4 outside of the Northeast
7 Chichagof Controlled Use Area, possibly displacing
8 hunters in other areas. Non-Federally-qualified users
9 may also concentrate more efforts on the State managed
10 lands within the area including lands immediately
11 surrounding Hoonah. However, considering that very few
12 non-Federally-qualified users harvest.....

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

(Teleconference interference -
participants not muted)

MR. DUNN:more than two deer in
Unit 4 and most of the deer harvested within the
analysis are are males, this restriction would probably
have little impact on the hunting effort, location or
harvest of non-Federally-qualified users within the
analysis area.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
oppose this proposal. Justification for that is
restricting non-Federally-qualified users to two male
deer annually in the proposed area does not appear
necessary because deer populations in Unit 4 are high
and may be approaching carrying capacity in some
locations. This restriction also does not appear
necessary for the continuation of subsistence uses.
The average annual success rate for Hoonah deer hunters
has been increasing since 2008 and the deer harvested
per hunter had rebounded to pre-2007 levels. Further,
few non-Federally-qualified users harvest more than two
deer in Unit 4 and they primarily harvest males in the
analysis area, therefore, the proposed restriction is
not likely to significantly effort by non-Federally-
qualified users or the hunting experience of Federally-
qualified subsistence users.

That's all I have. I'm ready for
questions if there's any.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Mr. Dunn. Questions on the analysis for this proposal
from the Council members. Questions.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

0430

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I guess I want to
4 bring up a figure that maybe conflicts with the
5 narrative so I'm hoping to rectify that. So Figure 3
6 of the analysis, which is annual deer harvest, you
7 know, represented by non-Federal and Federal harvest.
8 In the narrative it was suggested that deer harvest has
9 been increasing since 2008 but it looks like in 2015
10 and 2016 that harvest has been decreasing since that
11 time. So I was wondering if you could clarify why it
12 was concluded that harvest is only increasing.

13

14 MR. DUNN: Yes, I can -- through the
15 Chair, this is Greg. Yes, I could see how that -- how
16 you could see that. So the trend is upward although,
17 you know, it does a curve where it peaks in 2015 and
18 2016, the trend is upwards in deer harvest and that's
19 what that table shows (indiscernible - cuts out) is the
20 upwards trend.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anything further
23 Ian.

24

25 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I do have
26 maybe.....

27

28 (Teleconference interference -
29 participants not muted)

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second,
32 Ian, I do want to say that we are getting some
33 background noise and there may still be somebody with
34 their phones who is not muted so check your phones
35 again. Thank you. So go ahead, Ian.

36

37 MR. JOHNSON: I was wondering if data
38 were available from 2020 as well. It seems like -- I
39 guess I'm surprised those were left out of the analysis
40 overall and so I guess I'm just wondering why that was.

41

42 MR. DUNN: Yes, Ian, through the Chair.
43 This is -- yes, we did not get 2020 and we tried to get
44 it, they did not have it ready yet for us.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Other
49 Council members with questions.

50

0431

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

4 Go ahead.

5

6 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
7 have two questions that are sort of related. In the
8 analysis on Page 176 under cultural knowledge and
9 traditional practices, again, you reference Sill and
10 Koster from 2017 that reported Hoonah respondents
11 expressed concern about deer populations and harvest.
12 Some respondents expressed concern that non-local
13 hunters were taking too many deer and causing
14 competition. So it seems like some competition by non-
15 Federally-qualified users has been documented. Did you
16 find any other documentation and I kind of want to say
17 that we might have discussed this in Regional Advisory
18 Council meetings maybe three or four years ago, or
19 maybe Member Wright had put it in his comments for the
20 Council when we open up meetings, so I'm wondering if
21 any of those documents were looked at and whether or
22 not you found other accountings of competition for deer
23 populations.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 MR. DUNN: Thank you, Cathy. Through
28 the Chair. I didn't do this analysis so I don't know
29 if he looked at other cultural knowledge and
30 traditional practices. But I think he found the most
31 recent ones he could.

32

33 MS. NEEDHAM: All right, thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

36

37 MS. NEEDHAM: And I had one additional
38 question, of whether or not the analysis looked at with
39 the cumulative impacts by the other proposals regarding
40 deer in Unit 2 may have an effect on this proposal
41 given if the other proposals were supported, whether or
42 not there's anything in your analysis that had to do
43 with that.

44

45 MR. DUNN: Thank you, Cathy. I read
46 through this pretty well and I didn't see anything like
47 that so the answer for me would be no, but also at the
48 same time I don't know fully.

49

50

0432

1 MS. NEEDHAM: All right, thank you.

2

3 (Teleconference interference -
4 participants not muted)

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
7 Anybody else with a question.

8

9 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

12

13 MR. JOHNSON: Maybe it's a little bit
14 more of a comment but it's relevant to the analysis in
15 that it goes back to what we discussed earlier in the
16 meeting around what truly is impact and what isn't. I
17 know the analysis suggests that OSM opposes because the
18 regulation may not have effect, I'm looking at the
19 graph though on Figure 5 and it seems like, you know,
20 there's a substantial number of hunters on average each
21 year that harvest three to four deer it looks like and
22 that's in -- and, granted this Unit 4 broadly, it looks
23 like this is not within the analysis area on this one
24 but I mean that might be a clarifying question that I
25 have is, what -- you know, do we have an indication
26 within the analysis area of how many hunters harvest
27 three or four deer. And then my comment more broadly
28 is like, I guess, it's up to determining if that is
29 impactful or not.

30

31 MR. DUNN: Yes, Ian, through the Chair.
32 This is Greg again. So you are right and what they
33 stated in this analysis is that the majority of hunters
34 don't harvest more than two deer that visit and I think
35 that's the general trend in most of Unit 4 is what it
36 looks like. So I think they're just extrapolating that
37 and pulling it -- going down to the smaller areas like
38 the Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area and saying,
39 yeah, the majority of people aren't taking more than
40 two deer that are non-Federally-qualified.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Follow-up, Ian.

43

44 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, the previous
45 analysis for the Angoon issue was able to do analysis
46 at that WAA level and it doesn't seem like that
47 occurred on this one as much and I'm curious why the
48 different scale -- why this analysis occurred at Unit 4
49 scale versus the WAAs, or the WAAs, even though like

50

0433

1 Map 2 does break this down into wilderness analysis
2 areas.

3

4 MR. DUNN: Yes, through the Chair. So
5 we tried to get data down to the WAA level and they did
6 not have sufficient -- the harvest data, we couldn't
7 get down to the WAA level, they only had it for Unit 4.
8 Probably the harvest tickets weren't that accurate is
9 what I imagine when they're reporting. But we did ask
10 for it all the way down to the WAA level, we just
11 didn't get it.

12

13 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ian.
16 Anybody else with a question.

17

18 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.

19

20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

21

22 MR. WRIGHT: What did -- thank you, Mr.
23 Chairman. What do you mean by close to carrying
24 capacity, is it close that we got to be careful on how
25 much we harvest or what are you saying. I think that's
26 what I heard.

27

28 MR. DUNN: Yes, this is Greg, through
29 the Chair. So what we mean by close to carrying
30 capacity is that there might be almost too many deer
31 for the forage to support right now and the habitat
32 itself.

33

34 MR. WRIGHT: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman.
35 So you're not talking about the hunting, you're just
36 talking about the forage that is being -- that the deer
37 might eat themselves out of, is that what it is?

38

39 MR. DUNN: Yes, through the Chair, that
40 is exactly what I'm talking about.

41

42 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman. You also
43 said that mostly male deer were taken by non-
44 residential, how do you know that, is it -- because
45 I've seen them go out of here with a lot of deer,
46 especially when the ferry system's running. So is it
47 stated on the ticket that you get that it's a male
48 deer?

49

50

0434

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 MR. DUNN: Yes, through the Chair, this
4 is Greg. On the harvest tickets themselves they -- it
5 specifically asks if you got a male or a female deer.

6

7 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. So does aren't
8 being taken by non-residents, is that what it is?

9

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 MR. DUNN: This is Greg, through the
13 Chair. So, yeah, what we're saying is that they are
14 targeting male deer and not taking that many female
15 deer. And when you look at the harvest on Figure 6 it
16 shows -- this is for -- it's for that area and they're
17 only reporting 50 -- like last year -- or 2019 57 deer
18 taken out of 260 deer were females, so they're not
19 necessarily targeting female deer and plus you have
20 that time limit after September 15th is when you're
21 allowed to shoot a female deer. So.

22

23 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.
24 Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
27 Frank. Anybody else with a question on the analysis.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks. I hope you don't
34 mind a chain of questions. Carrying capacity question
35 that Frank asked brought to mind, I just want to
36 clarify, Greg are you talking about winter carrying
37 capacity or summer carrying capacity?

38

39 MR. DUNN: Yes, this Greg, through the
40 Chair. Yeah, I'm talking about winter carrying
41 capacity. And it falls over through summer if there's
42 good enough spring to bring them back well enough so
43 it's a more of a winter/spring type of capacity that
44 limits the amount of deer that can be on the landscape.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, yeah, because I
47 mean summer browse here doesn't see any indication of
48 shortage. I also guess want to ask about Figure 8 in
49 the analysis -- oh, sorry, Mr. Chair, I hope a follow-

50

0435

1 up question is okay again.

2

3

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, just that I'm seeing a 80 percent oftentimes success rate associated with the last several years of hunting in Hoonah, I want to make -- can you tell me where that information comes from for sure, is that on the harvest tag, and then like essentially the hunter report that you're getting amount of effort from: is that correct?

MR. DUNN: Yes, through the Chair. That is correct, they base it off, you know, how many times you've gone out to hunt and if you were successful in each one of those hunts. Because a lot of the Federally-qualified folks go out rand -- you know, different times, not always all day, so they -- so that's why -- that's how you get that number.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Yeah, it just seems very high, 80 percent would be surprising just on my intuition for success rate around here.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal Casipit, can I.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

MR. CASIPIT: That's the reason for my suggestion to Fish and Game earlier about having something on that report card that highlights that folks need to record their non-successful hunts as much as their successful ones and that's why I was trying to get that point across at that time. That a lot of folks only fill it out, you know, as you get a deer you fill it out, you don't really fill out all your trips.

Anyway, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, Cal. Anybody else with a question.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. It sounds

0436

1 like we might have concluded that presentation, thank
2 you, Mr. Dunn. We'll move on and ask again for any
3 reports on tribal or ANCSA Corporation consultations on
4 this proposal.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Do we have any?

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm not hearing
13 any so I'll assume we had no consultation.

14

15 Agency comments, any.....

16

17 MS. WESSELS: I'm sorry Don, this is
18 Katya Wessels. I was struggling with unmuting myself.
19 We have no tribal or ANCSA Corporation comments on this
20 proposal. Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
23 So that brings us to other agencies. Department of
24 Fish and Game, do you have comments on this proposal
25 other than.....

26

27 MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello, this is Tom
28 Schumacher, can you hear me.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, go ahead,
31 Tom.

32

33 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay, thank you. I
34 think we covered the meat of it in the last go around
35 but there are a couple of points I'd like to reiterate
36 and a couple of new ones to bring up.

37

38 You know the first is that the
39 rationalization for this proposal, the reason for it is
40 that in recent years there's an alleged trend of
41 increasing competition from non-Federally-qualified
42 hunters. You know our draft comments, which I believe
43 all of you probably have by now has a graph showing the
44 trends and numbers of Federally-qualified and non-
45 Federally-qualified hunters. The number of non-
46 Federally-qualified hunters is essentially steady for
47 the last 20 years, maybe slightly declining. The
48 number of Federally-qualified hunters, and those
49 Federally-qualified hunters are overwhelmingly
50

0437

1 residents of Hoonah has declined steeply from the late
2 '90s through 2005 of so. And, again, you know, if
3 there's been a decline in harvest and, you know, our
4 data does suggest there has been a decline in harvest
5 by Federally-qualified residents, the data we have
6 almost certainly point to that resulting from fewer
7 people hunting and spending fewer days in the field
8 hunting. It's not due to competition, or at least
9 there's no evidence to suggest it's from competition,
10 because competition hasn't changed in 20 years.

11

12 So imposing a bag limit restriction on
13 those hunters seems unnecessary either for deer
14 conservation or for meeting subsistence needs.

15

16 You know at this point it's difficult
17 for us to comment on the whole concept of meeting
18 subsistence needs because as far as I'm aware there's
19 no definition of what they are and, therefore, there's
20 no bar to measure, you know, for us when we develop
21 comments and I think there's no understanding by non-
22 Federally-qualified users, you know, why they're being
23 restricted, you know, what's the rationale for that,
24 you know, is there's some objective measure. And then,
25 you know, another problem I think they have and, you
26 know, we have as their advocate, and the advocate of
27 all hunters in Alaska is if opportunity is taken away
28 under the Federal system is there a way for that
29 opportunity to flow back to the non-Federally-qualified
30 hunter. So those are some things that we really
31 struggle to deal with in our comments. And as
32 representatives of all hunters it would help if we
33 could, you know, get some guidance on how we can be
34 effective doing that.

35

36 And, you know, moving on, you know, the
37 hunters who -- the Federally-qualified hunters who hunt
38 on Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area are doing
39 very well. The days required to harvest a deer are
40 very low compared to their non-Federally-qualified
41 counterparts, although they're doing pretty well too,
42 relative to all hunters -- deer hunters in Southeast.
43 You know a Federally-qualified hunter on Chichagof
44 requires less than two days to harvest a deer, I think
45 that's about as good as it gets, statewide, and the
46 number of deer harvested per hunter, you know, it
47 varies by year but it's about the same now as it was 20
48 years ago, which, you know, things were pretty good
49 then, things are pretty good now.

50

0438

1 So, you know the only text that we see
2 here for why harvest would be declining in the
3 community of Hoonah is because fewer people are
4 hunting. The number -- I believe there was a question
5 from a Council member earlier about, you know, the
6 number of non-Federally-qualified hunters who might
7 feel disenfranchised by a bag limit restriction, I do
8 have those numbers for you. Current -- you know, based
9 on data from 2011 to 2019, roughly 36 percent of non-
10 Federally-qualified hunters on Northeast Chichagof
11 Island are unsuccessful period. So they hunted but
12 they didn't get anything. So more than a third don't
13 harvest any deer. Roughly 30 percent harvest one deer,
14 17 percent harvest two deer. So of all the hunters,
15 that's what, 66 plus 17 and so 83 percent harvest zero,
16 one or two deer. An additional 16 percent, or 17
17 percent, I guess there's some rounding error in there
18 harvest three or four deer. We don't have any data --
19 at least at the time these comments were drafted we did
20 not have 2020 data so we don't know if anyone harvested
21 five or six. For comparison, Federally-qualified users
22 23 percent of Federally-qualified users who did hunt
23 did not harvest deer, 23 percent of Federally-qualified
24 hunters who did hunt harvested one deer, 17 percent
25 harvested two deer, 12 percent harvested three deer,
26 and six and eight percent harvested more, so 14 percent
27 harvested more than four deer.

28
29 So you know those are comparative
30 success rates. Federally-qualified subsistence hunters
31 generally have a higher success rates and have a higher
32 bag limit, at least for the years that these data were
33 compiled that harvested more deer.

34
35 So, yes, the crux of it is that while
36 harvest may have gone down in total it just appears to
37 be that there are fewer people hunting, fewer
38 Federally-qualified people hunting in Hoonah. It
39 doesn't appear that, you know, as the justification for
40 this proposal says, that there's been an increase, a
41 recent increase in competition from non-Federally-
42 qualified, but the data that we have simply doesn't
43 bear that out. And, therefore, the Department cannot
44 support this proposal and, in fact, we oppose it.

45
46 And that'll conclude my comments on
47 this one.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
50

0439

1 Mr. Schumacher. And now we have an opportunity to have
2 questions from the Council to Mr. Schumacher on this
3 proposal and the Fish and Game analysis.

4

5 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, I've got a
6 question. This is Bob.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

9

10 MR. SCHROEDER: Tom, thanks for your
11 presentation of the data. Just I'm not sure of how the
12 designated hunter program works under the State system,
13 but since I've become an old guy I'm pretty aware of
14 that. Basically a designated hunter under the State
15 system can hunt for someone else and what really active
16 hunters tend to do is do that. So that kind of lessens
17 the effectiveness of bag limit, or harvest limits.
18 Could you comment on that Tom, or just let people know
19 how designated hunter works.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, through the
24 Chair to Member Schroeder. The designated hunter
25 program is operated by the -- it's a Federal Program.
26 The State of Alaska offers proxy hunting permits. To
27 qualify for a proxy hunting permit you need to be over
28 65, blind, or 70 percent physically disabled. I don't
29 believe very many proxy permits are used on Northeast
30 Chichagof Island.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: You have anything
33 further, Bob.

34

35 MR. SCHROEDER: No, that's it. And I
36 misspoke about proxy permits, I meant to ask about
37 proxy permits but I think Tom covered it well.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody
40 else for a question for Mr. Schumacher.

41

42 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: I just want to maybe
47 reask the question that I had asked Greg for the
48 analysis, to you Tom. Is there any data available at
49 the wildlife analysis scale like we had for the

50

0440

1 previous proposal, you know, it would be good to know
2 if any inferences could be made from that data or what
3 it looks like because I think some of these time scale
4 effects might be helpful to know about, if there are
5 things that can be inferred.

6
7 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes. To answer your
8 question, the analysis that I presented to you and
9 which I expect you have in your hands, deals with the
10 Wildlife Analysis Areas that would be affected by this
11 proposal, which there are eight, I believe. So each of
12 those Wildlife Analysis Areas, you know, data can be
13 broken down to that scale. I will tell you that as you
14 break data down into smaller and smaller spacial scales
15 it becomes less precise and you have less certainty in
16 the numbers that are provided and it may jump around a
17 lot year to year. So if you're looking for trends over
18 a long term it's better to look at larger geographic
19 areas if you can.

20
21 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Mr. Chair, a
22 follow-up.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

25
26 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, Tom, I understand
27 this. Most of the figures are -- the captions that
28 they're presented at the Unit 4 scale, they're not
29 necessarily represented of just the north end of
30 Chichagof. So for instance, Figure 5 is listed as
31 annually in Unit 4, Figure 7 Federally-qualified users
32 in Unit 4, Figure 8 residents hunting in Unit 4. So it
33 seems like these data are being aggregated at a much
34 larger scale than just the proposed WAA areas outlined
35 in Map 2.

36
37 MR. SCHUMACHER: It sounds to me like
38 you're referring to the Federal analysis. I'm afraid
39 you have me at a disadvantage there because I've been
40 unable to log back on to the Teams meeting and I can't
41 see what you're looking at. It's also an analysis that
42 we did not compile so I'd rather not talk on it.
43 However, I believe most members of the Committee -- or
44 the Council do have the Department draft comments in
45 hand and those are the comments that I referred to when
46 I was speaking.

47
48 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.

49
50

0441

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second,
2 Cal, Ian, do you have any follow-up with that.

3
4 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I mean it sounds
5 like that's where the disconnect is occurring and I'm
6 trying to pull up the ADF&G analysis.

7
8 (Teleconference interference -
9 participants not muted)

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll go to
12 Cal. Cal, go ahead.

13
14 MR. CASIPIT: That's the issue that I
15 brought up on the first day, about a draft Fish and
16 Game analysis that's been floating around that we
17 haven't seen. I believe Ms. Wessels has said that it
18 was -- something about 508 compliance or something the
19 reason it couldn't be shared with -- I'm not sure, but,
20 yeah. The assumption that all the Council members have
21 this is not an assumption that I would make at this
22 point.

23
24 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
25 Wessels. I don't think the Council members have copies
26 of the State analysis. It is usually not the way
27 things were done in the past. State never provided us
28 with a draft analysis prior to the Board meeting. So
29 the only solution that I see to this is if the State
30 wants to share the analysis with the Council and with
31 the public, that the State can distribute this analysis
32 to -- by posting them on their website and this way the
33 public has access to this analysis.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
38 Katya. And, yeah, during the course of this meeting
39 it was distributed over the noon hour, I believe. I
40 don't know where it came from. I don't know if that
41 was from you or from someone else. But, yes, I have
42 seen it, I hope everybody has seen it. Maybe they
43 haven't checked their email so I don't know.

44
45 MR. DUNN: Mr. Chair, this is Greg
46 Dunn.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Greg.

49
50

0442

1 MR. DUNN: I just wanted to make a
2 clarification for everybody because it seemed like I
3 forgot to make the clarification. So from Figure 3 on
4 it's the proposal analysis area, which is the Northeast
5 Chichagof Controlled Use Area so all those numbers are
6 down to that area, not just down by a single WAA.
7 There's like six or seven WAAs in that area. So it's
8 broken down to just that analysis area.

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
11 Greg. And if I could ask a question here. And it
12 relates to Figure 4 in the Federal analysis, so I guess
13 Mr. Schumacher probably doesn't have that, but I guess
14 I can describe it and ask his opinion because it's
15 essentially some of the same data that Fish and Game
16 presented in their analysis. But it shows that -- I'm
17 going to go to the years 2007 and 2008 when the deer
18 population took a steep decline and it seems like
19 that's kind of the change point where things started
20 changing and Figure 4 does deal with annual effort and
21 hunter days in the proposal analysis area, and so I'm
22 assuming that is just Northeast Chichagof area that
23 we're talking about and it's broken down into non-
24 Federal days hunted and Federally-qualified days
25 hunted. So I think that's the data that Mr. Schumacher
26 is using to illustrate that, yes, in the course of
27 these -- and it's a 20 year period, the non-Federally-
28 qualified users and hunter days has remained relatively
29 stable except for those deep declines in the heavy snow
30 years. Prior to the heavy snow years the Federally-
31 qualified [sic] days hunted was always significantly
32 higher than the Federally-qualified [sic] days hunted.
33 It shows a lot of participation by probably Hoonah
34 residents. Significantly more than non-residents.
35 After those heavy snow years everything changes. All
36 of a sudden you start to see that the hunting effort by
37 non-Federally-qualified residents starts to exceed the
38 hunting effort by local residents. And Mr. Schumacher
39 attributes that to just declining participation by
40 hunters out of Hoonah for whatever reason. It could be
41 declining population of Hoonah, could be another factor
42 that maybe we haven't even considered yet. It's hard
43 to determine that.

44
45 But the Fish and Game Department
46 interprets that as indicating that there is not an
47 increase in competition because a hunting effort does
48 not increase by non-local hunters. However, I think
49 the Council kind of recognizes that there's a lot of
50

0443

1 factors involved in competition other than just numbers
2 of deer taken and days hunted and what not. And the
3 fact that -- I wonder if Fish and Game considered the
4 fact that now in more recent times, the last 10 years,
5 the effort by non-local hunters actually exceeds the
6 effort of local hunters, that that fact alone, just
7 that there are now more hunters from outside than there
8 are for local, is that, in and of itself, a reason why
9 people are feeling that there is more competition,
10 they're being out numbered. Did you even consider that
11 fact?

12

13 MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, to Chairman
14 Hernandez. You know I looked at the same data and I
15 think what you're looking at on the Federal analysis is
16 largely similar to what is in the State's analysis. In
17 terms of numbers of hunters and hunting effort, yeah,
18 after the hard winter of 2006/07 there does appear to
19 be a change. You know it took a few years but hunting
20 -- numbers of non-Federally-qualified hunters and
21 hunting effort by those same hunters rebounded to the
22 levels pre-2006. It's the numbers and the days of
23 hunting effort by the Federally-qualified hunters that
24 declined and while it has recovered some, it's a lot
25 lower than it used to be. I guess, you know, in terms
26 of competition, while, yes the relative numbers of
27 people out there has change, the absolute number of
28 hunters, or the competition posed by non-Federally-
29 qualified hunters is the same as it was 20 years ago,
30 so I view that as no change. And if harvest by
31 Federally-qualified users has declined it's because
32 fewer of them are hunting, you know, fewer people in
33 the woods, less harvest, that's just how it works. I
34 don't view that as an increase in competition.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, I'm
37 going to take that as your opinion and other people may
38 have a different opinion. So I think we will just keep
39 that in mind, so thank you.

40

41 Anybody else.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any other
46 questions.

47

48 MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey Kitka.

49

50

0444

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

2

3

4 MR. KITKA: It seems like a few years
5 back when we didn't get the report from the State and
6 they did it verbally, and we still don't have a report
7 in our little hot hands so we can look at it and
8 analyze it a little better, it seems like it's hard to
9 take that report as written, or as it's verbally
10 transmitted. So I don't know what to do with it at
11 this point.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Point

13 taken Harvey. Any other Council members.

14

15 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, this
16 is Frank.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

19

20 MR. WRIGHT: I was wondering, you know,
21 fewer people are hunting, I think that's what the
22 person said and I was wondering where he got those
23 numbers because I live on Front Street and I see skiffs
24 going out all the time so it's kind of like I'm
25 wondering where those numbers came from.

26

27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28

29

30 MR. SCHUMACHER: This is Tom
31 Schumacher, through the Chair to Member Wright. The
32 data presented in our analysis comes from deer harvest
33 ticket reports. And we discussed earlier how everyone
34 has to get deer harvest tickets to hunt deer, those
35 harvest tickets come with a mandatory reporting
36 requirement and the data we take in, you know, for
37 Federally-qualified and non-Federally-qualified hunters
38 comes from those reports. So the data from Northeast
39 Chichagof came from people from Hoonah, that's what
40 they told us for the last 23 years.

40

41 MR. WRIGHT: Hello, Mr. Chair.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

44

45

46 MR. WRIGHT: I like Mr. Casipit's
47 suggestion that, you know, there's a lot of people that
48 don't get any because there's not much around here in
49 Port Frederick or you can't go outside Icy Straits
50 because it might be too rough or something in their

50

0445

1 Lunds, but I think putting on the ticket that
2 unsuccessful hunts are there.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.
7 Any other questions for the Department of Fish and
8 Game.

9

10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

11

12 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Howard, I believe.

15

16 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
17 from Pelican, I'll defer to Ian if Ian you want to go
18 first.

19

20 MR. JOHNSON: Sure, thanks, Jim.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that Ian, go
23 ahead Ian.

24

25 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir, thank you, Mr.
26 Chair. I guess I'm going to ask what ultimately is
27 probably an unanswerable question. But, Tom, do you
28 know -- let's say hypothetically that Hoonah users are
29 under reporting the amount of effort by say, you know,
30 70 percent, say it was three times higher than it is,
31 which, actually my instinct tells me that it may be
32 that, but I'm just wondering what -- do you -- I'm
33 thinking back to the question about competition and how
34 it looks like it's represented in the analysis. If the
35 number of user days was three times higher, would that
36 cause a change in the Department's position on this
37 proposal?

38

39 MR. SCHUMACHER: It's really hard to
40 say. The data here spans two types of harvest
41 reporting prior to 2011, it was a mailout survey to
42 about 30 percent of hunters in each community. So if
43 you got deer harvest tickets we selected 30 percent of
44 hunters in each community by random and sent them a
45 survey. Roughly a third of those people responded to
46 the survey. So data from 1997 through 2010, actually
47 earlier than 1997, but 1997 is where my graph ends, is
48 based on responses of about 12 percent of hunters. In
49 2010 the Board of Game, at the request of rural
50

0446

1 communities, largely to do a better job of documenting
2 deer harvest and deer hunting effort enacted a
3 mandatory harvest reporting requirement for harvest
4 tickets. As with any change, you know, it got off to a
5 little bit of a rocky start with relatively low
6 reporting requirements in some communities. Over the
7 years the Department has worked vigorously to improve
8 those reporting rates and we've been successful but it
9 takes some work. You know we -- as I mentioned
10 earlier, if a community has a reporting rate of lower
11 than 60 percent we actually call people up and ask just
12 to get it up to about 60 percent because we feel that's
13 a number that represents nearly -- you know, most
14 points of view, most experiences of hunters in that
15 community.

16
17 So I guess a good way to address your
18 question is if we had a higher reporting rate is would
19 the answer differ. When I look at -- for a change
20 between 2010 and 2011 in the graph, if you don't have
21 our analysis in front of you you can look at the Forest
22 Service analysis, they're based on the same numbers,
23 you don't see any great difference between 2010 and
24 2011 when we switched harvest reporting methods, and we
25 have, you know, if prior 2011 we had reports from maybe
26 12 percent of hunters and now we have reports from
27 about 60 percent of hunters, that's a five-fold
28 increase and that five-fold increase didn't really
29 change the magnitude of any of the measurements that we
30 take. So what that says, from a data analytic's point
31 of view, is that we're really sampling the same
32 population. The difference between the old deer hunter
33 survey and the current harvest ticket reporting is that
34 because we get so many more respondents we can have
35 more confidence in the results. So maybe that's a long
36 roundabout way of saying, if we got a higher reporting
37 in Hoonah it might change things a little bit but it's
38 probably not going to change it a lot.

39
40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Did you
41 have a question as well, Jim.

42
43 MR. SLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No,
44 I think it was covered close enough by the answer
45 there. It was based on harvest tickets and lack of
46 compliance and so on, similar to comments that were
47 brought out for the previous proposal.

48
49 Thank you.

50

0447

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
2 Any other questions.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think
7 we're done with Fish and Game testimony. Thank you
8 again, Mr. Schumacher.

9
10 MR. SCHUMACHER: You're welcome.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any other -- was
13 that somebody?

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No, okay. Any
18 other agencies, Federal or tribal, want to comment on
19 this.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hearing none. Do
24 we have comments from other Regional Advisory
25 Committees or local Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

26
27 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
28 Wessels. We have a comment in your meeting book from
29 one of the Advisory Committees, Juneau/Douglas Advisory
30 Committee and it's on Page 214 of your meeting books.
31 So for the sake of time I'm not going to read it into
32 the record but it's in your meeting books.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
37 And I think Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee kind of
38 covered all three proposals in their comments, and they
39 were read previously so we can keep those in mind.

40
41 Do we have a summary of written public
42 comments. And, once again you know I think there were
43 60 -- approximately 60 written public comments and many
44 of them covered all three of the proposals that we're
45 dealing with

46
47 (Teleconference interference -
48 participants not muted)

49
50

0448

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: so we
2 probably summarized them previously but are there any
3 comments specific to this proposal.

4
5 MR. DUNN: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
6 Greg.

7
8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Greg.

9
10 MR. DUNN: So we had 44 written public
11 comments opposed to the proposal and two were neutral.
12 The one neutral comment from the Sportsman Alliance
13 asked the Board to only approve the proposal if it was
14 supported by scientific evidence. The other neutral
15 comment suggested that the bag limit proposed would be
16 more appropriate than the closures proposed in 7 and 9.
17 The highlights among the concerns are:

18
19 The proposal will force non-Federally-
20 qualified hunters into a smaller area leading into over
21 crowding and unsafe conditions.

22
23 The deer population is healthy making a
24 closure unwarranted.

25
26 The proposal is not based on sound
27 science or justified by data.

28
29 The proposal will further divide user
30 groups.

31
32 The assertion that Federally-qualified
33 subsistence users have had trouble meeting their needs
34 is not supported by the evidence.

35
36 Environmental conditions such as harsh
37 winter conditions are the primary drivers of deer
38 abundance rather than hunting so the proposal will not
39 increase the availability of deer.

40
41 The proposal would exclude non-
42 qualified family members of qualified users from
43 hunting together.

44
45 And the existing January season for
46 Federally-qualified users provides them with sufficient
47 priority for deer.

48
49 And that's it.

50

0449

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
2 for that summary again, Greg. So now it's time for
3 public testimony on this particular proposal. So once
4 again we go to the phone lines and ask if there's
5 anybody standing by that would like to give an oral
6 testimony on this proposal. And I will ask before we
7 start the testimony if I could hear from folks online
8 and I'll make a list of.....

9
10 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:them and.....

13
14 MS. WESSELS: Pardon my interruption,
15 this is Katya Wessels. We just received an additional
16 written public comment from Patricia Phillips on WP22-
17 08. So I just received it a couple of minutes ago in
18 the email subsistence@fws.gov. So she's -- it's kind
19 of hard -- I mean I'll try to read it but it says:

20
21 Figure 4, average number of non-
22 Federally-qualified users harvest in 01, two deer is
23 1,314 (ph) hunters. Average number of non-Federally-
24 qualified users harvesting three and four deer is 282
25 hunters, 282 underscored -- underlined. Total non-
26 Federally-qualified users 1,596 hunters. With most of
27 the effort and harvest in November. The analysis
28 trends recent years of increasing harvest from non-
29 Federally-qualified users. Figure 7, Page 183, 500
30 days hunted, non-Federally-qualified users in November,
31 this is 16 (ph) 17 (ph) hunters per day, 200 days
32 hunted Federally-qualified users in November, this is
33 six to seven hunters per day. This would give the
34 perception that there increasing effort by non-
35 Federally-qualified. Question. What, in fact, will
36 harvest from this proposal effect on non-Federally-
37 qualified hunter, who can then hunt six deer outside of
38 the NECCUA. Thank you. Patricia Phillips, Pelican
39 Alaska.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
42 Katya. I forgot about incoming email comments. Thank
43 you for reminding us of that. And thank you Patty
44 Phillips for submitting that information for us to hash
45 over. So now public testimony on the telephone. I'm
46 looking for a list of names of people who are standing
47 by. So just go ahead and start shouting out if you're
48 on the phone.

49
50

0450

1 MR. ORR: Nicholas Orr, Juneau.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Nick Orr,
4 got you. Anybody else.

5

6 MR. BEASON: Ryan Beason, Territorial
7 Sportsman.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Ryan again. Okay,
10 anybody else.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think that's it.
15 So, yeah, Mr. Orr testified at the previous proposal,
16 you have something to add on this one, go ahead.

17

18 MR. ORR: Yeah, I just wanted to note
19 that there's a lot of cabin owners in Freshwater Bay
20 and this was in some of the comments that were
21 submitted, although, not one of the dominate themes.
22 There are a lot of cabin owners in Freshwater Bay who
23 don't really compete with -- I don't think they compete
24 with the road system hunters from Hoonah, who this
25 would adversely effect. And these guys have a lot of
26 money into these cabins and a number of them have
27 bought wood from the mill there and they supported the
28 economy. So I'm not sure -- I think this is
29 unnecessary for those folks. And then I kind of
30 question whether reducing a bag limit from three to two
31 would help rural users meet their subsistence needs
32 just given -- most people are only shooting two deer
33 anyways. So there's a lot of deer there, you just have
34 to get out of your truck to go get them, I think is my
35 comment on that.

36

37 So that's it, and I hope the meeting
38 proceeds quickly.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
41 Mr. Orr. Anybody on the Council have a question for
42 Mr. Orr.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
47 again. How about Ryan Beason, go ahead.

48

49 MR. BEASON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0451

1 Again, I won't go through the same comments as my
2 previous proposal. So I won't go through those in
3 detail, they're the same. We oppose this and agree
4 with ADF&G's comments. I will bring up a couple points
5 up from the last discussion that I felt were really
6 good, a couple Council members brought up a working
7 group. I think this is a great idea. I believe it was
8 done in Unit 2 deer as well. I think this will bring a
9 lot of parties to the table to discuss this and have a
10 way to have everybody have a voice in this. I think a
11 lot of people are being left out in their voices right
12 now so I think that's a great idea and I really
13 appreciated the idea.

14

15 A couple other issues to bring up here.
16 This might be my limited knowledge, but enforcement of
17 these, I can't see that I've ever seen any Federal
18 agencies out and about this time of year. I guess this
19 maybe is a question in general but if somebody could
20 answer it, who enforces these and if there is nobody to
21 enforce it, how does that work.

22

23 And lastly I just wanted to bring up
24 the unintended consequences of this with Proposal 22-07
25 on Admiralty being recommended to pass, how this will
26 impact users that will now go over to this Northern
27 Chichagof and potentially increase the unit there. So
28 I think by having these subparcels in Unit 4 being
29 broken off it's going to create a lot of unintended
30 consequences and shift people to certain areas where,
31 you know, it may affect other hunts and other users as
32 well.

33

34 So thank you, I appreciate your time.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
37 Mr. Beason. Does anyone on the Council have a question
38 they'd like to ask.

39

40 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

43

44 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
45 And thank you, Ryan, for bringing up that last point in
46 your comments. One question that I had for the folks
47 that did our analysis for us that I'll now pose to you,
48 is, when you were considering these proposals, did you
49 consider the effects cumulatively and I mean it sounds
50

0452

1 like you kind of have thought like what the effect of
2 approving Proposal -- if the Board were to approve
3 Proposal 07, what effects that might have, but did you
4 also consider like if 09 goes, is that going to
5 potentially negatively create more competition in the
6 Hoonah area. I'm just wondering if you guys looked at
7 things a little bit holistically.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. It sounds
12 like that was a question back to the Staff.

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.
15 Actually that was for Ryan for -- because I know that
16 he did work with the Territorial Sportsman, they
17 provided comments for all three proposals but I was
18 just wondering if their discussions were centered
19 around a more holistic, how these proposals impact one
20 another.

21

22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
25 Cathy. Mr. Beason, you want to answer that.

26

27 MR. BEASON: Yes, certainly. Thank you,
28 Mr. Chair and Cathy. I really appreciate the question.
29 No, we did not discuss this. It will be something we
30 definitely discuss before the Federal Subsistence Board
31 meeting because it just came up to me after the other
32 proposal was recommended to pass. So we have not
33 discussed it but it will be something we are discussing
34 in the future.

35

36 So thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

39

40 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is

41 Albert.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Who is this?

44

45 MR. HOWARD: It's Albert.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Albert, go ahead,

48 Albert.

49

50

0453

1 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 This is for the gentleman at Territorial Sportsman.
3 How much area do you need to hunt because you have the
4 whole east side of Admiralty Island, (Indiscernible -
5 muffled) Canal and that whole area, so I'm kind of
6 confused here. A lot of what you're saying kind of
7 contradicts itself and seems to be threatening to some
8 point and I'm just wondering how much areas do you
9 actually need and do you understand the subsistence
10 priority and the intent of it.

11

12 MR. BEASON: Thank you for the
13 question. I guess there's really no answer as far as
14 the exact area. I think what Territorial Sportsman is
15 for is for access to all individuals, especially
16 Alaskans. And what I think this is doing is just
17 pitting us against each other. And your second
18 question, yes, I'm very familiar with subsistence
19 needs. I live in Juneau, but, however, I live off the
20 land as well. I don't want to compare myself to anybody
21 else but I am aware of subsistence needs.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
26 Any other questions for Mr. Beason.

27

28 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

31

32 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry, slow on this one
33 this is actually a follow-up to Mr. Orr's comment. I
34 do want to note that we're not just talking about a bag
35 limit change, we're also talking about limitation to
36 male only deer, and I think that's actually a
37 significant component that hasn't been necessarily
38 acknowledged to-date through our discussion. So
39 looking, for instance, at Figure 6, and others, you
40 know, there's a pretty significant number of does
41 harvested annually and that would -- this proposal
42 would change that. So I want to put that out there,
43 you know, for Freshwater Bay users, I guess, I'm
44 thinking about them, you know, yeah, it would just
45 limit their ability to harvest does at that point.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any
48 response Mr. Orr, or maybe not necessarily.

49

50

0454

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
4 questions.

5

6 MR. ORR: Hello, sorry, I had a problem
7 with my mute button. Hello.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, is that
10 Nick.

11

12 MR. ORR: Yeah, this is Nick Orr, I'm
13 sorry, I had a problem with my mute button.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, if you
16 wanted to respond to that last question, go ahead.

17

18 MR. ORR: I was just asking for a
19 clarification, are we talking about from like three
20 bucks -- three deer to just two bucks only?

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes. Yes, to
23 answer your question, that is what the proposal is,
24 correct, is eliminate.....

25

26 MR. ORR: Yeah, I.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:harvest
29 of.....

30

31 MR. ORR: Personally, I wouldn't have a
32 problem and I don't think a lot of people would have a
33 problem if it was three deer, bucks only. I mean as
34 one of the -- one of the figures here, I think Figure 6
35 shows most people -- I'm not sure which figure it is,
36 but -- or yeah Figure 6 shows most people are shooting
37 bucks anyways and I don't think that would be an issue
38 for most people. But I think the bag limit change is
39 not helpful. So that was my comment.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
42 for that. Any other questions.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 MR. HOWARD: One quick question, this
47 is Albert.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,

50

0455

1 Albert.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. HOWARD: When you mention the bag limit change is not helpful, not helpful to who?

MR. ORR: Yeah, I would say that -- through the Chair. I'd say that it does not help the rural users meet their subsistence needs to limit from three deer to two deer. But if you start eliminating the take of does that certainly has a widespread follow through ramifications for the population in future years. If you look at goats, mountain goats, ADF&G has some really good materials that show how the removal of females out of a population considerably limit the population going forward.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you for that. Any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think I can thank you gentlemen for your testimony. Appreciate it very much. And now it's time for the Council to recommend an action on Wildlife Proposal 22-08. So we'll be looking for a motion.

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I move to support Wildlife Proposal 22-08.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.

MR. HOWARD: Second, this is Albert.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert. Okay, the proposal is now open for deliberation. What are the thoughts of the Council on this one.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

MR. JOHNSON: I mean I think I can give the proposal the same kind of local context that Albert was able to provide in Angoon from what I've heard from the community and what I've experienced in my own time

0456

1 out harvesting.

2

3

4 So last season was a particularly hard,
5 competition-wise. There was days I'd go out and I'd
6 have to hop over, you know, say three bays. There was
7 one time I went to Flynn Cove and Chicken Creek and
8 finding in a -- compromising in a spot where we really
9 didn't really want to be and we didn't end up getting
10 any deer that day. It was really common last year
11 because of the early snowfall. We had three weeks of
12 like 16 inches of snow starting the first week in
13 November and extending through most of November. It
14 put a lot of pressure on the deer. And so I just -- I
15 want to reiterate that aspect of competition as a
16 strong factor.

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

I also, I guess in terms of -- I mean
it's hard to fit this into the justification narrative
but I just know that in many cases hunter success rate,
especially average hunter success rate is lower than
indicated in the analysis and I think that tends to be
attributed to just the competition factor. There was
-- last year, you know, one of the things that exists
here that doesn't exist other places is in some places
the really extensive road network and that allows you
to get to coastlines that you don't have to take a
skiff to. And so there's a place here, Whitestone
Harbor, that experienced really, really high pressure
from skiffs and from, what I presume is non-local
users, I don't have a way to confirm that -- or I'm
sorry, non-Federally-qualified users, the others, the
hunters from Hoonah who would drive out to Whitestone
Harbor and basically not be able to hunt there because
of the continuing -- like having three boats parked up
at Whitestone Harbor hunting the entire thing, like
every weekend, during the week too.

(Teleconference interference -
participants not muted- loud whistling)

MR. JOHNSON: And then in terms of
population status in Hoonah, as a justification, I
guess I'm considering what I think is my pretty
reasonable observations of deer population and, again,
this is what I've heard from others, is that the deer
numbers are just a little bit down right now. I'm not
saying that -- I don't think I could say there's a
conservation concern, it's nothing like that, but I'm
an Alpine hunter myself, I've been on top of I guess

0457

1 four different mountains this season and it's been a
2 pretty mixed bag up there in terms of what's been
3 available. Some mountains actually did have pretty
4 good populations and some were literally blank like
5 with no sign. So, yeah, just between that and the same
6 kind of stories coming from other Alpine hunters, I
7 think numbers aren't as high right now as they may be.
8 I'm not saying it's a conservation concern but I do
9 think the lack of inclusion of winter 2019 and winter
10 2020 data within the analysis kind of misrepresents the
11 intent of the proposal. When it was put in we were
12 partly responding to the relatively difficult winters
13 we had where we would have four to five feet of snow
14 down to the timberline all the way through May, or at
15 least late April. It was a tough year for the deer.

16

17 So thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
20 Ian for (indiscernible - muffled) us out with all that
21 information. So how about other Council members,
22 anybody else want to talk about what their thoughts on
23 this are and maybe address justifications for those.

24

25 (Teleconference interference -
26 participants not muted)

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.
29 Can I take a shot at some additional justification.

30

31 (Teleconference interference -
32 participants not muted)

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

35

36 (Teleconference interference -
37 participants not muted)

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: Excuse me, there's
40 somebody who isn't muted and I would like to speak
41 without being interrupted. Thank you.

42

43 (Teleconference interference -
44 participants not muted)

45

46 MR. CASIPIT: Okay, it sounds clear
47 now.

48

49 (Teleconference interference -

50

0458

1 participants not muted)

2

3

MR. CASIPIT: Was that you, Mr. Chair?

4

5

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No, go ahead, Cal.

6

7

MR. CASIPIT: Okay, thank you. First of all, I think this is a very good proposal. I'm going to be voting for it, several reasons why.

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

Number 1. I think there is a documented concern about, and it's held up by local traditional knowledge that there is competition on the Hoonah road system from non-Federally-qualified users, you know, Hoonah still does get ferries, thank goodness. I guess that's good and bad because it's able to bring a lot of folks from Juneau to go deer hunting there, I know that's still going on. But that being said, to me, it's a very measured approach to dealing with this increasing competition. It's not asking for a closure of any areas, or any time closures, it's just simply requesting a reduction in the bag limit and limiting it to bucks only. I know in the justification it says it might not, you know, the Federal Staff said it might not make that big of a difference, but I think at this point we should try, I mean it may make a difference. So, you know that doesn't bother me.

Also this talk about, you know, whether it's necessary and all this kind of stuff, well, that -- you know to me that applies to hard closures, like time -- closures of time or closures of area, but just an adjustment in a bag limit to try to address an issue like this seems reasonable and it seems like it's a measured approach to finding the solution. And for that reason I'm supporting it.

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

You know so anyway thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal. Any other Council members want to weigh in on this one.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would agree with what Member Casipit has said. After reconsideration, I would mention that based on the

0459

1 analysis and what was in the book and, prior, I
2 probably would not have supported this proposal because
3 I think because there is not a conservation concern
4 within the unit, restricting non-Federally-qualified
5 subsistence users is not necessary and I don't want to
6 unnecessarily restrict them. However, that being said,
7 I think that this is not a closure, it is just a
8 reduction in bag limit to provide a little more
9 opportunity for those right around Hoonah. I think
10 that in my mind if Wildlife Proposal 22-07 were to pass
11 that it would potentially increase competition in and
12 around Hoonah by non-Federally-qualified subsistence
13 users that reside in Juneau even though they may have
14 the whole east side of Admiralty to hunt, I think that
15 Hoonah would then become a more popular place to go to
16 hunt the road system and access, and I think we would
17 potentially see those shifts.

18
19 I want to state for the record that I
20 don't know those things, and the analysis doesn't
21 necessarily show those things and I still really feel
22 like for Unit 4 that we should highly recommend that a
23 Unit 4 deer strategy be approached so that all
24 communities in the unit and all Federally-qualified
25 subsistence users have a little more dialogue about
26 what their needs are in the unit. I just think that we
27 are moving pretty fast by throwing these proposals out
28 there without looking at things more holistically and
29 looking at the cumulative impacts of what these
30 proposals have on one another. But I just wanted that
31 on the record.

32
33 And for the reasons that Mr. Casipit
34 put forward and the fact that this was not a proposal
35 to actually close an area to non-Federally-qualified
36 subsistence users I can see myself supporting this
37 proposal.

38
39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.

42
43 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this Albert.

44
45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody else.

46
47 MR. HOWARD: This is Albert, Mr.
48 Chairman.

49
50

0460

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

2

3

4 MR. HOWARD: I thought we were done
5 with Proposal WP22-07. To keep bringing it up in that
6 context is like beating a dead horse. I did ask for
7 ideas to move this forward and got nothing and I've
8 also gotten an absolute no when I asked what if we took
9 4044 off the table. So, you know, I don't understand
10 why this has to be compared to that. We voted on it.
11 In my political career, when a majority votes on it,
12 the rest have to support it whether they like it or
13 not. I don't know if that's how this works as well but
14 thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Duly noted,
17 Albert. But, yeah, I think Cathy was just making a
18 point for having a more -- trying to get to a more
19 holistic approach for the whole unit. I guess I was
20 going to weigh in on that as well.

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

 So -- like I say, I'm in favor of
advancing these community-based solutions to a
developing problem and see if we can't get somewhere on
this situation down the line. So that's my feeling. I
believe they're justified.

 So any other Council members want to
weigh in.

0461

1 MR. SCHROEDER: Don, this is Bob
2 Schroeder.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Bob.

5
6 MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah, my phone cut out
7 for a little while there so I missed a little bit of
8 what was being said. I have two comments.

9
10 One was related to, I did ask Mr.
11 Schumacher a comment about designated hunter/proxy
12 permits. And because designated hunter and proxy
13 permits exist for this particular deer hunt, in fact
14 they'd be proxy permits, and kind of what happens is,
15 if someone's a really active hunter and they're able to
16 shoot a lot of deer it's pretty easy for them to get
17 proxy permits. My son is one of those types of guys
18 and he'll regularly harvest a dozen deer or more that
19 he supplies to elders and people who can't hunt for
20 themselves. He's a Juneau resident. So anybody going
21 into this area who wanted to shoot a bunch of deer just
22 has to go through a relatively minor step of getting a
23 proxy permit for one or two people and they could
24 harvest quite a few deer. So that limits the
25 effectiveness of harvest limits on cutting down deer
26 hunting.

27
28 The second is, it's really interesting
29 everyone loves the Prince of Wales deer planning group
30 that met many years ago. And I was involved in that,
31 and it would be really great to do that. I don't know
32 that it's in the cards. That cost upwards of a quarter
33 of a million dollars and took a huge amount of Staff
34 time on top of that. That was the actual dollar cost.
35 And I haven't seen any enthusiasm from either the State
36 or the Federal government to spend those kinds of bucks
37 on a planning effort. So it may be a really great idea
38 but, you know, you got to put resources behind it.

39
40 That's about what I have on this at
41 this time. Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thanks for
44 those comments, Bob. Anybody else.

45
46 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

49
50

0462

1 MR. JOHNSON: Just responding to Mr.
2 Schroeder there and thinking about our initial comments
3 from the Forest Service. There's the Southeast Alaska
4 Sustainability Strategy occurring right now, and I'm
5 not saying this is an opportunity for that but at the
6 same time seems like it could be, and there may be
7 dollars out there right now.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
12 for that, Ian. Anybody else.

13
14 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

17
18 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I think I'll ask Mr.
19 Schroeder's boy to proxy hunt for me, I can't get my
20 nephew to do it. But anyway I'm in favor of this
21 motion. I think the ferry is kind of a blessing in
22 disguise that they don't come here all the time
23 anymore.

24
25 So thank you, Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.
28 Anybody else, thoughts on this, more justification or
29 just added comments.

30
31 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, Mike
32 Douville.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Mr. Douville.

35
36 MR. DOUVILLE: I've listened to Cal,
37 I've listened to Cathy and listened to you, and I will
38 support this, you all had good points. I will support.
39 Listening to those, my thoughts are -- feelings are
40 similar. But, you know, Mr. Schroeder mentioned Prince
41 of Wales deer summit or whatever it was, planning, it
42 was quite some time ago and actually we are pursuing
43 another one because things have changed since that many
44 years ago, old growth, young growth, more issues, all
45 kinds of stuff so just as general information on that
46 part. We are pursuing an updated one. But in any case
47 I will support the motion.

48
49 Thank you.

50

0463

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
2 Mike. Any other Council members.

3
4 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
5 from Pelican.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

8
9 MR. SLATER: Thank you. I wanted to
10 comment on that this is a different approach than we
11 have proposed here in Pelican and we've seen other
12 proposals and I'm very interested to see how the two
13 things will play out if either one is implemented. I
14 do believe that a reduced bag limit provides more
15 opportunity for non-Federally-qualified people,
16 hunters, but I also do think that it has maybe the
17 potential for having less effect. So I'm curious to
18 see if it will have effect, and anxious and hoping that
19 it does because it would be a fair solution.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
24 Jim. Anybody else.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are we ready to
29 vote.

30
31 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, I call for the
32 question.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
35 Cal. Question's been called for. The motion is to
36 adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-08 as written on Page 174 of
37 our Council books. This proposal would state that
38 September 15th through January 31st, non-Federally-
39 qualified users are limited to two male deer on
40 Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area.

41
42 So, Frank, if you want to do a roll
43 call vote on this one.

44
45 MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

46
47 MR. JOHNSON: Ian votes yes.

48
49 MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

50

0464

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

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

MR. SLATER: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Albert votes yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

MR. ROBBINS: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

(No comments)

MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

(No comments)

MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Motion passes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Frank. Did I hear your vote in there.

MR. WRIGHT: I voted yes. Sorry about
that.

0465

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, very good.
2 Okay, motion passes. We'll go ahead and move on to the
3 next proposal, Wildlife Proposal 22-09, and do we have
4 a presenter ready to do that proposal.

5
6 MR. DUNN: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is Greg
7 Dunn again.

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Mr. Dunn, go
10 ahead and are you going to be doing the same analysis
11 for both 9 and 10?

12
13 MR. DUNN: Yes, I was going to ask you
14 if you'd like me to present them together because we
15 have them up as presented together.

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think that would
18 be fine, same situation, different solution.

19
20 MR. DUNN: Correct.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So go ahead.

23
24 MR. DUNN: For the record, this is Greg
25 Dunn, Wildlife Biologist with the Tongass National
26 Forest. The executive summary for Wildlife Proposals
27 22-09 and 10 are on Page 245 of your Council books and
28 the analysis begins on Page 246.

29
30 Wildlife Proposal WP22-09 submitted by
31 the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
32 Council requests that Federal public lands draining
33 into Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait, and Stag Bay
34 south of latitude of Mike Cove and north of latitude of
35 Lost Cove be closed to deer hunting October 1st through
36 December 31st except by Federally-qualified subsistence
37 users.

38
39 Wildlife Proposal WP22-10 submitted by
40 Patricia Phillips of Pelican requests that deer harvest
41 limit for non-Federally-qualified users in Lisianski
42 Inlet and Lisianski Strait be reduced to four deer.

43
44 The proponent of WP22-09 stated that it
45 recently became more challenging to Federally-qualified
46 subsistence users in Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait
47 and Stag Bay to harvest sufficient deer for their needs
48 due to increased hunting pressure from non-Federally-
49 qualified users. They state that regulatory change is
50

1 needed to protect the deer population from further
2 depletion and increase opportunity for Federally-
3 qualified subsistence users.

4
5 The proponent of WP22-10 stated that
6 hunting pressure from non-Federally-qualified users
7 results in Federally-qualified subsistence users deer
8 needs not being met. The proponent further contends
9 that bear predation on deer population has deer staying
10 out of the deer fringe which makes deer skittish when
11 there is ongoing deer hunting pressure.

12
13 These proposals would restrict non-
14 Federally-qualified users from hunting deer in portions
15 of Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait and all of Stag
16 Bay. Restricting non-Federally-qualified users could
17 decrease overall deer harvest and reduce competition
18 with Federally-qualified subsistence users in the area.
19 Lower harvest and reduced competition may lead to more
20 favorable hunting conditions for Federally-qualified
21 subsistence users. Non-Federally-qualified users may
22 shift some deer hunting effort to other areas of Unit 4
23 possibly displacing other hunters.

24
25 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
26 oppose these proposals. They have the same
27 justification.

28
29 Restricting deer hunting in the
30 analysis area for non-Federally-qualified users does
31 not appear necessary for conservation because deer
32 populations in Unit 4 are high and may be approaching
33 carrying capacity in some locations. Hunting effort in
34 Unit 4 by non-Federally-qualified is highest in
35 November and to a lesser extent in December. This
36 could be evidence that increased competition during
37 this time may be a factor affecting Federally-qualified
38 subsistence users needs being met. However, the
39 success rate in November for residents in Pelican has
40 been 86 percent or higher since 2014 and the annual
41 success rate has been 93 percent or higher since 2017.
42 The number of deer harvested per hunter has been
43 trending up since 2009, thus a partial season closure
44 to non-Federally-qualified users in the proposal area
45 does not appear necessary to continue subsistence uses.
46 Very few non-Federally-qualified hunters harvest more
47 than three deer annually in Unit 4 so restricting them
48 to four deer annually would not significantly affect
49 harvest or effort by non-Federally-qualified users or
50

0467

1 the hunting experience of Federally-qualified
2 subsistence users. Lowering the harvest limit for non-
3 Federally-qualified users does not appear necessary to
4 continue subsistence uses.

5

6 And that is the conclusion.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
9 Greg. So now it's.....

10

11 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
12 Wessels.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:time for --
15 oh, Katya, go ahead.

16

17 MS. WESSELS: Yes, I just want to ask
18 Greg one clarifying question. You're saying that the
19 season would be closed to deer hunting, what's the
20 dates, because I thought I might have misheard
21 something.

22

23 MR. DUNN: Mr. Chair. To answer that
24 question, October 15th through December 31st.

25

26 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Greg.

27

28 MR. DUNN: Yes.

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Hopefully that's
31 clear to everybody.

32

33 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal,
34 can I have a quick question of the Staff please.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure, go ahead
37 it's time for questions.

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40 You know I was following you right along there at the
41 end and I was kind of understanding what was going on
42 and then you said something about reducing the bag
43 limit from -- the harvest limit for non-Federally-
44 qualified users from six to four wouldn't make a
45 difference because nobody harvests more than four, so
46 up until 2019, so that means only two years have passed
47 where they could anyway, so I'm not sure we could say
48 that, is what I'm saying. Because up until recently
49 non-Federally-qualified users could only harvest four
50

0468

1 in the area anyway. It's only recently that they could
2 harvest six. So I don't know that you could say that
3 unless I misunderstood you and I need to be corrected.

4

5 MR. DUNN: Through the Chair. No, you
6 did not misunderstand me and we did not have the data
7 from 2020 to see how many deer -- how many hunters
8 harvested over four deer. So that's why it looked like
9 that.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, so is that
12 clear Cal.

13

14 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, I have a
15 question, this is Ian.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

18

19 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Mr. Dunn,
20 this kind of goes back to my initial question last
21 time, actually in the analysis it looks like it's done
22 at the unit scale again, which I understand a little
23 better now. But I'm actually comparing Figure 5 from
24 the previous one to the current one, it looks like the
25 data are the exact same, and the same goes for Figure 7
26 -- well, Figure 7 in the Hoonah one but Figure 5 in the
27 current analysis looks to be the same data, so, again,
28 I'm just going back to kind of, you know, it seems like
29 this should be an analysis of the Pelican area but it
30 seems like there's data being represented in two
31 different scenarios -- like the Hoonah scenario and the
32 Pelican scenario, we have the same data representing
33 both, is that -- why would that be?

34

35 MR. DUNN: Yes, through the Chair,
36 thank you for that question. So to clarify, if you
37 looked at Map 2 there's four different WAAs right
38 there, those are represented in Figure 2 and Figure 3,
39 Figure 4 and Figure 5 show all of Unit 4 because we
40 couldn't break those ones actually down to that
41 specific analysis area. But Figures 2 and 3 were
42 broken down to those specific areas.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Did that answer
45 your question, Ian.

46

47 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I mean I understand
48 but it just does seem hard to make an inference from it
49 just because, you know, there's no indication of how
50

0469

1 then these are weighted in Pelican, like for instance
2 Figure 1, one deer, two deers, like this bar graph, how
3 does that get weighted across Unit 4, I mean it could
4 be drastically different, you know, depending -- you
5 know, for instance, zero deer with a column of 579,
6 there's no representation at this point of like where
7 these zero deer hunters are being -- are distributed,
8 if that's evenly across Unit 4, or if it's heavily in
9 Pelican or heavily in Hoonah, or others. So it makes
10 it difficult.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Good point
13 to consider, Ian. I don't know if there's an answer to
14 that. Do we have an another question for Mr. Dunn.

15

16 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.

19

20 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 Kind of along those same lines as Ian, my understanding
22 is that when people report deer harvest it goes into a
23 database and I understand that OSM probably asks for
24 the data from Fish and Game, and I guess what I don't
25 understand is why they don't have access to this
26 information. On top of that, I don't know the
27 timeframe of when this analysis was done but I do know,
28 personally, because I asked Fish and Game for it back
29 in June because when I was having discussions with
30 users in Unit 4 they kept referring to the Fish and
31 Game analysis and so I asked Fish and Game if I could
32 get a copy of those numbers, which actually do start
33 addressing some of these questions that Ian is getting
34 at and so if that information was available back in
35 June, I'm wondering why it wasn't available -- I'm
36 asking if it was not available for OSM at the same
37 time.

38

39 That's one question, and then I have a
40 second unrelated question if you can answer that.

41

42 MR. DUNN: Yes, through the Chair, to
43 answer Cathy's question. Yeah, so we asked for all
44 that information and we did not receive it when we were
45 doing the analysis. So we were able to break some of
46 it down with a lot of the information we got but we did
47 not -- we were unable to get everything broken down
48 into all that.

49

50

0470

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you for that. I
2 guess I'm just disappointed because there are Federal
3 regulations for managing deer populations within the
4 unit and for the regulatory agencies that oversee that
5 to not have access to the data, I mean they actually
6 have to go out and ask for it, which just seems awkward
7 to me. They should just be able to log into a database
8 that spits out the information to them because all of
9 that stuff is reported online, it's voluntary -- or
10 it's a requirement to be reported online so it just
11 seems like you should be able to get it.

12
13 But that's not related to my next
14 question which is I was reading -- when I was reading
15 this some of the comments talked about predation and I
16 was wondering whether or not OSM looked at whether or
17 not there were any impacts from predation on deer in
18 the analysis area, or like rates of predation or
19 anything like that.

20
21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22
23 MR. DUNN: Yes, Mr. Chair, to answer
24 Cathy's question. I read through -- we didn't -- I
25 don't think there was any way to tell if there was
26 excess predation by like bears like what the local
27 knowledge showed so it was not included into this
28 analysis because there was no way to show that
29 predation.

30
31 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cathy.
34 Any other questions from the Council.

35
36 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
37 from Pelican.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

40
41 MR. SLATER: Good, I just wanted to
42 confirm the local data that we see where data was
43 extracted specifically about Lisianski Inlet area,
44 that's all obtained from harvest tickets, or harvest
45 reports?

46
47 MR. DUNN: Through the Chair. That is
48 -- that's -- that is my understanding that they get all
49 that information from the harvest reports and the
50

0471

1 harvests -- they send out a questionnaire as well so
2 they extract some data from that.

3

4 MR. SLATER: Okay, thank you. We've
5 had discussions about the harvest reports earlier,
6 thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody
9 else with a question.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are there any more
14 questions for Mr. Dunn.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I guess
19 we're done with Mr. Dunn so we'll move on. Once again,
20 any reports from tribal consultations on this proposal.

21

22 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Katya Wessels. We have no comments from tribes or
24 ANCSA Corporations on WP22-09/10. Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
27 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, do you have
28 comments on this proposal.

29

30 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, Department of
31 Fish and Game is here. Again, this one shares a lot of
32 common ground with proposals from Hoonah and Angoon.
33 It's actually two proposals to restrict non-Federally-
34 qualified users either through restricting the season
35 dates or the bag limit. Information on deer in
36 Lisianski Inlet, again, is similar to what's reported
37 for elsewhere in Unit 4. Deer are abundant, not just
38 plentiful, but abundant. Three different metrics point
39 in that direction. Relative to other parts of the
40 state, Unit 4 has the densest, highest deer population
41 anywhere in Alaska.

42

43 Moving on, you know, there's been talk
44 of a decline in harvest, the decline in harvest in the
45 Pelican area, again, our data do indicate there has
46 been a decline but it's less than other areas, either
47 Hoonah or Angoon. And harvest for non-Federally-
48 qualified users remains stable, and these are data from
49 the last 23 years.

50

1 Again, for members of the Council, at
2 the time these comments were written, at the time we
3 were asked to provide data to the Forest Service, 2020
4 data was not yet available.

5
6 Change in Pelican is the same as the
7 changes elsewhere, Federally-qualified -- the number of
8 Federally-qualified hunters reporting harvest -- or
9 hunting there has declined, a large decline, 30 to 40
10 percent over the last 23 years whereas numbers of non-
11 Federally-qualified hunters have remained stable,
12 extremely stable in the Pelican area. Days of hunting
13 effort has jumped around a little bit more, but, again,
14 there's a downward trend in the number of days of
15 hunting effort by Federally-qualified users whereas
16 days of hunting effort by non-Federally-qualified users
17 remains stable. Prior to, you know, 2005/6 effort by
18 Federally-qualified users and numbers of Federally-
19 qualified users generally far exceeded the non-
20 Federally-qualified users, whereas in more recent years
21 that trend has changed, it's been -- you know, all that
22 reflects is that there were fewer and fewer Federally-
23 qualified hunters hunting. It's not a change in
24 anything -- there's been no change in competition, and
25 no change in deer present. Deer populations are
26 considered recovered from the hard winter of 2006/7,
27 2013, so in the last six years anyway, represented in
28 the data that we have here, the same conditions have
29 held steady. What's changed is that there are fewer
30 people hunting and that tends to be a bigger issue, I
31 guess, in these rural communities.

32
33 However, for the few people in Pelican
34 who continue to hunt deer, they're doing very, very
35 well. The days of hunting effort required to harvest
36 one deer for a Federally-qualified hunter in Pelican is
37 less than one -- or less than days, it's about 1.7
38 days, it's actually lower than it was 20 years ago.
39 And for reference, you know, around the state, you
40 know, we have deer in Southeast, we have deer in Prince
41 William Sound and we have deer on Kodiak Island, the
42 effort required to harvest one deer in Unit 4,
43 particularly in Pelican is very, very low compared to
44 other areas. Other areas, you know, in places like
45 Unit 2, usually four to five days of hunting effort and
46 it goes up to as high as 11, I think 10 or 11 days in
47 some places. So the hunting effort required to harvest
48 a deer in these areas is extremely low and by far the
49 best in the state. The number of deer harvested per
50

0473

1 hunter is largely stable for non-Federally-qualified
2 users but it's actually increasing for Federally-
3 qualified users. You know there's talk about having a
4 harder time harvesting deer, the data reported to us by
5 people who live in Pelican says they are harvesting
6 more deer than they used to in less time. There's just
7 no support in deer harvest report data for the
8 contention of the proposal.

9
10 Beyond that there's been talk about --
11 well, this wouldn't really effect -- well, the season
12 closure would have a big effect on non-Federally-
13 qualified hunters, that would take away the bulk of the
14 hunting season and the bulk of the harvest opportunity
15 because it covers October, November the rut period.
16 The bag limit restriction, yes, that would have less of
17 an effect, but is it warranted, very few hunters
18 anywhere harvest six deer, only six or seven percent of
19 all hunters. And usually, you know, less than 20
20 percent of all hunters in Unit 4 harvest six deer. So
21 restricting the bag limit to less than six deer would
22 have relatively a small effect as well.

23
24 In one year of data that's available,
25 we calculated based on the number of people who
26 harvested more than four deer that would leave three
27 extra deer on the landscape. So again you can say,
28 well, that has a very little effect on non-Federally-
29 qualified users, but reducing the bag limit also has
30 very little benefit for Federally-qualified users.

31
32 And at this point, you know, we just
33 don't see any case for these restrictions being needed
34 to continue subsistence use of deer. There's certainly
35 no conservation concern for deer in Unit 4. There are
36 more deer in Unit 4 than any other game management unit
37 in Alaska. So we simply don't see this passing the bar
38 under ANILCA and the State vigorously opposes both of
39 these proposals.

40
41 That's the end of my comments.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
44 Mr. Schumacher. So questions from the Council to Mr.
45 Schumacher on this proposal.

46
47 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

50

0474

1 MR. SLATER: This is Jim from Pelican.
2 I just wanted to.....

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

5
6 MR. SLATER:comment -- yeah,
7 thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to comment and
8 maybe make a statement that the harvest reports must
9 not be very well represented in Pelican and I think we
10 probably have a problem in that area that as a
11 community we need to address to make sure harvest
12 reports are filled out correctly.

13
14 That's all, thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
17 Jim for that comment. Anyone else with a question.

18
19 MR. KITKA: Chairman Don, this is
20 Harvey.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

23
24 MR. KITKA: I don't know who to pose
25 this question to, but over the past five years how much
26 of Pelican's population has declined, this would have
27 to do with how many hunters are there.

28
29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I don't know who
30 can answer that question but if anybody can.

31
32 MR. CARSON: Yeah, I'm looking at --
33 this is Chris Carson, I'm looking at the census online
34 right now. In 1990 there were 220 people residing in
35 Pelican. It looks like the current one that they have
36 online is 2019 87 people residing in Pelican. I
37 believe that's full-time according to the United States
38 census.

39
40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

41
42 MR. CARSON: And, you know, also I
43 looked up just because the information wasn't provided
44 during the Angoon one, in 1990 there were -- oh, sorry,
45 I don't have that information handy but the Angoon one
46 it showed about a fifth of the population and 2019, a
47 reduction of a little over 100 people.

48
49 Thank you.

50

0475

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

2

3 MR. KITKA: And could I have a follow-
4 up, Don.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

7

8 MR. SLATER: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I know.

11

12 MR. KITKA: Yes, with that reduction
13 and their needs are still not being met kind of shows
14 there's a problem there. So I will support probably
15 one of those proposals Anyway, thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
18 Harvey. And just as a point of reference, you know,
19 talking about census figures, you know the way the
20 census figures came out for the 2020 census, there
21 seems to be a problem with the 2020 census in rural
22 communities. I saw that, I think it was Wrangell was
23 protesting their census count and that it showed a 10
24 percent population drop in Wrangell and nobody believes
25 that that's actually true. I think there were other
26 communities, possibly, Craig, I think was objecting to
27 the census results. I know for my own community very
28 easy to count people in Point Baker, I can tell you
29 there's exactly 24 residents there somehow the U.S.
30 Census came out with 12. So there's a real problem in
31 the census for 2020 in rural communities in Alaska it's
32 probably due to the pandemic. So I would take those
33 numbers with a grain of salt. So anybody else with a
34 question.

35

36 MR. CARSON: Well, Mr. Chair, I just
37 looked through this. I was looking at the census and
38 they do have the 2020 and they identified for Pelican
39 163.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. You know
42 just for the record let's move on, thank you. Anybody
43 else with a question.

44

45 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair,
46 this is Jim from Pelican. This is directed to Mr.
47 Schumacher.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

50

0476

1 MR. SLATER: You mentioned the three
2 metrics for measuring for population. Just for our
3 information could you identify those. I know you
4 mentioned before dropping analysis -- or dropping
5 density, what are the other two methods.

6
7 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
8 Member Slater. Yeah, in my comments this morning I
9 talked about how the Department monitors trends in deer
10 populations by game management unit. We have no data
11 that reflects trends right around Pelican but there's
12 no reason to think that Pelican is any different than
13 anywhere else in Unit 4.

14
15 Methods that we get data from are deer
16 pellet counts. And as I explained this morning, those
17 are transects walked from the beach up to 1,500 feet
18 elevation in the springtime before things green up.
19 They're looking generally at winter density on the
20 landscape. The person doing the transect counts deer
21 pellets -- deer pellet groups on either side of the
22 line, half a meter, so you have a meter wide transect.
23 I forget how many 20 meter transects we do, 215 20
24 meter transects -- or 250 meter -- 215 20 meter wide
25 segments per transects, we do three transects per
26 watershed, and we select several watersheds throughout
27 Unit 4 to do per year. It's a rough means of
28 monitoring deer abundance, it's not all that sensitive,
29 we believe it's roughly sensitive to change in
30 population of about 30 percent. And as I explained
31 this morning, rather than really using it to monitor
32 year to year changes in population, the way I think
33 it's good to apply this conversation is to look at
34 relative densities among game management units. The
35 deer pellet densities do seem to do a pretty good job
36 of reflecting relative densities in places like Unit 4
37 compared to Unit 3 compared to Unit 3 compared to
38 various parts of Unit 1. Deer pellet densities in Game
39 Management Unit 4, no matter where you do them are
40 always the highest in the region.

41
42 So that argues for a very high
43 population of deer in Game Management Unit 4.

44
45 Densities in Unit 4 are also higher
46 than in Unit 6, Prince William Sound. They don't do
47 those types of surveys on Kodiak Island.

48
49 The other way that we've been looking
50

0477

1 at deer abundance measures or monitoring deer abundance
2 is through aerial Alpine surveys. So that's taking an
3 Alpine area and we have a protocol for flying surveys,
4 they begin two hours before sunset, you know, deer tend
5 to come out around sunset, we're trying to get a time
6 of day when deer are actually out. We try to do it
7 under very similar weather conditions so we record
8 whether it's clear, or cloudy, partly cloudy, we try to
9 do it under very consistent temperature, wind, we try
10 to take as many variables out of the survey as
11 possible. And, again, one survey to the next you may
12 see more deer, one deer -- we do multiple surveys, you
13 may see more deer on one survey than another, but,
14 again, like the pellet group surveys those seem to do a
15 good job reflecting relative abundance among game
16 management units. Game Management Unit 4 has by far
17 the highest deer counts -- express the measures of
18 those surveys in deer seen per hour.

19

20 And the third method is through harvest
21 monitoring. Things like gross harvest, so just general
22 harvest numbers and then harvest per hunter effort.
23 And, again, as I discussed in my comments here, Game
24 Management Unit 4 supports the highest deer harvest in
25 the state and Game Management Unit 4 requires the
26 lowest amount of effort by a hunter to harvest a deer,
27 and hunters in Unit 4 harvest the most deer per hunter.

28

29 So every measure that we have says that
30 deer are abundant in Unit 4 and that hunters in Unit 4
31 are among -- are the most successful in the state.

32

33 So this is why we just feel there's no
34 justification for the proposals.

35

36 MR. SLATER: Thank you, Mr. Schumacher.
37 I was just curious about the three methods and wanted
38 to make sure that I was understanding correctly. But
39 the main other points, this is an assessment for all of
40 Game Management Unit 4, nothing in particular to our
41 area.

42

43 MR. SCHUMACHER: No, I said that
44 directly. We are unable to monitor deer population --
45 it's not that we're unable to, we simply don't, because
46 we refocus our effort, we could focus in Pelican but
47 then people in Hoonah or someplace else might be
48 unhappy so we try to monitor populations at a game
49 management unit-wide level.

50

0478

1 And I'd like to add something else
2 about -- you know there was talk about census and
3 things like that, but one of the points I've made in my
4 comments about all these proposals, is the declining
5 number of hunters in these communities. And I like to
6 put that in some perspective. Alaska, and, in fact,
7 the United States, has an ageing population of hunters.
8 The average age of hunters is getting older and older.
9 And what that means is fewer young hunters are being
10 recruited. That's a nation-wide trend. And, you know,
11 for whatever it's worth you may be seeing that in your
12 communities as well.

13
14 MR. SLATER: Thank you for your
15 comments. And as a summary, I think one of the things
16 that was identified is that this proposal wasn't really
17 because of a conservation issue it was because of a
18 hunting pressure or competition issue. But I thank you
19 for the information on the populations, thanks.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
22 Jim. Okay, anybody else. Any other Council members
23 with questions for Mr. Schumacher.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Last call
28 for questions.

29
30 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Frank, go ahead.

33
34 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Schumacher, had
35 mentioned that declining in hunters and stuff, is there
36 a reason -- does he have a reason why that is because I
37 see a lot of young guys that can still climb the
38 mountain and going out there so I'm curious, is it age,
39 or taste of the deer or what.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to
44 Member Wright. I'm afraid -- yeah, I'm sure that
45 people have done surveys, you know, to say why aren't
46 more young people getting into hunting but I don't have
47 any kind of information to report to you on that,
48 however, that is a trend that most fish and game
49 agencies are monitoring and very interested in because,
50

0479

1 you know, our job is to manage hunting. If we run out
2 of hunters that's a serious issue for us.

3

4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, anybody
5 else.

6

7 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
8 This is Frank again.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Frank, follow-up,
11 go ahead.

12

13 MR. WRIGHT: I was just curious of why
14 that is because, where did they get numbers of hunters
15 that don't want to be when they live in a community
16 that the only time they get a decent meal is when they
17 get a deer. So I'm just curious of why that statement
18 even came up.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'll take
23 that as a comment. Anybody else with a question.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I think that
28 concludes the presentation from the Department of Fish
29 and Game. Thank you once again, Mr. Schumacher for
30 answering our questions. Any other agencies want to
31 comment, tribal comments or other Federal agencies.

32

33 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, there are no
34 tribal or ANCSA Corporation comments, thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
37 Katya. However, I do believe we do have some Fish and
38 Game Advisory Committee comments on this proposal, are
39 you presenting those or somebody else.

40

41 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, yeah, Katya
42 Wessels. So there are two comments from Fish and Game
43 Advisory Committees. One is in your meeting book, it's
44 on Page 300 and it's from Juneau/Douglas Advisory
45 Committee. That's the same comment that was read into
46 the record on WP22-07 so I'm not going to -- for the
47 sake of time I'm not going to read it.

48

49 (Teleconference interference -

50

0480

1 participants not muted)

2

3

MS. WESSELS: Then we also received
4 another comment in an email from Pelican AC and the
5 comment reads: The Pelican ADF&G Fish and Game
6 Advisory Committee met on Tuesday, September 7, 2021 at
7 5:30 p.m. 21 members of the public attended, nine were
8 members of the Pelican Fish and Game Advisory
9 Committee. On teleconference was an ADF&G wildlife
10 biologist and the Southeast Advisory Committee
11 coordinator. That's incorrect, actually I think that's
12 probably Southeast.....

13

14 (Teleconference interference -

15 participants not muted)

16

MS. WESSELS:Subsistence Advisory
17 Council Coordinator. The committee discussed the
18 Federal Subsistence Management Program 2022/24 wildlife
19 proposals. WP22-09 deer closure to non-Federally-
20 qualified users Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait,
21 WP22-10 deer lower harvest limit for non-Federally-
22 qualified users Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait.
23 Each person was given an opportunity to give voice.....
24

25

26 (Teleconference interference -

27 participants not muted)

28

MS. WESSELS:opinions regarding
29 deer proposal WP22-09 and WP22-10. When comments ended
30 there was consensus to support two deer bag limit for
31 non-Federally-qualified users. Below are the results
32 of a poll of meeting attendees, including AC members
33 and the public. Non-Federally-qualified hunters.....
34

35

36 (Teleconference interference -

37 participants not muted)

38

MS. WESSELS:reduce bag limit to
39 two deer, 19 yes, two no, one abstain. There was a
40 further request to limit the bag limit to bucks only.
41 Non-Federally-qualified hunters reduce bag limit to
42 deer bucks only, 12 yes, 5 no, one abstain. Submitted
43 by Patricia Phillips, Chairperson, Pelican ADF&G Fish
44 and Game AC.
45

46

47 Thank you.

48

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
49

50

0481

1 Katya, for those comments.

2

3 (Teleconference interference -
4 participants not muted)

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: How about public
7 comments.

8

9 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I can't hear
10 you.

11

12 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, there's
13 somebody without the mute button on and I'm having a
14 hard time hearing you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, there is some
17 background noise again. Everybody please check your
18 mute button and if you're not talking please put your
19 phone on mute.

20

21 Okay, I think we're good again, and
22 hopefully everybody heard the Advisory Committee
23 comments. Does anybody need those to be repeated or
24 have a question, miss something.

25

26 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like
27 to have them be repeated, thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Go ahead,
30 try again, Katya.

31

32 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, are you
33 addressing me, sorry, I couldn't hear what was that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, could you
36 read.....

37

38 MS. WESSELS: You're breaking up.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, we had a
41 request from some of the Council members to read those
42 comments again, we had a lot of interference on the
43 line.

44

45 MS. WESSELS: You want me to read the
46 Pelican AC comments again?

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, if you would,
49 please.

50

0482

1 MS. WESSELS: Okay. So the Pelican
2 ADF&G Fish and Game Advisory Committee met on Tuesday,
3 September 7, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. 21 members of the
4 public attended, nine were members of the Pelican Fish
5 and Game Advisory Committee. On teleconference was an
6 ADF&G wildlife biologist and the Southeast Advisory
7 Committee coordinator. The committee discussed the
8 Federal Subsistence Management Program 2022/2024
9 wildlife proposals. WP22-09 deer closure to non-
10 Federally-qualified users Lisianski Inlet/Strait, WP22-
11 10 deer lower harvest limit for non-Federally-qualified
12 users Lisianski Inlet/Strait. Each person was given an
13 opportunity to give voice to their views and opinions
14 regarding deer proposals WP22-09 and WP22-10. When
15 comments ended there was consensus to support a two
16 deer bag limit for non-Federally-qualified users.
17 Below are the results of a poll of meeting attendees,
18 including AC members and the public. Non-Federally-
19 qualified hunters reduce bag limit to two deer, 19 yes,
20 two no, one abstain. There was a further request to
21 limit the bag limit to bucks only. Non-Federally-
22 qualified hunters reduce bag limit to deer bucks only,
23 12 yes, 5 no, one abstain. Submitted by Patricia
24 Phillips, Chairperson, Pelican ADF&G Fish and Game
25 Advisory Committee.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
30 Katya. I heard it pretty clearly that time, hopefully
31 everybody else did. How about a summary of written
32 public comments, do you have that available.

33
34 MR. DUNN: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
35 Greg.

36
37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Greg.

38
39 MR. DUNN: So there were quite a few.
40 There were 63 written public comments that opposed the
41 proposal, one was neutral. The one neutral comment
42 from the Sportsmen Alliance asked the Board to only
43 approve the proposal if it was supported by scientific
44 evidence. The summary of the other comments is exactly
45 the same as 7 and 8.

46
47 And then we just had a recent comment
48 from Norm Carson. It says, having listened to
49 discussion of 7 and 9 -- having listened to 7, he says
50

0483

1 I will say 9 should not be supported and 10 would be a
2 better alternative. If the deer appear to become over
3 populated then we could ask for an emergency rescind of
4 bag limit being lowered for non-Federally-qualified.
5 But that's support for 10 and not 9.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

8
9 MR. DUNN: And if anybody would like to
10 go more into the summary, they're exactly the same as 7
11 and 8, I can, but I figure it'll be easier.

12
13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. Okay, I
14 think we've heard the summaries of the 60-odd comments
15 and now we have one emailed comment, I take it that
16 last comment was emailed in.

17
18 MR. DUNN: Yes, Mr. Chair, that's.....

19
20 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Ameer
21 Howard.

22
23 MR. DUNN:correct.

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Ms. Howard, do you
26 have something to add.

27
28 MS. HOWARD: We did have a few more
29 comments emailed to us that I can add when you're ready
30 to go to the public testimony portion.

31
32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Let's do
33 the -- let's see the written comments that you have
34 that have been emailed in, go ahead and relate those to
35 the Council.

36
37 MS. HOWARD: I have six -- six emails
38 to read into the record for the Council. Greg took
39 care of one of them. We received a total of seven
40 meetings during the time the meeting has been in
41 session.

42
43 The first email is from Denny Corbin
44 and it states: I am opposed to both deer hunting
45 closure proposals in Lisianski Inlet for these reasons.

46
47 No. 1. This proposal is a generation
48 (indiscernible - cuts out) for hunting rights for
49 families who live in Lisianski Inlet. Closing deer
50

1 hunting in Lisianski Inlet to non-subsistence qualified
2 residents will have the effect of making hunting a
3 Federal crime for people who grow up in Pelican and are
4 forced to move away for whatever reasons they may have.
5 The economic condition of the area to the last several
6 decades departing to look for work opportunities is
7 something bound to happen. People who move away will
8 not be allowed to come home and hunt with their parents
9 or grandparents who remain. If they have children,
10 then the grandchildren will be robbed of opportunities
11 to hunt with their parents and grandparents. This will
12 destroy a tradition of subsistence hunting and destroy
13 opportunities to teach the younger generations how to
14 hunt. Several decades ago Pelican Seafoods, the main
15 employer in Pelican went bankrupt and shut down. Since
16 that time the economic situation has not improved much
17 so young people who grow up in Pelican need to leave in
18 order to find opportunity. Once they start living
19 somewhere else they will be denied the ability to come
20 home to hunt with family and friends. This breaks a
21 longstanding tradition throughout human history that
22 parents take care of their children, teach them to
23 hunt, and when the children become adults they take c
24 care of parents, grandparents and other elders by
25 bringing venison back from the Forest. It means less
26 deer overall for the community of Pelican.

27
28 No. 2. According to the best science
29 there is not a problem with the deer population in
30 Lisianski Inlet. This makes sense to me as the winters
31 are much warmer now than when I was a kid and there are
32 many less people living in the area. The data shows a
33 reduction in hunting pressure and game biologists
34 report the island is at carrying capacity. Given the
35 available information and the seriousness of the
36 changes this proposal will cause, I think the
37 proponents of this should have the burden of proof to
38 show that there is actually a problem with the deer
39 population.

40
41 No. 3. The proposal creates a second
42 class of citizens. The people who have lost hunting
43 privileges because they went away versus those people
44 who stay and never leave. This is a terrible thing to
45 inflict on a small community. What intelligent young
46 person would want to be in a place where they are
47 considered second class based on how many days they
48 have been in Pelican and never left.

49
50

0485

1 Denny Corbin, Pelican Alaska.

2

3 Would you like me to move on to the
4 second email, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead and
7 read through them all and identify who they're from.

8

9 MS. HOWARD: All right. The second
10 email is from Scott Carson.

11

12 My name is Scott Carson. I am a life
13 long Alaskan and currently live in Juneau. I grew up
14 in Southeast Alaska spending my summers with my
15 grandparents and parents in Pelican where I commercial
16 fished with them. As I grew older I joined my father
17 and grandfather and grandparents in yearly deer hunts.
18 After I graduated high school I left Alaska and joined
19 the United States Army where I served for six years. I
20 return to Alaska every year and spend my vacation time
21 in Pelican with my family. I returned to Alaska in 1998
22 where I began my career as an Alaska State Trooper.
23 I've been stationed in Anchorage, Petersburg, Sitka,
24 Ketchikan and Juneau. I return to Pelican twice a year
25 to spend time with my family. It's my intention to
26 carry on this tradition to my children and
27 grandchildren. I have spent over 40 years hunting and
28 fishing in the Pelican area. For these reasons I
29 support ANILCA and its goal to preserve Alaska's
30 resources for future generations. I want future
31 generations of Alaskans to enjoy what I have.

32

33 I oppose WP22-09 for the following
34 reasons: There is no depletion of deer in the Game
35 Management Unit 4 including the areas surrounding
36 Lisianski Inlet. The Alaska Department of Fish and
37 Game actively manages the deer population in this area.
38 Alaska Department of Fish and Game released a report in
39 2021 that detailed the deer population, hunter efforts
40 and success rates. The report concluded that there is
41 no shortage of deer. A copy of this report has been
42 made to this Council. This proposal violates ANILCA as
43 written. This proposal was pushed by Pelican resident
44 and Board Member Jim Slater who has a land dispute over
45 deer hunting with a neighbor in 2020.

46

47 Mr. Chair, I would not like to continue
48 on this point in the comment, it goes further regarding
49 Mr. Slater, and I do not feel that it is appropriate

50

0486

1 but I can share the email with the Council.

2

3 MR. CARSON: I would -- I would like to
4 hear the whole letter myself.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Who was that?

7

8 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Yes, I'd like to
9 hear it too.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Are those Council
12 people?

13

14 MR. CARSON: It doesn't matter who we
15 are, it should be -- it's a public comment, this is a
16 public meeting and it should be read in full and the
17 Council shouldn't have the right to say or make
18 decisions on who or who can't or what can be said, it's
19 a public comment, it should be read in full. Thank
20 you.

21

22 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: I agree.

23

24 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman.

25

26 MS. WESSELS: Okay, point of order.
27 Point of order, Mr. Chair. Everyone who speaks in the
28 Council meeting -- this is.....

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'm going
31 to.....

32

33 MS. WESSELS:Katya Wessels with
34 OSM.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Katya, I'm going
37 to.....

38

39 MS. WESSELS: Anyone who speaks in a
40 Council meeting needs to identify themselves first
41 before speaking. Every time you speak, identify
42 yourself.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm going to --
45 I'm going to -- excuse me, I'm going to defer to Ms.
46 Wessels on this, she is our designated Federal officer
47 who has ultimate say over what happens at our Council
48 meetings, so she's familiar with all those rules and
49 regulations far more than I am, so Katya I'll let you
50

0487

1 handle this, whatever you feel is appropriate. Go
2 ahead.

3

4 MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Since these comments were received during the public
6 meeting, we're only supposed to -- in any case, for
7 reading the comments, we're supposed to only summarize
8 the comments. Sometimes when the comments are short we
9 will read them verbatim. This Council is already
10 running short on time on the agenda. So, you know, I
11 would like the members of the public who just spoke to
12 the Council to identify themselves by name, please.

13

14 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
15 Albert.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Let Katya finish,
18 Albert.

19

20 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, I would just
21 like people to address the Chair, that's all I'm going
22 to say, Mr. Chair, just to maintain order.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.

25

26 MR. CARSON: Yeah, through the
27 Chair.....

28

29 MS. WESSELS: So, thank.....

30

31 MR. CARSON:this is Chris Carson.
32 This is Chris Carson.

33

34 MS. WESSELS: Okay.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
37 Mr. Carson.

38

39 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
40 Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: And I recognize
43 Frank, go ahead Frank.

44

45 MR. WRIGHT: There's a section in here
46 for public testimony and this is a Council meeting
47 right now, thank you, Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That's correct.

50

0488

1 MS. WESSELS: Yes, so I would like to
2 ask Mr. Carson and the other members of the public,
3 when the Council is listening to the presentation from
4 the Office of Subsistence Management and in this case,
5 the presentation of the written public comments, please
6 do not interrupt and if the members of Office of
7 Subsistence Management are asking the Chair and the
8 Council questions, that is up to the Council to make
9 this decision. So I know that Ameer posed a question to
10 the Council and to the Chair and I would like to hear
11 how the Council would like to proceed with this matter.

12
13 Thank you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
16 Katya. This is Don Hernandez, the Chair. I don't know
17 how, you know, the Board feels about this but, you
18 know, as far as myself running meetings I've made it
19 clear that we don't want to hear personal attacks on
20 Council members, and as I indicated, I believe, this
21 morning, maybe it was yesterday morning, you know,
22 during the course of the meeting I do have the ability
23 as the Chair to turn off the microphone of somebody
24 who's speaking if I feel they're out of line of how we
25 like to conduct meeting, but what Ms. Howard was doing
26 was not wanting to read personal attacks on Council
27 members, I would deem that to be something that I
28 probably would agree with. I don't think it's relevant
29 to the discussion here. Nobody's motivation are in
30 question. This is not a proposal from Mr. Slater, this
31 is a proposal from the Council. Issues from numerous
32 Pelican residents were brought before the Council, the
33 Council put in a proposal in response to comments from
34 numerous Pelican residents so personal attacks are not
35 appropriate. And it's not absolutely necessary we need
36 all comments verbatim. It was just provided that
37 comments can be summarized so whatever -- I'm allowing,
38 you know, verbatim reading of the comments, I would
39 like to hear comments as much as possible that's a big
40 part of our process but Ms. Howard felt that she didn't
41 want to read some parts of the comments, I would agree
42 with her on that so if anybody has objection to that, I
43 could just say from here on forward that comments will
44 be summarized, we won't read any of them. So if you
45 want to continue hearing comments, I suggest you follow
46 my recommendation.

47
48 So Ms. Howard you may continue reading
49 comments verbatim and if you, you know, don't want to
50

0489

1 read personal comments against Council members, that's
2 perfectly within your right so go ahead and continue.

3

4

5 MS. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To
6 continue, another point made by Mr. Scott Carson in his
7 comment, in other areas of the state where a game
8 population was in decline there was a thorough study of
9 the resources before any action was taken. The current
10 report from the local biologist reports a robust deer
11 population and does not merit any restrictions on
12 hunting. In closing WP22-09 violates ANILCA. Without
13 a scarcity of deer this proposal lacks legal
14 justification to restrict the hunting rights of
15 Alaskans. Thank you for your time. Scott Carson.

15

16

17 The third email received was from
18 Celeste Weller. Hello Southeast Regional Advisory
19 Council. I am a full-time resident of Pelican Alaska.
20 I hunt black-tail deer yearly. I work in Pelican year-
21 round. I witness and experience first-hand the
22 negative impacts of unrestricted tourism.....

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

(Teleconference interference -
participants not muted)

MS. HOWARD:and community. I
support WP22-09 and 10 as a starting point to slowing
or stopping further future resource exploitation in
this area. Decreasing the bag limit and restricting
allowable hunting times can help discourage those who
would choose to hunt here for sport. Regular regional
hunters who come here for food or subsistence should be
capable of changing their schedules to accommodate the
proposed hunting period change. WP22-09 does not close
hunting, just restricts the timeline. The Pelican
community has been accommodating tourism and part-time
residents for decades to its slow detriment. It's time
for a change in my opinion. Many opponents to these
proposals argue that there is no current interest in
sporthunting for wintertime black-tail deer in
Lisianski Inlet and Strait, however, as previously
mentioned the intense expansion in tourism centralized
in Pelican indicates otherwise. At the September 7,
2021 meeting of the Pelican ADF&G Advisory Committee,
less half of the attending Council and community
members represented full-time residents of Pelican and
the surrounding area. Most were part-time residents.
Our tiny year-round population is outnumbered in voice
from what regulations are discussed and/or determined

0490

1 in our area. I'm not opposed to tourism as long as it
2 can be regulated and the locals of the community that
3 tourism takes place in don't have to compete for
4 resources. I am not a generational resident of
5 Pelican, Lisianski Inlet or Alaska. I have, however,
6 lived here year-round for almost six years, volunteer
7 within the community in a myriad of ways and
8 participated in subsistence hunting and fishing since
9 then. I appreciate that every voice is being heard for
10 these proposal discussions. Thank you, sincerely,
11 Celeste Weller, City of Pelican, City Council Member,
12 ADF&G Regional Advisory Committee, Pelican Secretary.

13

14 The fourth email received was from
15 Patty.....

16

17 MR. ORR: Can I jump in, please.....

18

19 MS. HOWARD:Phillips.

20

21 MR. ORR:just real quick. This
22 is Nicholas Orr, a member of the public. I just want a
23 point of clarification, are we reading all of the
24 written comments received prior to the Board meeting
25 because I'm familiar with these, I read them in the
26 packet.

27

28 MS. HOWARD: Nicholas.....

29

30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: These comments
31 were emailed.....

32

33 MS. HOWARD:through the Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:during the
36 course of the meeting.

37

38 MR. ORR: Well, I'm just wondering if
39 these were received during the meeting or prior to the
40 meeting.

41

42 MS. HOWARD: Through the Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Ms. Howard.

45

46 MS. HOWARD: These emails were the ones
47 received during the meeting.

48

49 MR. ORR: Well, through the Chair. I

50

0491

1 would say the first two that have been read were
2 already in the packet so they were received also prior
3 to the meeting. So we're just reading stuff that has
4 already been distributing at this point. And I'll be
5 quiet here.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, who's the
8 next one from Ms. Howard.

9
10 MS. HOWARD: The next one that I have
11 is from Patty Phillips and that was received after the
12 meeting began.

13
14 Good morning, Chairman Hernandez and
15 Regional Council Members. Public testimony. WP22-09
16 states increased hunter pressure by non-Federally-
17 qualified making it more challenging to meet their
18 subsistence needs. WP22-10 reduces the bag limit to
19 four deer in Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski Strait.
20 Local residents of Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski Strait
21 active hunters state that they are seeing less deer in
22 Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski Strait area. Why are
23 there less deer being seen and harvested by locally
24 Federally-qualified users. Are we seeing less deer
25 because of climate change effects, the recent winters
26 have been less severe with less snow which can impact
27 whether the deer are being driven to the beach front or
28 not.

29
30 (Teleconference interference -
31 participants not muted)

32
33 MS. HOWARD: I personally did observe
34 slightly less deer than average -- than the average
35 number of deer that I normally observe. This may have
36 been because the snow level was well above the beach
37 fringe and I have observed significant deer browse --
38 browse within the beach fringe areas. Anecdotally,
39 healthy deer populations are observed in the Alpine and
40 bear predation on deer kept deer out of the beach
41 fringe. It does concern me when local Federal-
42 qualified hunters say their subsistence needs are not
43 being met. The wildlife analysis does not support
44 restrictions on non-Federally-qualified users in the
45 Lisianski Inlet and Strait area. A complication to the
46 Federal process is that it will be two years before
47 another deer proposal can be submitted to readdress
48 this issue. Emergency closures shut down the resource
49 to all users causing subsistence needs to not be met.
50

1 To err on the side of conservation a reduced bag limit
2 is reasonable for a continued healthy resource.

3
4 I recommend approving WP22-10 deer
5 harvest limit on non-Federally-qualified with an
6 amendment of reducing harvest to three deer. The
7 analysis depicts the efficiency of local Federally-
8 qualified hunters of Lisianski Inlet and Straits as
9 having a greater success rate. I question this
10 information. When I complete a deer hunter survey I
11 only list actual deer harvested and it is always a one
12 day deer hunt, I never list the number of times I hunt
13 without success which may be three, four, or five times
14 before I shoot a deer. The analysis states very few
15 NFQ, non-Federally-qualified harvest of more than three
16 deer, not all hunters report harvest. There is a
17 presumption of under-reporting of harvest. Having
18 long-term engagement at the local level, city council,
19 and as Mayor, and current Mayor, I know the community
20 of Pelican supports and continues to support Alaska
21 Division of Subsistence conducting subsistence studies
22 for the Pelican area.

23
24 On a closing note, women membership on
25 the Federal Subsistence Southeast Regional Advisory RAC
26 is significantly under-represented and to the detriment
27 of the region.

28
29 The fifth email was received by Norm
30 Carson regarding WP22-09. My name is Norm Carson. My
31 wife and I reside three miles south of Pelican. We
32 moved here from Juneau in 1997 and first came to
33 Pelican some 55-years ago as a college kid working at
34 the Pelican Cold Storage. I left Pelican to have a
35 career as an Alaska State Trooper. My last duty
36 station was Juneau. Every year after I moved from
37 Pelican I return during late October or November to
38 take part in deer hunting with my parents. Later after
39 we had children and they were old enough to join me
40 they learned to hunt with not just their dad but also
41 their grandparents. Generally this was done near
42 Thanksgiving day. The hunts were a time for us to
43 gather the family, enjoy the outdoor activity and put
44 up some venison for winter. I travel from town -- I
45 traveled from towns I was stationed in, Petersburg,
46 Anchorage, Sitka and Juneau. My wife and I own our
47 home three miles south of Pelican and another inside
48 the city of Pelican. We continue this hunting
49 tradition with our sons and hopefully our grandsons in
50

0493

1 the future.

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

I oppose WP22-09 for the following reasons. A recent report by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game on deer availability and hunter success clearly shows there is not a shortage of deer, moreover abundance of hunters in this area. This spring and early summer we reviewed -- or we viewed deer frequently on our property. This August I saw four separate pairs of buck/doe on the beach, in the Inlet and Strait.

Next point. Before we discriminate against the community of Juneau and take away Alaska resident's hunting privileges we should know how many deer are taken by hunters from that community.

Next point. The proposal is out of compliance with ANILCA. If data shows there is a conservation issue I would support some sort of restriction but it should be brought through the local advisory board to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Next point. I am 74 years old, have two artificial knees and do not feel the hunting privileges of others be taken away so that I might take a deer within easy distance from the beach.

Next point. During the hunting season, preceding this proposal, the Board member presenting this had a land use dispute with a non-resident neighbor over hunting. It appears this is the catalyst for WP22-09.

Next point. The Board member that pushed this proposal was appointed to the RAC one week prior to the March Council meeting. During this time he sent emails to select Pelican residents coaching them on what to testify at the teleconference with the RAC. The teleconference was set at the Pelican City Hall, there were five persons at Pelican City Hall that testified. One was the now previous Mayor and two of the others were City Councilmen. This gave the impression the testimony came from the City. This meeting was not publicized, it could have been easily announced over the town's social media page and a public notice posted.

0494

1 Next point. A total of seven people
2 testified in favor of the proposal at the March RAC
3 meeting. Once the news of the proposal got out there
4 were 63 written comments opposing, one neutral and zero
5 in favor received by the RAC for consideration at the
6 October meeting.

7
8 Next point. I have not been aware of
9 any discussion locally of a deer scarcity until this
10 proposal. I've hunted this area for 55 years, there
11 were times when there was much more hunting effort than
12 what is occurring now.

13
14 Next point. This proposal is being
15 rushed. The best way to handle it is to vote no, send
16 it back to the community for work by the local Alaska
17 Department of Fish and Game Advisory Committee and
18 through the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. We
19 need a proposal based upon data, not upon innuendo,
20 rumor or speculation.

21
22 Thank you for your time. I hope my
23 grandchildren will retain their right to come and hunt
24 with us. Norm Carson, Pelican Alaska.

25
26 The sixth email we received were
27 additional comments for the RAC from Norm Carson on
28 WP22-09. I remain opposed to the proposal and want to
29 put forth these comments should the RAC consider it
30 necessary to move this proposal. It is impossible to
31 make comparisons of Pelican to other rural qualified
32 communities.

33
34 First point. Sitka. This community of
35 approximately 6,000 has a jet airport and miles of road
36 system. The services offered incentives a busy
37 commercial tourism system that in some instances have a
38 negative impact on subsistence resources.

39
40 Next point. Hoonah. A much larger
41 community than Pelican with over 100 miles of road
42 system, an airport, closer to Juneau and every week
43 ferry service.

44
45 Next point. Angoon. A much larger
46 community with an airport, closer to Juneau and more
47 frequent ferry service.

48
49 Next point. Tenakee. About twice the
50

1 population of Pelican, commonly referred to as a
2 bedroom community of Juneau. Tenakee Inlet is
3 expansive and bordered with much greater (indiscernible
4 - muffled) than Pelican. This has been a popular deer
5 hunting destination of Juneau residents for decades.

6
7 Next point. Access to and hunting at
8 Lisianski Inlet and Straits has the following
9 challenges. First, Pelican is about 70 air miles from
10 Pelican [sic], the route is made more difficult by
11 3,000 foot mountains bordering Lisianski Inlet.
12 Second, in November and December float plane service to
13 Pelican is very restricted by reduced daylight and
14 weather. Third, the terrain is challenging for the new
15 hunter. One needs a boat. The opportunity for a
16 mishap on the water or on land is significant. Fourth,
17 it is uncommon for several miles of Lisianski Inlet to
18 freeze over in November. About three years ago we were
19 forced to depart our home three miles south of Pelican
20 and spend several nights in Pelican, we were breaking
21 ice all the way to town. Fifth, knowing the above
22 would a commercial hunting lodge be a good investment
23 in the area. Clients may never get to Pelican and once
24 there, not get out for an extended period of time.
25 Hunters from Juneau will be paying a \$400 round-trip
26 airfare unless they could catch the one ferry in
27 November or December. Out of state hunters would have
28 an additional \$450 license and deer tag to pay, only
29 one deer at that.

30
31 Next point. All Federal lands in
32 Lisianski Inlet and Strait is bordered by State tide
33 lands that are not covered by ANILCA. They would be
34 open to beach hunting by non-rural qualified hunters.
35 Additionally there are large parcels of State lands
36 surrounding rural subdivisions as well as undeveloped
37 lots averaging three acres in size, again, open to all
38 hunters. Conflicts are almost guaranteed.

39
40 Next point. Who will enforce. The
41 area is so remote, it is extremely difficult for Alaska
42 Wildlife Troopers to regularly patrol the area.
43 Regulations that are not enforceable are not advisable.

44
45 Next point. This proposal had no
46 public hearing within Pelican prior to it being brought
47 before the RAC at the March meeting. Once this
48 proposal became known after the March meeting, there
49 was overwhelming negative responses.

0496

1 Next point. As of this moment there
2 does not appear to be a conservation issue with the
3 Sitka black-tail within the Lisianski area. This
4 proposal is in conflict with the requirements of
5 conservation issue in ANILCA.

6
7 Recommendation. This proposal needs
8 more study and review. The Pelican Fish and Game
9 Advisory Committee should work with the Alaska
10 Department of Fish and Game and explore the possibility
11 of a local area management plan for not only fish
12 resources, but also for game.

13
14 Next point. We should ask for an
15 updated study of Sitka black-tailed deer in the
16 Lisianski area to determine if the deer population
17 remains healthy.

18
19 Mr. Chair, that concludes the emails we
20 have received on additional written public comment
21 during this Council meeting.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
24 Ms. Howard. So this is a relatively new -- actually
25 it's an all new policy, I don't think we've had to deal
26 with it before with emailed comments in the course of
27 the meeting. My recommendation to the Staff would be
28 that some of these comments were just emailed comments
29 of comments that have previously been mailed, were in
30 our Council books. Some of it was new information, it
31 was kind of a mix. I would recommend that the Staff
32 kind of go through these emailed comments and if
33 they're verbatim from what we already have in our
34 Council book not to have to read them again. But as I
35 said there was some new information as well mixed in,
36 so we do have to hear public comments. So we'll just
37 try and make it as efficient as possible.

38
39 So next up is.....

40
41 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, go ahead.

44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
46 had actually asked for the Chair's attention before we
47 decided to have Anee read the written public comments
48 that came in after the fact, or, sorry, during our
49 meeting, to be read into the comments, so I appreciate
50

0497

1 you coming back to me. When -- before she did that,
2 the Staff was going to give a summary of written public
3 comments and their summary was just basically that they
4 mirrored or represented a lot of the comments that we
5 had heard and put into the record for 07 and 08, and so
6 then we decided not to put that in, but I really feel
7 like our job is to build a public record, those -- all
8 of those comments are in our book and that's publicly
9 made available, so I appreciate that part, but they did
10 summarize their comments for the other proposals and we
11 should have, on the record, the summary of comments for
12 this proposal. And the reason why I feel it's
13 important is because I've read every public comment in
14 this book and one thing I think is different about the
15 Pelican proposals is that there are a lot of Pelican
16 residents that took the time to comment on this
17 proposal, so we're actually hearing from the community
18 as well as other places and I think most of the written
19 public comments were in opposition, so I would be
20 interested in the proportion of written comments that
21 are in opposition that are residents from Pelican
22 versus non-residents of Pelican as well.

23

24 And so I don't know how you feel about
25 that, I know we're getting late in time but I just want
26 to make sure that we have a clear public record and
27 maybe they don't have to actually read it in but I
28 really want to make sure that Staff has that clear
29 public record when this proposal goes to the Board.

30

31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
34 Cathy. As you noted we are running really late on this
35 meeting with numerous agenda items still to go. Public
36 comment is a really important part of our process and
37 we do try and accommodate people. Your point is well
38 taken on that there may be some specifics on this
39 Lisianski proposal that need to be brought out. I'll
40 be asking folks to start thinking about how we want to
41 finish out conducting this meeting at this late hour,
42 but in the meantime if the Staff is able to accommodate
43 Cathy's request to summarize some of the public
44 comments specific to this Lisianski proposal, if you
45 can do that, or if you have done that, go ahead and
46 give us that summary now.

47

48 MR. DUNN: Mr. Chair, this is.....

49

50

0498

1 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
2 Wessels.

3
4 MR. DUNN:Greg.....

5
6 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, I think Greg has
7 the summary so -- sorry Greg.

8
9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Greg.

10
11 MR. DUNN: Yes, Mr. Chair. I only had
12 it -- the summary that was given to me only showed that
13 there were 63 written public comments that opposed the
14 proposal. We didn't get down to the nitty gritty of
15 which ones were Pelican residents. So if that answers
16 any of the questions.

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, do you need
19 to respond to that.

20
21 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 Greg, for the other proposals you actually bulleted out
23 a summary of the common themes amongst the written
24 public comments and so I was wondering if you had
25 actually a summary for these two proposals and the
26 other thing I would like to add is that I know of at
27 least one written public comment that was turned in
28 prior to the date that did not make our meeting book
29 and so it has not been made publicly available, and I
30 would want to make sure that that written public
31 comment also made it into our record. It was sent by
32 email by our Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry, it was
33 supposed to have been read -- it was received before
34 the deadline and oversight for getting in our book but
35 it has not been read today and it has not, you know,
36 not everybody has it in front of them.

37
38 So, thank you, Mr. Chair.

39
40 MR. DUNN: Yes, Cathy, through the
41 Chair. I can.....

42
43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody know about
44 the comments she's referencing, I'm unaware of it.

45
46 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, was that a
47 question for me, this is Cathy.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I don't know if
50

0499

1 the Staff has that comment available or not, I'm kind
2 of looking for them to respond.

3

4 MS. NEEDHAM: Well, for clarification
5 the comment came from Roger Harding. Thank you, Mr.
6 Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. And you say
9 it was emailed.

10

11 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Chair. The
12 comment was submitted to the Office of Subsistence
13 Management prior to the written comment deadline,
14 however it was not in our book. When it was submitted
15 to OSM it was CC'd to me so I had asked why it hadn't
16 been put in the book and our Council Coordinator,
17 DeAnna Perry, did send it out to the Council in an
18 email subsequently, but it is -- even though she sent
19 it to us, it's not in our transcripts or our public
20 record.

21

22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
25 Cathy. I'm sorry I'm not aware of that one. I don't
26 know if I saw it or not. I don't always see all the
27 emails. So.....

28

29 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair. It was
30 submitted to the Council -- or DeAnna sent it to the
31 Council on October 4th if that helps.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, if anybody
34 can bring that up, it sounds like it was submitted
35 within the timeline. If somebody can find it, I'm not
36 going to go looking for it now but if somebody has it
37 it should be read.

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal
40 Casipit. Yes, it was forwarded on to us from Cathy --
41 or from DeAnna, just as Cathy said. I'm looking at the
42 letter now, it was in our email on October 4th. There
43 was a bunch of other attachments that are up for
44 discussion later on this afternoon if we -- evening --
45 hopefully when we get there.

46

47 But it's a page and a half long and I'm
48 not really into reading it into the record but I mean
49 OSM has to have it, it's mailed to them and it's dated
50

0500

1 July 1st.

2

3

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

4

5

6

MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee Howard.

7

8

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Amee.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair and Council members. We will find the letter and be sure that -- since it was submitted during the Federal Register written comment period, we'll be sure that we can get it into the record. It will be part of the comments for the Federal Subsistence Board.

16

17

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. But if you do have it available, if you could at least summarize it if it brings up some issue that we haven't heard before that would be helpful.

21

22

23

24

MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair. Through the Chair.

25

26

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

27

28

29

MS. HOWARD: We will look and I will get back to you on available of a summary. Thank you.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. And in the meantime, I want to at least get through the rest of the process on this proposal before we decide what to do for the evening. And the next procedure would be oral public testimony. So once again I don't know if there's anybody on the phones who wanted to address this proposal over the phone line, but if some.....

37

38

39

MS. POLLEY: Mr. Chairman.

40

41

42

43

44

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:somebody is reading something that's already been presented I'd appreciate it if you'd hold off on that but if it's a new person with new information we'd be anxious to hear it.

45

46

47

So who do we have.

48

49

MS. POLLEY: Mr. Chairman. This is Karen Polley in Pelican.

50

0501

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: All right.

2

3 MR. MURPHY: Michael Murphy in Pelican.

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Karen Polley,

6 Michael Murphy.

7

8 MR. WOLF: Ken Wolf in.....

9

10 MR. CARSON: Mr. Chair. This is

11 Chris.....

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Dan Wolf did I

14 hear.

15

16 MR. WOLF: Ken.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

19

20 MR. CARSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is

21 Chris Carson. I have some additional information I'd

22 like to talk about.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Chris.

25 Anybody else.

26

27 (Teleconference interference -
28 participants not muted)

29

30 MR. ORR: Nicholas Orr, Juneau.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Nick Orr

33 again. Who else.

34

35 MR. BEASON: This is Ryan Beason,

36 Territorial Sportsman.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Ryan.

39

40 MR. WOLF: Did you get Ken Wolf,

41 Pelican.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Let's see I

44 thought I heard Dan Wolf, is it Ken Wolf.

45

46 MR. WOLF: Ken.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Ken Wolf, okay, I

49 gotcha. Anybody else.

50

0502

1 MR. PHILLIPS: James Phillips of
2 Pelican.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Dan [sic]
5 Phillips, okay. Next.

6
7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, maybe that's
11 it.

12
13 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya
14 Wessels.

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Katya.

17
18 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, I was able to
19 locate that one comment that is missing from your
20 Council meeting book that was submitted to OSM on July
21 1st of this year. So do you want me to -- would you
22 like me to read this comment into the -- the letter.

23
24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: At this point
25 could you look through it and summarize it and see if
26 it has any new information.

27
28 MS. WESSELS: It will take a me few
29 minutes then. Perhaps then after the oral testimony.

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. I'm going
32 to proceed with oral testimony and if you can do that
33 that would be great. After we're done with oral
34 testimony, if you don't think you can do a good summary
35 we'll have you read it into the record.

36
37 MS. WESSELS: Alrighty.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So let's begin
40 with Karen, do you want to state your name again for
41 the record and give your testimony.

42
43 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this Cathy.

44
45 MS. POLLEY: My name is Karen.

46
47 MS. NEEDHAM: I'm going to have to go,
48 thank you.

49
50

0503

1 MS. POLLEY: Mr. Chairman, my.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think I

4 heard.....

5

6 MS. POLLEY:name is Karen Polley.

7

8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Karen Polley,

9 okay.

10

11 MS. POLLEY: Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

14

15 MS. POLLEY: I have hunted in Game
16 Management Unit 4 since 1993 and have been very aware
17 of the deer population. I've always hunted the good
18 time between October 20th and November 24th or so,
19 Thanksgiving. And I can witness that there is a
20 significant decrease in the population in the Pelican
21 area. In '98, as I would walk through my three acres
22 and the hillsides going up the hill to hunt you would
23 frequently see multiple droppings, multiple areas of
24 droppings. Now, as I walk through three to eight acres
25 of the area near Sunnyside it's hardly one dropping for
26 every 10 feet or two meters, and so you assume it's the
27 same deer. So there is a significant increase -- or
28 decrease in the population in the Inlet.

29

30 I'm also familiar with areas outside
31 the Inlet and I see a larger population there where
32 we've seen herds of deer, seven or eight at times,
33 we're seeing two or three.

34

35 So I just want to say that I support
36 the proposal because I think the deer population in
37 Lisianski Inlet is in danger of not being able to
38 reproduce and keep the herd up.

39

40 I can't read that par (indiscernible -
41 paper rustling).....

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
44 Ms. Polley.....

45

46 MS. POLLEY:the big problems that
47 I see is the increased competition. There are more
48 boats hunting and more people coming in on airlines and
49 on the ferry and hunting locally. Not always some of

50

0504

1 the relatives and stuff but people who are unknown to
2 Pelican are hunting here as well as relatives and
3 friends and family. So there's more competition in the
4 Inlet as well as more competition in the outer coastal
5 areas of (Indiscernible - cuts out) Ogden Passage and
6 that area. Large seine boats are coming up from Sitka
7 with three or four smaller boats attached and they're
8 hunting areas that were traditionally hunted by people
9 who had Forest Service lease cabins out in that area.
10 So there is more pressure all the way from Sitka to
11 here. On the outer coast there's more space and more
12 area for deer than there is in the Inlet. The Inlet is
13 restricted by limited drainages.

14

15 Thank you for this opportunity to
16 testify in support of the proposal to support the
17 residents of Pelican.

18

19 I am also Chairman of the Food Bank in
20 Pelican and in the last year we distributed over 2,000
21 pounds of food to residents of Pelican because of
22 shortage of food, (Indiscernible - cuts out) and
23 because of the limited ferry service. So I think it's
24 important to know the degree which people in this area
25 depend on wild game and fish.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
30 Ms. Polley. In an effort to kind of keep things moving
31 here I'm going to not go to questions from the Council
32 members at this time, hopefully that's okay with
33 everybody. So let's move on to Mike Murphy, go ahead
34 with your testimony.

35

36 MR. MURPHY: Okay, thank you, Mr.
37 Chair. I, too, support this proposal. I've been out
38 in the hills hunting and there is a definite lack of
39 deer.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, is that your
42 full testimony.

43

44 MR. MURPHY: Yes, it is.

45

46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
47 Mr. Murphy. How about Ken Wolf, you're up.

48

49 MR. WOLF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
50

0505

1 name's Ken Wolf and I've lived in Pelican right just
2 coming up on 30 years. And anyways last year 2020,
3 which doesn't show in records as far as the Fish and
4 Game and the biologist, last year I shot one deer and
5 my wife and I and my daughter, we live on one fixed
6 income and we depend on our fish and our deer to eat.
7 And we have one ferry a month, if we're lucky, and our
8 -- the shipping through -- for our food as far as
9 Alaska SeaPlanes is \$1 a pound. And we can't afford to
10 go and buy the expensive beef and expensive food.
11 Lately we've been going without food, and the increased
12 pressure in our area, along with the pressure of the
13 bears has just totally -- I mean it's -- it's hindered
14 our hunting. But anyways I'm in favor of this
15 proposal. I'm seeing competition out in the field from
16 other communities, which they are at right, you know,
17 the Federal subsistence hunters, but we're seeing more
18 and more pressure all through our whole area, and there
19 are not more deer. And back 20 years ago we could go
20 to these drainages on the cold weather and snowbound
21 deer and there'd be 150, 200 deer on the beaches and
22 they would -- you know, literally dying as, you know,
23 we drove by and now our last heavy snows and long cold
24 spells, we -- we took and went down and in those same
25 drainages there were probably maybe a handful of deer,
26 six to 10 deer on each drainages in these times, and
27 the water was froze up high and the deer were
28 snowbound. Now, we -- we sit there and we're just
29 struggling for our food and these -- a lot of people
30 that have commented against, opposing this, they chose
31 to move away from this country and we live here because
32 we like it, it's our way of life and we're here to turn
33 the lights on the next year for these summertime
34 residents that come. The Inlet -- the State land has
35 all been sold out and our access is trimmed down and
36 with the lands, we're having people come out from all
37 areas and they're building cabins, cabins coming, and
38 in turn what they're doing is they're bringing their
39 friends, their family, everybody else and we've got
40 other things to do other than just hunt also, we've got
41 to stay warm, and we've got to fish. And we can't get
42 out there all the time. And I just -- I am for this
43 motion just for the fact that I want to eat.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that Mike

50

0506

1 Douville.

2

3

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes, Mike Douville here.
4 Can we limit the testimony to like three minutes or a
5 couple minutes and have them get their point across,
6 we're going to be here until 5:00 in the morning if we
7 don't kind of streamline things. I'm willing to listen
8 to them but, you know, I think it could be done in a
9 little bit shorter time. Thank you.

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 HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you,
Mike. Yeah, at this point to be fair I probably can't
do that to the remaining people, I probably should have
done that initially so I'm sorry I think we just got to
continue on. I would just ask people to please
consider maybe limiting their comments to a shorter
time and cover your main points quickly, it would be
helpful.

Mr. Carson, you're up next.

MR. CARSON: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
Chair. I'll make it real quick here, just a few points
that I got from listening over the last few days.

You know, the October 15th deadline
that's proposed in this just wouldn't work. I mean our
cabin sits about 75 feet -- yards from a fish creek, my
aunt and uncle were out there for 25 years in this
cabin and had to leave usually the first or second week
of August because the bears just get too thick and it
just actually becomes unsafe. So there'd be no chance
for us hunting there anytime before October 15th.
After October 15th it gets a little bit better.

I've heard some comments from the
Committee -- the Council regarding subsistence, and if
you're from Juneau you're not a subsistence hunter,
that's just totally inaccurate. I was born and raised
in Juneau, I joined the Coast Guard, when I was in the
Coast Guard I was lucky enough to be stationed for four
years in Juneau, I had a \$932 a month base pay and I
had two kids and I think Juneau ranks in the top 10 of
the most expensive places to live in the country, so
there's many, many subsistence hunters in Juneau who
rely on deer and fish and everything to get them
through the winters.

My next point, you know, this proposal

0507

1 -- when we were in Pelican last year a boat came in
2 when we were getting on the ferry and I know everybody
3 was up in arms about how many deer they pulled off this
4 fishing boat. That fishing boat wasn't from Juneau,
5 that fishing boat was from Haines. So this proposal is
6 not going to do anything to stop people from Haines,
7 Gustavus and other areas, subsistence areas coming over
8 to hunt. It's not going to do it. So it's kind of
9 null and void.

10

11 I believe the majority of the
12 population of, or a lot of the population of the people
13 who have cabins out there are from Juneau, other
14 countries, Canada and the Lower 48 so, you know, I
15 think the population there has decreased quite a bit
16 and I think that kind of makes up for the low deer
17 counts in Pelican over the last few years.

18

19 You know there was another comment from
20 Albert from Angoon regarding, you know, people from
21 Juneau can just go to Costco and Fred Meyers and get
22 their meat and all that, well, I called Costco and
23 Costco does deliver and service all of the smaller
24 communities. I've helped them load the van out of
25 Pelican where there was tons of food brought out from
26 Costco, so, you know, Costco, they supply and everybody
27 from Pelican and Hoonah and Angoon, they all utilize
28 those stores in Juneau.

29

30 And, I guess, you know, the last thing
31 I'd have to say here is, you know, I'm looking at all
32 these letters that are not supporting these proposals,
33 these last three or four proposals, and all the
34 testimony that's not in support of it, which really
35 overweighs the support of them by far and this
36 Committee continuing to vote these proposals through.
37 I mean it's going to get to the point where, you know,
38 this Committee is going to lose credibility that
39 they're not taking facts and they're not taking the
40 wishes of Southeast as a whole into consideration and I
41 believe a lot of this is just self-interest, a lot of
42 it's self-interest and, you know, for individual people
43 of these areas. You know I understand the hardship,
44 but the hardship goes around, not just in these rural
45 areas, there's people in Juneau that have hardship and
46 the people -- you want to talk about pressured hunting,
47 leave Auke Bay and Juneau on a Saturday during the
48 hunting time, when you got a dozen boats heading out
49 towards Admiralty Island, from Point Retreat down to
50

0508

1 Point Arden is basically where we can hunt if you got a
2 small boat, because you're not going across Taku Inlet
3 to go further south, or you could hunt Douglas Island.
4 So there's a lot more room in hunting even Lisianski
5 Strait and the Strait going out to the open than there
6 is around the Juneau area.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
11 Carson. Let's see Nick Orr, we'll hear from you again.

12

13 MR. ORR: Okay. I just was going to
14 say that I would caution against allowing the Federal
15 Subsistence process to be used as a tool for proposal
16 authors to settle localized disputes. Two of the
17 testifiers from the first day as well as a number of
18 the written comments indicated there was some sort of
19 property dispute going on between Pelican residents and
20 the proposal author and I think this proposal might be
21 related to that somehow. I don't really have anything
22 to do with that but I think that that's something to be
23 careful of.

24

25 I mean I think we also saw that in the
26 first proposal on Angoon, because that author, when he
27 first introduced that proposal was all about limiting
28 bear hunters who were stealing his crab, so I think you
29 guys may have been led down a path to settle some sort
30 of local dispute and I would caution against that in
31 this case.

32

33 I would add that there's no biological
34 reason for limiting non-Federally-qualified users
35 especially since both people who support the proposal
36 and those who do not support the proposal as well as
37 Alaska Fish and Game have said there's large numbers of
38 deer. I remember in the initial transcripts from the
39 March meeting, I forget who said it, but someone who
40 was in support of this proposal said, yeah, there's a
41 lot of deer up on Wedge Mountain, we counted like 200
42 of them, so there's plenty of deer, the question is --
43 I think, to me, it boils down to are people willing to
44 get out of their boat. But I mean that's really up for
45 you guys to decide.

46

47 I'm probably never going out there but
48 I'm just giving my comments on the process.

49

50

0509

1 I would add that the non-Federally-
2 qualified users that are hunting in Pelican seem to all
3 have relatives and friends and family in Pelican, so
4 this is really kind of divisive in that community.

5
6 I'd like to also add that there's no
7 reason to adjust the bag limits. Most people are not
8 harvesting six deer and it would be pretty hard to
9 think that there are a lot of people doing that and
10 then hauling them back to Juneau given someone said
11 it's a buck a pound or 1.10 a pound, I mean that's a
12 lot of money.

13
14 And I would also remind you guys that
15 part of the rationale for moving the limit from four to
16 six was to make it so it was legal for Federally-
17 qualified subsistence users when they shot deer below
18 the mean high tide mark so they would not be illegal
19 under State statutes. So it was an alignment of
20 Federal and State guidelines.

21
22 And finally I'd like to address the
23 issue of I only report deer hunt that I'm successful
24 on. I think that that's really common among both
25 Federally-qualified users and non-Federally-qualified
26 users. I, personally, try and report all my deer hunts
27 but I know a lot of guys that are just like deer, deer,
28 deer, done, so I think that's kind of like across the
29 board and it's reflected on both sides of the
30 statistics.

31
32 All right, thank you, I'm done.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: All right, thank
35 you, Nick, appreciate your comments. Mr. Beason, go
36 ahead.

37
38 MR. BEASON: All right, thank you, Mr.
39 Chair. In light of time I'll try to keep my testimony
40 short. I will say that Territorial Sportsman is
41 opposed to this proposal. Again, I won't go into the
42 details but we do agree with all of the ADF&G comments.

43
44 I want to point out a couple things
45 just to bring to light here. I think this proposal,
46 especially, illustrates that the conflict between user
47 groups that these proposals are creating is enormous,
48 we're pitting neighbor against neighbor, friend against
49 friend, family against family, and is that the intent
50

0510

1 of these. I think what we should do is work together,
2 have some sort of working group to make sure that we're
3 all on the same page, everyone feels that they're
4 represented and treated equally going forward. I don't
5 think that has been done here or for any of the deer
6 proposals.

7
8 And my last thing, too, which I brought
9 up previously, and I would hope that somebody could
10 answer this question, I apologize, but enforcement of
11 these, who will enforce these, and if they're not
12 enforced are they really a law in place. And if
13 there's somebody out there that can answer that
14 question, I'm just not familiar with it, who will
15 enforce these in these remote areas and if they're not
16 enforced, how can somebody -- I mean what are the next
17 repercussions after that.

18
19 So thank you for your time.
20 Territorial Sportsmen is opposed to this proposal, both
21 proposals. Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
24 Beason for being succinct with your comments. When we
25 get into deliberation, you know, some of the questions
26 you may have been in asking could come up in
27 deliberations so there's still opportunity for that.

28
29 So Mr. Phillips, go ahead with your
30 testimony.

31
32 MR. PHILLIPS: Did you say Mr.
33 Phillips.

34
35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is Dan Phillips
36 still on the line -- yes, Dan Phillips.

37
38 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, this is James
39 Phillips, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm one of them people
40 that Mr. Beason has just talked about. I bring family
41 and friends out here. I live in Pelican, have since
42 1961, four years in Sitka. It does divide us all. But
43 one of the things that really divides us all is the
44 definition of a resident. That is No. 1. Is it
45 resident of the town or resident of the state, or the
46 Inlet. And No. 2, is we have 184 days to get our six
47 deer, that gives you a 30.666 days to get a deer. And,
48 yes, some of the residents are right, we have fewer
49 deer, we see fewer deer, it isn't because we can't get
50

0511

1 out of the skiff and walk up and look, it's just a
2 fact. Maybe Area 4 is huge, it's got the ABC Islands,
3 I think we got some 2,000 some square miles on our
4 island, but yet it's basically -- the deer hunting
5 pressure is only a few certain sections. And we --
6 like I said earlier, yesterday, the day before, we used
7 to leave town but I don't anymore, because why should
8 I, just to leave for somebody else.

9
10 Thank you, I'm done.

11
12 My wife would like to comment, thank
13 you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Do we.....

16
17 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
18 Hernandez, this is Patricia Phillips.

19
20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:have one more
21 person who would like to comment.

22
23 MS. PHILLIPS: Lisianski Inlet/Strait
24 doesn't have roads or ferries affecting access and we
25 are a LUD2 and wilderness area, therefore, no timber
26 harvest except personal use. This -- first I want to
27 say thank you to the RAC for your service and, you
28 know, I really honor and respect the job that you do.
29 However, this proposal sequence has been fast-tracked
30 and it has the potential to significantly adversely
31 promoting a highly controversial issue, I mean you've
32 seen it in the public testimony, in your
33 correspondence.

34
35 The harvest in our area is -- has
36 increased and the number of hunters has increased, but
37 we're talking about hunters from Yakutat, Sitka,
38 Haines, Hoonah, Gustavus, they can all hunt our area,
39 they're all Federally-qualified, and then you have the
40 Juneau hunters who also hunt our area. So, you know,
41 it's like we can get rid of one batch but we still have
42 the other, so I don't know.

43
44 And then I want to thank the ADF&G
45 wildlife biologist for sending me the wildlife
46 analysis, but when we held our local Fish and Game
47 Advisory Committee meeting, I had contacted the RAC
48 Coordinator -- the Subsistence RAC Coordinator and
49 asked for a wildlife analysis and was told it wasn't
50

0512

1 available yet and then after our meeting, the wildlife
2 -- the ADF&G wildlife biologist sent me -- emailed me
3 an analysis which I immediately sent out to our
4 membership, and it's a pretty good report, by the way,
5 except for where I gave my opinion about, you know
6 efficiency. But one good winter kill will eliminate
7 all the conflict that we're having right now.

8
9 And I would remind you about the Unit 2
10 deer planning process, which in 2004, it had five --
11 they met five times within six months and they had, not
12 only members of the public, but a large group of
13 technical assistance from Federal and State agencies,
14 and all the subcommittee meetings were advertised and
15 open to the public and people were able to testify at
16 the subcommittee meetings and at the Southeast RAC
17 meetings, and that's what I appreciate about this
18 process, it's a very open process, it's not just a
19 select few people that get to chime in. And one
20 outcome of that Unit 2 subcommittee process was a
21 better understanding of ANILCA by all meeting
22 participants and recommendations to improve deer
23 harvest reporting which is still ongoing as we can hear
24 from this meeting and, you know, a request for better
25 estimates of deer populations, and, as I indicated
26 earlier, if -- you know, if Fish and Game, Division of
27 Subsistence could come in here and do a subsistence
28 study, but there would need to be increased
29 collaboration with managing agencies and regulatory
30 groups, such as yourself, with the public.

31
32 So thank you, Mr. Chair, I'm clear.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Patty.
35 More good comments, lots of good comments all good
36 stuff for the Council to consider here. I'll just
37 check one more time if there's anybody else who's come
38 on the phone since we got started who would like to
39 testify.

40
41 MR. SPENCER: Hi, this is Phillip
42 Spencer, I'm in Pelican, and I don't know if you heard
43 me put my name on the list for public comment earlier.

44
45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No, I don't think
46 we did. Mr. Spencer, you say.

47
48 MR. SPENCER: Yes. Yes, thank you, Mr.
49 Chair.

50

0513

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mr.
2 Spencer.

3
4 MR. SPENCER: May I speak now?

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead.

7
8 MR. SPENCER: Thank you. I came up to
9 Alaska in 2015 to begin commercial fishing and the next
10 year was the first time I got to go out hunting, not
11 just in Alaska, but period, but even just in 2016 there
12 were noticeably more deer for a completely
13 inexperienced novice hunter. Just seeing the animals
14 running around compared to the limited amount that
15 you're seeing now and how much further you have to hike
16 for them. And with -- whether or not the data shows
17 that there's this abundance in Area 4, well, the sub-
18 area of the Inlet, we are just not seeing what you are
19 suggesting is there. There's a lot more boat traffic.
20 There's a lot more people from other communities who
21 are running up and down the beaches for a clear place
22 to hike up. And with the -- this proposal doesn't seem
23 to be a moratorium for hunters, it's a restriction of
24 the area, which is a massive area in which to hunt.
25 You can leave Pelican, go out the Inlet, you've got
26 Cross Sound, you've got the outer coast of Yakobi
27 Island, which is all full of nooks and crannies and
28 wonderful places to go in and hunt that aren't as close
29 to home. You mentioned also that the average age of
30 the hunter is increasing, so this could also be looked
31 at as a respect for elders scenario where we reserve
32 the place closer to the town for the people who are
33 aging in the town to hunt closer to home.

34
35 And thank you, that's all I have to
36 say.

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
39 Mr. Spencer. Anybody else who's recently called in
40 since we got started on this oral testimony.

41
42 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, Terry Wirta.

43
44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Was that Harry
45 Woods?

46
47 MR. WIRTA: Terry Wirta.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Terry Wirta.

50

0514

1 MR. WIRTA: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, go ahead,
4 Mr. Wirta.

5

6 MR. WIRTA: Yeah, I've lived here 65
7 years and I've hunted since I was 12 years old and what
8 not, and, you know, I've seen the deer population
9 decline in here. And I think everybody's right on
10 saying that. I don't know, Fish and Game, they seem to
11 count turds and seems like they think that everything's
12 good but I don't think that is true. I mean I've been
13 out hunting there last year and I never even got a
14 deer, thank goodness my woman did. But, yeah, I don't
15 know, just I haven't seen anything here this year. I'm
16 still hoping to get something. Yeah, there seems to be
17 a lot more traffic running around here and fewer deer.

18

19 So I don't have a whole lot to say
20 about that but that's about what I got, thanks for my
21 time.

22

23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you for
24 your testimony. Anybody else.

25

26 MR. CARSON: Yeah, this is Richard
27 Carson.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Richard Carson,
30 okay, I don't think we've heard from you yet, go ahead.

31

32 MR. CARSON: You guys are talking about
33 cutting back on the hunting for the people who don't
34 live there and the next thing you know you'll be
35 talking about doing away with charter boats and
36 everything else out there. Now, according to the
37 reports that I hear, there is no shortage, the shortage
38 isn't there for the deer, there's plenty of them. So
39 is this just going to be just taken away and just given
40 to the local people to do just for themselves, the
41 whole thing, and then the next thing you know there'll
42 be no fishing and other boats can't come out there in
43 the summertime.

44

45 That's all I have to say. I'm against
46 it.

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
49 Mr. Carson. Anybody else on the phone line that's

50

0515

1 recently called in.

2

3

(No comments)

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 HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think I will call an end to the public testimony. I want to thank you folks for calling in and keeping it short. Sorry that we didn't take the time to have questions from the Council but I think that could have gone on for a very long time. So we'll just have to deal with that. So then we'll.....

MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya Wessels.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead, Katya.

MS. WESSELS: Yeah, I have a summary of that one written public comment that was misplaced from being placed into your Council meeting books with the analysis and it was received by OSM on July 2nd and the comment is from Roger Harding of Juneau. So I have a summary.

The comment is regarding WP22-09 but also regarding 07, 08, and 10. Mr. Harding opposes all four proposals. He sites comments issued by ADF&G and reiterates their findings. Then he said that he's supportive of satisfying Federally-qualified subsistence user needs but he states that the changes to the Federal regulations are only allowed and necessary when there's conservation concerns. And he thinks there is no concerns in this situation. Mr. Harding owns property in Pelican for the last 25 years and pays taxes there, although his primary residence is in Juneau. He enjoys the community of Pelican and hunting and fishing opportunities in Lisianski Inlet. He would be supportive of WP22-09 if there was a conservation concern. He thinks that if passed, this proposal would cause undue hardship to Alaskans from Juneau, Ketchikan and other areas from outside Southeast Alaska as well as non-resident deer hunters. In conclusion, Mr. Harding reiterates that if adopted, this proposal will not follow the intent of ANILCA.

This concludes my summary of Mr. Harding's written public comment.

0516

1 Thank you.

2

3

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
4 Katya for reminding me of that, and appreciate you
5 doing a summary. So that concludes all the information
6 gathering on these proposals. That brings us up to the
7 point where we make the Council recommendation and a
8 motion. However, given the fact that it's moving on
9 towards 6:00 o'clock in the evening, I guess, and I
10 know we already lost one Council member who had to
11 leave, I don't know if we've lost anybody else, I'm
12 just going to do a quick poll here of people that are
13 on the phone. I'm a little kind of up in the air of
14 how to proceed here, we haven't quite run into this
15 situation before where we're this far behind and, I
16 don't know, given the process we have it just doesn't
17 seem possible to get through all these proposals in a
18 short amount of time and allow all the testimony and
19 all the deliberation that everybody seems to want to
20 engage in. So I'm asking the Council members if
21 there's, anybody who's still on the phone, how we want
22 to proceed.

23

24

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

25

26

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

27

28

29

30

31

MR. WRIGHT: Are there kind of like
deadlines on these other proposals, or is it another
two years from now or what. Just curious, Mr. Chair.

32

33

34

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Not a question I
can answer, Frank, I don't know what the polices and
procedures are.

35

36

37

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I'm.....

38

39

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm not the.....

40

41

42

43

44

MS. WESSELS: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
Katya Wessels. So your question is if the Council
needs to make a decision of these proposals at this
meeting, is that what your question is?

45

46

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it is.

47

48

49

50

MS. WESSELS: Okay. Yes, this is an
action item. All the proposals and closure reviews are
action items so the Council needs to provide their

0517

1 recommendations to the Board.

2

3 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

4

5 MS. WESSELS: So the opportunity that
6 the Council has is to extend its meeting into tomorrow
7 and get at least through all the action items, which
8 are the remaining proposals starting from WP22-09/10,
9 and ending up with WP22-02. And then there are two
10 other action items. One is identifying issues for 2021
11 annual report from the Council to the Board, and then
12 confirming the dates for the next meeting and deciding
13 the dates for the fall 2022 meeting. So those are all
14 the action items that the Council needs to take care of
15 during this meeting.

16

17 I already spoke with the court reporter
18 and she said that they can accommodate the Council
19 meeting tomorrow if the Council decides to extend the
20 meeting that one day. You know other items on the
21 agenda can be moved to your next meeting during the
22 wintertime.

23

24 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
27 Frank.

28

29 MR. WRIGHT: I suggest that we see if
30 we can finish this one and then table the other ones
31 until tomorrow morning at 8:00 o'clock. I'm supposed
32 to go fishing.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. That's a
35 good suggestion, Frank. I was going to.....

36

37 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, well, Mr.
38 Chair.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:recommend
41 we.....

42

43 MS. WESSELS:this is Katya.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Katya, go ahead.

46

47 MS. WESSELS: Katya Wessels. Yeah, one
48 additional thing, if the Council decides to extend the
49 meeting one day I would suggest that you have a motion
50

0518

1 on record to extend the meeting one day so it's clear
2 for the record and this way we announce it to the
3 public that that's what the Council's intent is, is to
4 continue this public meeting tomorrow.

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
7 Katya. It's a good suggestion, Frank. I'll just maybe
8 ask the rest of the Council how they feel about that,
9 the rest of the Council members.

10
11 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I make a
12 motion that we extend the meeting to 8:00 tomorrow
13 morning after we finish this one. Thank you, Mr.
14 Chair. That's a motion.

15
16 MR. HOWARD: Second. This is Albert.

17
18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

19
20 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Did you second
23 that, Albert, you were a little garbled?

24
25 MR. HOWARD: Yes, I did, Mr. Chairman.

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
28 Albert. I got you that time, you seconded. Okay, so
29 that makes it a motion that's required, so any other
30 comments from the rest of the Council.

31
32 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

35
36 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, Mike
37 Douville. I have a question.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

40
41 MR. DOUVILLE: Question or a
42 suggestion, it could be taken either way. But is it
43 possible that we could restrict our agenda tomorrow to
44 action items and forward the non-action items on to the
45 next meeting.

46
47 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Frank.

48
49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,
50

0519

1 Frank, you made the motion. Go ahead and respond to
2 that.

3

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, we can, because at
6 the beginning of the agenda we stated this agenda was a
7 guide, so that's the way it was. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That's right,
11 thank you, Frank. We can always adjust the agenda as we
12 move through the meeting. I think my recommendation
13 would be that if this motion were adopted that we start
14 off tomorrow morning, take it as it comes, if we can
15 take care of maybe some other items that aren't
16 necessarily action items we could do that, if we don't
17 feel like doing that at that time we'll make that
18 decision as we go along. That would be my suggestion.
19 Any other Council members with discussion on this
20 motion.

21

22

(No comments)

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. WRIGHT: Call for the question, Mr.
Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
Frank. We better do a roll call on this just to make
sure we know who's with us, and also to restate the
motion I believe the motion was to continue on with the
meeting tomorrow at 8:00 o'clock in the morning,
however, I think you also stated that we would complete
the proposal that's now before us, is that correct,
tonight?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it is, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, very good.
That's the motion. Go ahead and do a roll call.

MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Ian says yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Did you say, yes, sir?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Ian votes yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

0520

1

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

2

3

MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville votes yes.

4

5

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

6

7

MR. SLATER: Jim Slater votes yes.

8

9

MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

10

11

(No comments)

12

13

MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

14

15

(No comments)

16

17

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

18

19

MR. HOWARD: Albert votes yes.

20

21

MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

22

23

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I vote yes.

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

26

27

MR. ROBBINS: I vote yes.

28

29

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

30

31

Harvey Kitka.

32

33

MR. KITKA: I vote yes.

34

35

MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.

36

37

(No comments)

38

39

MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

40

41

(No comments)

42

43

MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

44

45

(No comments)

46

47

MR. WRIGHT: Motion passes, Mr. Chair.

48

49

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,

50

0521

1 Frank. It sounds like we lost Bob and I heard Cathy
2 come on and say she had to leave, but, yes, we still
3 have a quorum. So let's finish out Wildlife Proposal
4 22-09 and 22-10, and then we'll recess for the night.
5 In order to do that I guess we'll need a motion on the
6 floor, and we should probably address these
7 independently so let's look for a motion on 22-09.

8

9 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair. I move to
10 adopt WP22-09.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
13 That's Mike Douville.

14

15 MR. HOWARD: Second. Mr. Chairman,
16 this is Albert, I'll second.

17

18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
19 Okay. So we have this proposal on the floor. I would
20 suggest that in this discussion if on this proposal, if
21 it sounds like 22-10 becomes maybe a preferred
22 alternative we can discuss that in relation to 09, so
23 we can deal with them somewhat together, but depending
24 on how that discussion goes we'll make a decision on 09
25 first. That would be my recommendation.

26

27 So after all of this testimony and
28 presentations, what's the Council's thoughts on the
29 proposal which would close this designated area around
30 Lisianski Inlet to non-subsistence hunters from October
31 15th until December 31st.

32

33 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, this is Jim
34 from Pelican.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

37

38 MR. SLATER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd
39 be grateful if I could give a lead in like Albert and
40 Ian did for the previous two proposals.

41

42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: You bet, go ahead.

43

44 MR. SLATER: Okay. Just a little bit
45 of background. I agree with most of the crowd here
46 that things moved fairly quickly with this proposal.
47 As a new member I had a short time to prepare for the
48 spring 2021 meeting. However, in that time I did talk
49 to a number of year-round residents here who I knew had
50

1 concerns about subsistence hunting opportunities. In
2 particular, subsistence concerns are especially
3 relevant to us, as has been mentioned before we have
4 very sporadic ferry service. For example, during the
5 peak of the pandemic we had no ferry service for a
6 complete year. Everything had to be brought in by
7 volunteers on fishing boats or by float plane access,
8 which you know is expensive and, in itself is sporadic
9 in the winter. This year we have ferry service once a
10 month that we -- that's the planned schedule throughout
11 until the summer 2022, and we'll have no ferry service
12 from December until March of this winter.

13

14 Hunting competition was the number 1
15 concern amongst the residents I talked to. Most or
16 many confirmed that they've seen an increase of hunting
17 pressure from hunters coming from outside the area and
18 this correlated to a more difficult time in them
19 obtaining their sufficient subsistence animals.

20

21 As was mentioned before we had a Fish
22 and Game Advisory Committee in which 21 people
23 attended. There was a clear majority to support a
24 modified proposal of a reduced bag limit as a means to
25 come to some kind of compromise. Following that -- and
26 that was a vote for a bag limit for two deer only and I
27 think it was 12 to five -- I thought it was originally
28 higher than that but I don't want to argue about that,
29 for supporting the bag limit of two only. A city
30 resolution supporting the modified proposal narrowly
31 failed by one vote due to the absence of a supporting
32 Council member who had to go fishing. Interestingly
33 enough the same people who originally proposed all this
34 stuff and then voted for the modified proposal opposed
35 it in the city council meeting to, I guess, stopping
36 its success.

37

38 We know this is very -- it's causing a
39 great conflict, this is a tough issue, and you can see
40 how emotional a lot of people are and the vocal
41 opponents of this proposal have painted a very ugly
42 picture. I'm not going to go into the personal attacks
43 and so on that I've seen, but I will say one thing,
44 that anyone who thinks that anyone here can coerce or
45 convince or manipulate the unwitting community members
46 of Pelican has another thing coming to them if they try
47 to do it here, we're an independent group. And of
48 that, I am a group of a -- a member of a group of a
49 significant number of year-round community members who
50

0523

1 have legitimate subsistence concerns and I brought
2 their concerns as a RAC as is my duty as a member. If
3 not all, or the vast majority of the people who have
4 commented and testified in opposition to this don't
5 live here year-round no matter what they say in their
6 proposals -- or their comments. They're not spending
7 12 months a year here, the majority of them.

8
9 As was stated by a number of people,
10 actually both sides of this proposal, Lisianski Inlet
11 has limited access to hunting. This is due to the
12 geography here. We have very steep mountains with
13 intermittent watersheds. So these watersheds, although
14 there's an extensive coastline, these watersheds
15 provide the access to hunting areas. It doesn't take
16 much or more than -- in these areas, more than a few
17 boats to clog up, or to essentially clog up the
18 watersheds with hunters already, especially if there's
19 two or three boats with several hunters each dropping
20 guys off at these different beaches. There's not that
21 many beaches and access ways up there. And it's a
22 further deterrent when people, you know a boat went up
23 there and you don't know what beaches they're at,
24 there's only four or five beaches, or watersheds to go
25 up, and you know that there's a group of hunters up
26 there, you almost -- you can't go to that whole area
27 and this effect can last multiple days. A lot of
28 people are asking themselves, if it's this bad now
29 what's going to happen when there's one, two or three
30 other large group hunting cabins. There are several
31 cabins around here that are owned by non-year-round
32 residents and I'd say -- I haven't talked to anyone who
33 has a concern about people who own land to come up here
34 and hunt, what people do have the concern about is when
35 they bring large groups and now it turns into an
36 overcrowded mess. Worse yet, is there a commercial
37 activity coming down the pike. We don't have it yet
38 but there's several potential places that have a
39 likelihood to some level of turning into a lodge.
40 Safety is also a concern. When there's that many
41 people and you have to try to follow someone up a
42 watershed, and you don't know they're there, you don't
43 feel quite safe about it. Do we have to go to blaze
44 orange clothing.

45
46 So all in all this has been talked
47 about for years but nothing has ever been done. We
48 feel, in this group of people here that it's a serious
49 issue now and if the trend continues it's on track to
50

0524

1 be much worse.

2

3

4 We all have different ideas and dreams
5 of what we want to do here and these dreams aren't all
6 the same and they are in conflict. Some of us want to
7 make money out of this place. Some of us want it to be
8 a place of recreation for friends and family. But
9 there's a significant number of people who just want to
10 live a traditional subsistence lifestyle. We all have
11 rights. But it seems that in recent years, at least,
12 subsistence folks have been losing ground. What can we
13 do. It seems like all we have is this blunt tool of
14 Federally-qualified hunters versus non-Federally-
15 qualified hunters. And with that we have reduced bag
16 limits, which in a sense do something but don't address
17 hunting pressure or hunting access because, as was
18 shown in report after report, the number of people
19 coming in to hunt don't take that many deer, it's
20 really the pressure that causes the problem. And the
21 other one is the closure for an area or time, or both,
22 and that's what this proposal is, and that addresses
23 the issue but it does have collateral damage. Like I
24 said, it's a blunt tool and no one feels good about
25 that. And if there was another tool it would be great
26 to find out but we don't have one at this point and
27 that's why this proposal is structured as such.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Jim. I
32 think you did a pretty good job of addressing the
33 stipulation that something is necessary to address the
34 ability of the subsistence users to continue their
35 subsistence activities so well done on that point.
36 Anybody else on the Council want to weigh in on this
37 proposal.

38

39 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez.

40

41 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Mr. Douville, go
44 ahead.

45

46 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you. You know I
47 find it hard for me to support either one of them. It
48 seems like the first one is -- according to the
49 Department and all their data there's no shortage of
50 deer, up to carrying capacity and so on. What it looks

51

0525

1 like is that there's plenty of water but there's not
2 enough elbow room at the bar. So I don't know if this
3 is the answer to it, but the number 10 part of it would
4 restrict non-Federally-qualified users in the whole of
5 Unit 4 to four deer where it seems like there's a lot
6 of deer in Unit 4, but would it be necessary to
7 restrict those guys in Unit 4. I mean there's got to
8 be places where they could take six, or they probably
9 wouldn't be qualified for six now. But neither one of
10 them are a real good option so unless I hear testimony
11 otherwise I do not support either one.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
16 Anybody else on the Council.

17

18 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, it's Ian.

19

20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

21

22 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Mr. Slater, I
23 just wonder -- I think from what I heard from you was
24 that you might be more in favor of the bag limit change
25 than the all out closure based on the vote for that,
26 could you just clarify maybe which is your preference
27 at this point. I know we're talking about 9 and not
28 10, but it's when you have these contingent -- like
29 ultimately contingent motions I'm trying to sort that
30 out.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ian.
33 Yeah, Jim if you could respond to Ian and I'd just kind
34 of like to remind the Council that, yes, we may -- even
35 though we're going to vote on these separately they are
36 kind of tied together and how we vote on one might
37 determine, you know, what action we take on the other
38 so keep that in mind. And, and, Jim, if you want to
39 respond to that, go ahead.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: You might be muted
44 Jim, I don't know if you're trying to respond.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I don't know, I
49 hope we didn't lose Mr. Slater due to bad phone

50

0526

1 connections.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, we'll
6 standby. Is there anybody else on the Council with a
7 comment on this proposal.

8

9 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I guess I
10 will follow-up until we get Jim back.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

13

14 MR. JOHNSON: Just that my concerns
15 about a closure in this case are the same as they were
16 previously, that I'm just concerned about squeezing the
17 balloon, and so I would be more in favor of a bag limit
18 change than a closure in order to protect Hoonah
19 subsistence users as well in the shifting of
20 competition.

21

22 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
23 Ian. Other Council members want to weigh in on this
24 one.

25

26 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
27 Cal.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

30

31 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, just for
32 clarification and stuff, I just wanted to make sure I
33 have.....

34

35 MR. SLATER: Hi.

36

37 MR. CASIPIT:this right.

38

39 MR. SLATER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Just a second, we
42 lost you and we kind of moved on and we'll come back to
43 you but Cal Casipit is up now but we'll get to you.

44

45 MR. SLATER: Okay, thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

48

49 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. I was just saying

50

0527

1 like on Page 247 of the analysis, it says that 22-10,
2 that four deer harvest limit for non-Federally-
3 qualified users was to be applied in the Lisianski
4 Inlet and Lisianski Straits, so I think on the
5 following page where it talks about reducing the bag
6 limit to four from six in Unit 4, I think that just
7 might be an issue with the printing of the analysis.
8 But, yeah, I assumed the bag limit reduction was being
9 applied to that area that's described in bold at the
10 bottom of 247. But -- anyway, that's what I'm saying
11 there.

12

13 And then the other thing was that I
14 also wanted to reiterate -- or make sure I understood
15 and I'm pretty sure I did that the Pelican Fish and
16 Game Advisory Committee had suggested reducing the bag
17 limit down to two deer limit and apparently there was a
18 fair level of support for that and even a small -- and
19 then there was some support, not as much as the two
20 deer limit, but there was some support for two bucks
21 harvest limit as well applied into that Lisianski
22 Inlet, Lisianski Strait area that's described there.

23

24 So I'm kind of with Ian, I'm into this
25 -- you know, I'm concerned about the level -- the high
26 bar that we have to cross for actual closures, closures
27 of areas. You know this whole Section .815 thing. It
28 seems like we have a bit more latitude with adjusting
29 bag limits to provide priority. It's my preference we
30 go with a bag limit.....

31

32 (Teleconference interference -
33 participants not muted)

34

35 MR. CASIPIT: I'm sorry, harvest limit
36 reduction and -- but I'm open to the number and I'd
37 like to hear more discussion about that. I tend -- I
38 would maybe tend to go with the Advisory Committee's
39 recommendation but.....

40

41 (Teleconference interference -
42 participants not muted)

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Could people check
45 their mute buttons again there's somebody talking over
46 Cal.

47

48 (Teleconference interference -
49 participants not muted)

50

0528

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Somebody's unmuted
2 that's not talking. Okay, thank you, go ahead, Cal.

3
4 MR. CASIPIT: Sorry, I think I'm done.
5 I was just saying that I'd like to have more discussion
6 on what a bag limit reduction might look like but I
7 can't support a closure for much of the same reasons
8 that Ian alluded to plus the high bar that we're going
9 to have to cross for a closure to -- an area closure
10 with the Board.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
13 Cal. Jim, it sounds like you're back with us, are you
14 ready to respond to questions from Ian.

15
16 MR. SLATER: Yes. If I'm remembering
17 it correctly, do I support a bag limit reduction versus
18 a closure. I started to say a bag limit reduction is a
19 preferred way if there's a resource problem, but if
20 you're looking at a competition or hunting pressure
21 it's not really. And so as Mike said there's a lot of
22 water but no room at the bar, his analogy, which is
23 somewhat appropriate and so I guess that's the short
24 answer.

25
26 Like I said there's a lot of
27 apprehension and a lot of hesitation because of the
28 conflict that this is causing and no one likes that but
29 a bag limit reduction doesn't really accomplish it.
30 There's other ways to negotiate, and I know it'd still
31 be a closure but it's looking at dates and area. So
32 anyway that's enough for now.

33
34 Thanks.

35
36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

37
38 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez, Mike
39 Douville.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

42
43 MR. DOUVILLE: My question is for Cal,
44 am I not getting this right, like we're discussing
45 these both together WP22-10 says Unit 4 deer, but is
46 that bag limit reduction in there, is that only for
47 this proposed closure area or does that cover the whole
48 Unit 4. I'm not quite understanding what -- you
49 mentioned something about it and I didn't get it quite
50

0529

1 clear so maybe we could understand that clearly.
2 Because just to blanket Unit 4 with a reduction doesn't
3 make any sense to me either.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I understand what
8 you're saying there, Mike. We do need to discuss that,
9 I don't know, Cal, you kind of brought it up, I don't
10 know if you've looked at it closer but I think I see
11 what the problem might be here but if you want to
12 address it, go ahead, Cal.

13

14 MR. CASIPIT: Well, I'm not Staff and I
15 was trying to give a chance for Staff to chime in and
16 say something. But I mean you're right, the way it's
17 written, both in our executive summary and both on the
18 proposed Federal regulation on Page 247 and then
19 continuing on to 248, you are exactly right, Mike and
20 Don, but if you read under the issues where it comes
21 off, it says Wildlife Proposal WP22-10 submitted by
22 Patricia Phillips of Pelican requests that deer harvest
23 limits for non-Federally-qualified users in Lisianski
24 Inlet and Lisianski Strait be reduced to four deer
25 which is a lot different than the proposed regulatory
26 language. So that's what I was trying to point out.
27 And that's why I thought the bag limit for 22-10 was
28 for that Lisianski area only.

29

30 Staff can correct me if I'm wrong but
31 that's how I'm interpreting it and I think that the way
32 it's rewritten in the executive summary and the
33 analysis is not right.

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Maybe we should
36 have Staff answer that question if they're able.

37

38 MS. WESSELS: This is Katya. I wonder
39 if Greg Dunn or Lisa are online.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That's be helpful.

42

43 MR. SUMINSKI: Katya, this is Terry
44 Suminski.

45

46 MS. WESSELS: This is who, sorry?

47

48 MR. SUMINSKI: Terry Suminski.

49

50

0530

1 MS. WESSELS: Okay, Terry, maybe you
2 can help because I cannot help with this question.

3
4 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, go ahead,
5 Terry.

6
7 MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
8 Mr. Casipit. Just give me a second so I can pull up
9 the original proposal and I'll get back with you.
10 Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. But I think
13 regardless of what we end up doing here on this
14 proposal, it's probably going to take some kind of a
15 modification. I got a feeling neither of these
16 proposals would be acceptable as they're written so you
17 might want to be thinking about modifications.

18
19 Any other issues that want to be
20 brought up by the Council while we're waiting for Terry
21 on that question.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. While we're
26 waiting for Terry, I just wanted to add that I think I
27 agree with what Jim Slater said in regards to what
28 would be the best solution to this perceived problem
29 Pelican residents are bringing before us and a bag
30 limit reduction, in my view, is probably not the most
31 effective. You know the analysis shows that there are
32 not very many non-subsistence users that harvest more
33 than two deer so a four deer bag limit reduction would
34 probably not effect things all that much. A closure
35 would be more effective. A time closure in that area.
36 However, considering the fact that a good
37 representation of Pelican residents got together at an
38 Advisory Council meeting and did endorse a compromise
39 proposal that would reduce the bag limit, I would
40 probably defer to the locals on that. I don't want to
41 vote against both proposals because I do hear enough
42 concerns from Pelican residents that there is a problem
43 that needs to be addressed. And like I say with the
44 previous proposals I don't want to send the message to
45 the Board by voting against any kind of a solution to a
46 problem that we don't think there's a problem. I think
47 we need to send this on to the Board at least to let
48 them know that we do believe there's a problem that
49 needs solving. So that's my feeling on the whole
50

0531

1 issue.

2

3

4 And maybe Terry Suminski you have a
5 clarification on what the wording of Proposal 10 is and
6 do you have that yet?

7

8 MR. SUMINSKI: Hello, Mr. Chair, this
9 is Terry Suminski. And, yes, I did refer to the
10 original proposal and the area language is missing from
11 the analysis. So that part that's missing from Ms.
12 Phillips' proposal is in Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski
13 Straits reduce bag limit for non-Federally-qualified
14 subsistence harvesters to four deer bag limit. So
15 we'll be sure to correct that, thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
18 Terry. I think we can address that when we move to
19 Proposal 10, we'll keep that in mind that the language
20 needs to be modified so thank you for that.

21

22 Any other discussion on these
23 proposals.

24

25 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: Jim, I just have one more
30 follow-up question about the results of that September
31 7th RAC meeting. It's been brought to attention by you
32 and the testimony from Ms. Phillips that there was
33 those two votes a 19 -- or a vote for two deer and then
34 a two deer male -- I was just wondering was the closure
35 put to the RAC to a vote too and what were the results
36 of that.

37

38 MR. SLATER: Thank you, Ian. Through
39 the Chair. No, it -- basically the meeting was
40 somewhat of a free forum. We were talking about
41 different options and everyone gave their personal
42 testimony and what they felt was important and so on
43 and it went around the room. And then at one point
44 someone made a comment that why can't we just go to two
45 deer and that somehow seemed to be crystallized, a
46 consensus that, you know, everyone was looking for
47 compromise at that point. So at that point the
48 consensus formed and from there I think people didn't
49 want to give up some kind of agreement and so people
50 stopped arguing about it and we basically added the --

0532

1 just trying to be consistent with other proposals and
2 so on and so we thought it would be good to add a bucks
3 only, or male deer only with that and that went into a
4 subsequent vote and it still held the majority of both
5 the general population, or the general meeting
6 attendants and the Advisory Committee itself. So
7 that's how that went. We never got to a vote on actual
8 proposals per se.

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Other
11 Council members with comments, questions to be
12 answered.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. It sounds
17 like the Council is ready to take a vote on Wildlife
18 Proposal 22-09, the first one up before us, are we
19 ready to vote on that one or are you still thinking
20 about it.

21
22 (Teleconference interference -
23 participants not muted)

24
25 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

28
29 MR. SLATER: Basically in talking with
30 several of the community members who are supporting
31 this proposal, they were willing, as an -- to try to
32 reduce the impact to non-Federally-qualified users to
33 change the date and have a smaller area and a shorter
34 time, in a sense move the date from October 15th to
35 November 1st and then move the line from the head of
36 the Inlet, which is Lisianski River towards the
37 southeast portion of Lisianski Inlet up to basically
38 where the Straits intersect the Inlet, it would be
39 something on the west side of a local feature called
40 Nosehead going straight across to the bridge between
41 Miner Island and Miner Mountain and cutting over to the
42 day mark at Rocky Point at the Straits.

43
44 Which essentially reduces the area.

45
46 If you look at the total area before it
47 was 38 miles of Inlet and Bay and Straits, now it would
48 be a total of 16 miles, so it would be a reduction of
49 58 percent of the original area. It would essentially
50

0533

1 go down a little bit under 10 miles, 9-something from
2 Pelican to the head of the Inlet and up about six miles
3 to the Strait. It would encompass both Sunnyside and
4 Phonograph but that's about it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. It sounds
7 like you're offering that up as a modification to 09 --
8 Proposal 09.

9

10 MR. SLATER: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. If that's
13 your intent I guess we would have to make a motion for
14 an amendment and then discuss that amendment.

15

16 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez, who
17 was offering this amendment?

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That was Jim
20 Slater.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. I guess my
23 question is, I guess we can amend these things and
24 whatever but, we -- you know these things are being
25 offered up where the general public where those -- or
26 many of those that are impacted have not -- will not be
27 able to see or comment on or whatever, but, we, well
28 may be within our right, I'm not sure. But it's --
29 it's quite a change to make and we do have a motion on
30 the floor, if I'm not mistaken. And I am not in favor
31 of a closure, I would be more supportive of a reduced
32 bag limit.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thanks, Mike
37 for bringing that up. We don't have that amendment --
38 we don't have a motion to make that amendment yet, it
39 was just raised as a possibility. So let's just
40 discuss a little bit what that would mean.

41

42 In this case, it sounds like Jim and
43 maybe some of the other folks in Pelican are offering
44 up an amendment to the proposal which would essentially
45 shorten the time of the closure and reduce the area of
46 the closure. My feeling is that the important
47 consideration would be, does the analysis that we had
48 presented, you know, adequately cover what the impacts
49 of that amendment would be. So that, to me, would be
50

0534

1 the main consideration. If Council feels that it needs
2 more analysis than what we've already heard then we
3 probably would vote the amendment down, however if the
4 Council feels that we've -- it's within the realm of
5 what the analysis has covered and the public testimony
6 then we could probably vote on it.

7

8 So.....

9

10 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

11

12 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

13

14 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that Frank.

17

18 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. We need a

19 motion.....

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank.

22

23 MR. WRIGHT:on the amendment and
24 second otherwise it doesn't go anywhere. Thank you,
25 Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. So now
28 we're just to the point of whether Mr. Slater would
29 like to offer that up as a motion. We haven't actually
30 gotten a motion yet.

31

32 MR. SLATER: Okay. Sure, Mr. Chair, I

33 move.....

34

35 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

36

37 MR. SLATER:that we amend --
38 thank you. I move that we amend Proposal WP22-09 to
39 reduce the time period from, changing the beginning of
40 the closure from October 15th to November 1st and
41 reducing the scope of the area from the head of
42 Lisianski Inlet up to the west side of Nosehead across
43 over to the land bridge between Miner Island and Miner
44 Mountain and cutting over to the day mark at Rocky
45 Point across Lisianski Straits. Effectively reducing
46 the size by 58 percent of the area and the duration
47 from 10 weeks to eight weeks.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

50

0535

1 MR. WRIGHT: And I feel that.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Jim, then.....

4

5 MR. SLATER: And I feel that the.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Then.....

8

9 MR. SLATER: I'm sorry, I'll stop
10 there.

11

12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, well, we'll
13 leave that up for deliberations. It sounded specific
14 enough to me as motion, do we have a second.

15

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Do we have a
20 second so we can discuss that proposed amendment.

21

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

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
25 Cal. Okay, the amendment is open for discussion. Did
26 you want to add something to that Jim, your initial
27 statement.

28

29 MR. SLATER: I was just going to make a
30 comment that I gues -- well, I guess a couple comments.

31

32 One is that I feel this would no way
33 affect the analysis of it, it's the same area and it's
34 a shorter time period so it's a subset of everything,
35 so the analysis should still be valid. And that's, I
36 guess, about it. I'll hold my other comment.

37

38 Thanks.

39

40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Other
41 Council members.

42

43 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

46

47 MR. JOHNSON: Jim, when we did the
48 previous area modification for 07 we focused on the
49 WAAs as a way to retract land boundaries, could you --
50

0536

1 I'm just not familiar enough with the area to know, on
2 this tiny topographic map, exactly where it intersects
3 with the WAAs, so is there a way to make equivalent
4 your proposal to the WAAs. Like would it subtract 3419
5 -- well, I know it wouldn't subtract 3419, but would it
6 subtract 3418, for instance, or like can you -- is
7 there a way to describe it that way?

8

9 MR. SLATER: Through the Chair, thank
10 you, Ian. It would be difficult, basically 3418 and
11 3421 would both be removed and the bulk of -- or all of
12 34 -- yeah, I guess all of 3417 would be removed and it
13 would be roughly 3419, but 3419 is much, much larger
14 than the area, it would be -- so you would -- it's
15 basically -- it's the area to the southeast and
16 northwest of Pelican -- northwest of Pelican by about
17 six miles and southeast of Pelican by about 9-something
18 miles covering the two -- Pelican and the two
19 subdivisions, allowing people to basically hunt right
20 around Pelican if they didn't have a big boat or it was
21 rough weather they wouldn't be going out very far. It
22 would basically be the immediate area surrounding
23 Pelican itself.

24

25 That's all.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Does that
28 satisfy you Ian. Does that help?

29

30 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that's helpful, I
31 have a follow-up.

32

33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

34

35 MR. JOHNSON: Just that it's less clear
36 in this case what the effect of this will be just
37 because unfortunately we lack WAA level analysis in
38 this case. We've had the benefit of that in previous
39 proposals and so it's unclear to me whether this
40 spacial amendment truly resolves some of the concerns
41 that have been brought up by the Council before we were
42 able to quantify impact where that doesn't exist with
43 this amendment.

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody
46 else with a comment.

47

48 MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chair, Harold.

49

50

0537

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Excuse me, was
2 that Harold.

3
4 MR. ROBBINS: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is
5 Harold.

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,
8 Harold.

9
10 MR. ROBBINS: I don't feel very
11 comfortable with this, changing things around like this
12 without proper analysis and I would really like to see
13 the community of Pelican come together rather than be
14 so divided and I really have a hard time dealing with
15 these really divisive situations that's breaking these
16 communities apart. I just don't feel good about going
17 ahead and proceeding with this.

18
19 So that's my feelings.

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
22 for that, Harold. Anybody else.

23
24 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
25 Albert.

26
27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert.

28
29 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 I wonder if Staff could give us some thoughts on this.
31 It seems to me that.....

32
33 (Teleconference interference -
34 participants not muted)

35
36 MR. HOWARD: I'm not sure what the
37 noise is, it's not on my end. But it seems like we're
38 still within our right, I mean what concerns me is the
39 comment that was made that this Council's credibility
40 was mentioned earlier and the only thing I have to say
41 to that is to do their homework. It's part of our
42 requirement we have to do, is to understand this
43 forwards and backwards, and I think we're still within
44 our -- to make sure the subsistence user needs are met.
45 Now, I mentioned this on Berners Bay moose debate when
46 a gentleman from Juneau decided to throw me under the
47 bus, I guess. Subsistence has become a word that
48 people use because it's on TV all the time, but the
49 true meaning of subsistence is people in the rural
50

0538

1 communities with the population designation and that
2 designation was determined by a long drawn out process.
3 So that's where subsistence originally came from, and
4 it came from -- I'm trying to keep this short. It's
5 not agreeable by a lot people in this community because
6 it became a way to regulate our traditional uses here
7 in Angoon of the resource.

8

9 So I think we need Staff to weigh in on
10 whether or not we can do this and so far they haven't
11 really steered us in the wrong direction.

12

13 So thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Albert.
16 Anybody else.

17

18 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.
19 You know I'm pretty convinced that we could make this
20 change that's proposed in this amendment. I mean it's
21 -- basically it's reducing basically the time closure
22 to non-Federally-qualified users is down to what 15
23 days or something. The only concern I have is to make
24 sure that Staff is able to map this out properly based
25 on what was said orally over the phone here and
26 captured in the record. As long as Staff is okay
27 capturing that new area, I'm -- you know as long as
28 they're okay, they have an idea of what that area is
29 and they can put that -- draw that on a map and put
30 that on a map for the Board to look at, I'm okay with
31 it.

32

33 So I'm ready for the question on this
34 amendment.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
37 Anybody else.

38

39 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez.

40

41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, Mike, go
42 ahead.

43

44 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville here.
45 Okay, he said 15 days, I can't remember what the dates
46 were. But perhaps someone would kindly read the
47 amendment please.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, we don't want
50

0539

1 any confusion here Mike. Maybe Jim you could read the
2 amendment and read it as it would be written in what
3 would be in the new proposal. And you might want to
4 start using the language that's on Page 247 of the
5 proposal book, what your amendment look like if you
6 altered that language for the proposed regulations.

7

8 MR. SLATER: Okay. Let me see if I can
9 word it properly here.

10

11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

12

13 MR. SLATER: On Federal public lands
14 draining into Lisianski Inlet south of -- I am going to
15 use the local term here, Nosehead, south of the line --
16 southeast of the line from -- connecting Nosehead to
17 the land bridge between Minor Island and Minor Mountain
18 continuing on to the Rocky Point day mark and that
19 would be enough because that takes it all the way to
20 the head of the Inlet at that point. So I'm sorry, I
21 lost the verbiage there. It would be from that line I
22 mentioned to the head of Lisianski Inlet.

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right, okay, so we
25 got the area.

26

27 MR. SLATER: And then November 1st
28 through December 31st except by Federally-qualified
29 subsistence users hunting under these regulations.

30

31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think you missed
32 a little bit of a phrase here. So that area are
33 closed.....

34

35 MR. SLATER: Are closed -- are closed
36 to deer hunting November 1st through December 31st.....

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

39

40 MR. SLATER:except by Federally-
41 qualified subsistence users hunting under these
42 regulations.

43

44 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. So the
45 proposal would close that area to non-subsistence users
46 from November 1st to December 31st. So after November
47 1st non-Federally-qualified users cannot hunt that area
48 so since they have all of October to hunt under this
49 new amendment.

50

0540

1 MR. SLATER: Right.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

4

5 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Cal.

6 I'm glad you clarified that because I had it totally
7 backwards.

8

9 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Oh, I don't want
10 there to be any confusion, what were you thinking Cal?

11

12 MR. CASIPIT: Somehow I misheard.
13 Somehow I heard it was October 15th to November 1st
14 would be the period of closure so I'm glad that was
15 clarified.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, yeah, nope,
18 he's just altering that -- yeah, I could see the
19 confusion there. Essentially just moving back the
20 closure date until the end of October instead of
21 October 15th, so, yes.

22

23 MS. PHILLIPS: I thought he said 15
24 days. This is Patty Phillips. We're listening on this
25 end so please get it right.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I know. I know
28 you're listening Patty. So to summarize I guess what
29 the proposal would do now would allow the non-
30 Federally-qualified users to hunt for the entire month
31 of October in the area that is now a smaller closure
32 area than what was originally in the regulations. So
33 it would close to non-Federally-qualified people on
34 October 31st. Two weeks additional hunting time than
35 what the original proposal was and less closed area.

36

37 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead Mike.

40

41 MR. DOUVILLE: Without being able to
42 see these on paper or something, I kind of know where
43 the nose is because Patty prints pictures but, no, I
44 don't know where these lines are and I'm going to vote
45 yea or nay, I don't know how they run exactly. So to
46 me it's a little bit difficult in that respect. So
47 anyway that's my comment.

48

49 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, thanks, Mike.

50

0541

1 Hard to do this over the telephone.

2

3 MR. SLATER: Chairman Hernandez, I
4 could draw a -- I could send a message with a picture
5 of a marked up map if that will help.

6

7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, I don't know
8 if we could get it up on the screen somewhere where
9 everybody could view it at the same time.

10

11 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chairman, this is
12 Katya Wessels. We definitely get it on the Teams
13 visual meeting. So I don't know if all the Council
14 members are on that visual option, but we definitely
15 can get it up there.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. If that's
18 what the Council feel that they need then we'll ask
19 that to happen.

20

21 (Pause)

22

23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Jim, if you're
24 attempting to do that.

25

26 MR. SLATER: I'm working on it right
27 now.

28

29 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. You're
30 probably a better tech person than most of us so. But
31 while you're doing that, any other comments from the
32 Council just on the concept of this proposed amendment
33 of a shorter closure time and less closed area.

34

35 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, this is Amee
36 Howard.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Amee.

39

40 MS. HOWARD: Lisa Grediagin is on and
41 she posted on the Teams platform that if it can be
42 restated, the intent, she had to jump to another
43 meeting but she's joining back. If someone could
44 restate the intent she can help draft the language that
45 you're looking for.

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay.

48

49 MS. HOWARD: I just wanted to offer that

50

0542

1 help to the Council, if Jim can restate it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Jim's probably
4 tied up trying to work the map there.

5

6 So the intent of the amendment is to
7 alter the time of the closure, the original proposal
8 called for a closure date of October 15th to December
9 31st. The amendment offers up a closure date of
10 October 31st to December 31st. And the amendment also
11 offers up a reduced area of closure, which is going to
12 be hopefully displayed for everybody to look at to get
13 an idea of what the area is but it's a good bit smaller
14 than what's in the proposal right now.

15

16 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair. I sent it to
17 you. I didn't know who else to send it to, who could
18 put it up there, if I can have an email address I can
19 send it to them as well, or you could forward it.

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm going to ask
22 Staff if they could give you an email address to send
23 it to, I don't know if I want to start looking through
24 -- I'm not a good tech person and I don't want to have
25 to deal with that.

26

27 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, you can send it to
28 me.....

29

30 MR. SLATER: Okay.

31

32 MS. WESSELS:and, you know, my
33 email is Katerina K-A-T-E-R-I-N-A underscore Wessels,
34 W-E-S-S-E-L-S.

35

36 MR. SLATER: Okay, I got it. It came
37 up here in my book here.

38

39 MS. WESSELS: At fws.gov., okay.

40

41 MR. SLATER: It's on its way.

42

43 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Very good. Good
44 work. Okay. So like I say I think we're all clear on
45 what the intent of the amendment is. The exact lines
46 might be in question yet for folks. But any other
47 comments on the concept of changing the length of time
48 of the closure and reducing the area of the closure.

49

50

0543

1 (Teleconference interference -
2 participants not muted)

3
4 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

5
6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I would say -- I
7 would say at this point if Council members don't think
8 that this amendment is within the scope of the analysis
9 or have other questions on it we'd probably just have
10 to vote it down and go back to the original motion or
11 if you believe it has some merit then vote to approve
12 the amendment and we'll go back to the main motion as
13 amended.

14
15 MR. JOHNSON: This is Ian, Mr. Chair.

16
17 (Teleconference interference -
18 participants not muted)

19
20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: And I would also
21 offer up that if there's Council members that think
22 that a bag limit reduction is the best solution to the
23 problem then you'd probably want to vote down the main
24 motion even if it is amended and then we'll move on to
25 Proposal 10, which deals with a bag limit reduction and
26 we'll discuss that.

27
28 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, can you hear
29 me, this is Ian.

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

32
33 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, my reception must
34 have been breaking up. My only thought is to me it's
35 kind of, it becomes irrelevant, I just -- even with the
36 change, don't see myself supporting a full closure and
37 so I'll be -- I'm happy to review the map and whatever
38 needs to be done for process but I'll be ready when
39 others are.

40
41 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
42 Ian, that's helpful. Anybody else.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, we'll
47 probably just have to wait until we're ready to come to
48 a vote. Okay, I see the map's been put up on the
49 screen.

50

0544

1 MS. WESSELS: Actually let me change it
2 because I have a different window where you can maybe
3 see better.

4
5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: That'd be helpful.

6
7 MS. WESSELS: No, it still shows the
8 wrong window, sorry. I'll try it again.

9
10 (Pause)

11
12 MS. WESSELS: Okay, I know what I'm
13 doing wrong here.

14
15 (Pause)

16
17 MS. WESSELS: Okay, this is the best I
18 can do, you know, the map is not the best quality.

19
20 MR. SLATER: Mr. Chair, can I describe
21 it?

22
23 MS. WESSELS: Okay, thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, it's up on
26 the screen.....

27
28 MS. WESSELS: I'll try to zoom in some
29 more.

30
31 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:it looks like
32 a pretty good picture. I think if Mr. Slater kind of
33 describes what we're looking at we can kind of get an
34 idea.

35
36 MR. SLATER: It basically.....

37
38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Jim.

39
40 MR. SLATER: Sure. Basically extended
41 off before it gets to the Straits, or approximately at
42 the Straits and so it's from that point to the head of
43 the Inlet. It excludes Stag Bay, all of Lisianski
44 Strait and the west end of Lisianski Inlet.

45
46 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
47 And the previous did include all of Lisianski Strait or
48 just up to Stag Bay -- or Stag Bay?

49
50

0545

1 MR. SLATER: Well, no it went up to --
2 straight to that upper red line you see at the top and
3 it went out -- sorry -- up the Inlet to the upper -- to
4 the line -- the red line at the top and it went down
5 the Straits to the lower red line near MarkII there and
6 included all of Stag Bay. So it -- like I say it went
7 from 38 miles of Inlet or Bay or Straits down to 16
8 miles around Pelican.

9
10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I see the
11 red lines there. Those indicate the previous closure
12 boundary so to me that's pretty clear. Anybody else
13 have questions on the map that's up on the screen.
14 Hopefully they have the screen available if you're on
15 Teams.

16
17 (Pause)

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: So while people
20 are looking at that we might want to address some
21 obvious questions here. People might be wondering, you
22 know, what are the opportunities for public testimony
23 on a modified proposal. Well, the Council does make
24 modifications to proposals quite frequently, it's not
25 uncommon. Like I say that criteria whether or not we
26 believe the modification has fallen kind of within the
27 scope of the analysis we've received and whether or not
28 we feel we have enough, you know, public comment.....

29
30 (Teleconference interference -
31 participants not muted)

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:that probably
34 address this modification are all considerations we
35 have to make before we vote on it. If a proposal, you
36 know, does get modified.....

37
38 REPORTER: I'm sorry to interrupt but
39 there's somebody that's clicking on a keyboard. Thank
40 you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:so in this
43 case, you know, it goes to the Board for a decision,
44 which it most likely would. There is another
45 opportunity for public testimony to take place at the
46 Board meeting, both written and oral. So people could
47 address their concerns over a modification to the
48 Board. But it is something that we do fairly common.

49
50

0546

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez.

2

3 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Mike.

4

5 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, no, as long as the
6 spirit of the original is not diminished, well, you
7 know, I think we're fine. But as I said before I do
8 not support a closure when all the research and science
9 says that there's plenty of deer. I mean more abundant
10 than -- you know, I mean there's plenty of resource. I
11 would more lean towards a reduced bag limit in these
12 areas where it would be more appealing and fair to both
13 sides of the issue, I guess.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
18 Mike, for that opinion. So at some point here we're
19 going to vote on the amendment. And like I say if the
20 amendment fails then we go back to the main motion as
21 it was originally put. So ample opportunities for the
22 Council to weigh in on what they feel is the best
23 course of action.

24

25 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

26

27 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: I'd like to call for the
30 question on the amendment.

31

32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, was that
33 Ian?

34

35 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

36

37 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Question's
38 been called for. Hopefully everybody is now familiar
39 enough with the amendment and, Frank, I don't think I
40 need to state it again, I've stated it several times,
41 so do you want to go ahead with a roll call vote on the
42 amendment.

43

44 MR. SLATER: Yeah, Mr. Chair, can I
45 have a repeat of the amendment, please?

46

47 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I'll say it
48 one more time. The amendment is for Federal public
49 lands draining into Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski
50

0547

1 Strait -- well, we've eliminated Lisianski Strait so
2 I'll change that language, Federal lands draining into
3 Lisianski Inlet as described in the map that the
4 Council is now viewing are closed to deer hunting from
5 October 31st to December 31st except by Federally-
6 qualified subsistence users hunting under these
7 regulations. So it's closed to non-Federally-qualified
8 users.

9
10 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.
11 Chair.

12
13 Cathy Needham.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 MR. WRIGHT: Are we ready, Mr. Chair?

18
19 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, Frank. Cathy
20 had to leave the meeting so go ahead and proceed with
21 the rest of the roll call.

22
23 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

24
25 Harvey Kitka.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

30
31 MR. KITKA: I vote no.

32
33 MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

34
35 MR. ROBBINS: I vote no.

36
37 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

38
39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I vote no.

40
41 MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

46
47 MR. HOWARD: I vote no.

48
49 MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

50

0548

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

MR. SLATER: I vote yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

MR. SLATER: I vote yes. Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville votes no.

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: No.

MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: I vote yes.

PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Two to five, six.

MR. WRIGHT: Motion fails. Frank
Wright votes no.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Frank voted no,
okay. Thank you, Frank. Okay, so.....

MS. WESSELS: For the record it was
three yes and the rest were no.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Is that correct,
Frank?

MS. WESSELS: Seven no's and three yes,
this is Katya.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. SUMINSKI: Katya, this is Terry
Suminski. I believe Jim might have answered for Bob
Schroeder because I don't think Bob is on the phone.

(Teleconference interference -
participants not muted)

PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: Two.

MR. SLATER: That is correct, Jim

0549

1 accidentally answered for Bob Schroeder.

2

3 MS. WESSELS: Okay.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Is that legal?

6

7 (Laughter)

8

9 PUBLIC INTERRUPTION: No.

10

11 MR. WRIGHT: Is that a proxy vote or
12 what?

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.

17 Chair.

18

19 MR. DOUVILLE: Do we have delegated
20 authority.

21

22 (Laughter)

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I wasn't
25 sure what I heard there, I think he may have just
26 understood what you were saying there Frank. So the
27 motion did fail, there were not enough votes in favor.
28 So the amendment failed. That brings us back to the
29 main motion. And now we're back to a closure from
30 October 15th to December 31st for the larger area. So
31 do we need more discussion on that or is the Council
32 prepared to vote on the main motion.

33

34 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

35

36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Ian.

37

38 MR. JOHNSON: My position hasn't
39 changed. But I guess I would just maybe add some
40 justification. I feel that the RAC meeting results,
41 since that's local members that are participating in
42 that is pretty representative of the feeling on this
43 issue and the desire to have consensus around it,
44 although I certainly appreciate what Jim is saying that
45 it's being a tough and divisive issue. Anyway, yeah,
46 so by my math, I guess, you know, there was 19 people,
47 roughly 20 people at the RAC meeting, which is a little
48 less than a quarter of the population of Pelican, I
49 feel like that's pretty good representation of a group
50

0550

1 of people looking to find a medium to make this happen.
2 I think it's indicative of the fact that they navigated
3 away from the closure issue, even though there wasn't a
4 vote on it, so I guess echoing what Cal mentioned
5 earlier about public testimony in this process, I'm
6 still inclined to look more to address the issue with a
7 bag limit restriction, rather than a closure.

8

9 My yes vote on the amendment was just
10 that I did feel it helped address some of the issues
11 that are associated with the closure, so I chose to
12 vote yes, but I still don't feel that a closure is
13 appropriate.

14

15 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you
16 for that explanation, Ian, appreciate it. Anybody
17 else.

18

19 MR. DOUVILLE: Call for the.....

20

21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: And I'd just
22 like.....

23

24 MR. DOUVILLE:question.

25

26 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I'd just
27 like to say that I think my opinion pretty much mirrors
28 what Ian had to say there. So I probably would have
29 been supportive of the amendment but unlike Ian, I did
30 vote against it, I decided to defer to what the local
31 residents had come to as a consensus agreement. So
32 that will be addressed in the next proposal so let's go
33 ahead, I think I heard Mr. Douville call for the
34 question on the main motion. Is that correct, Mike?

35

36 MR. DOUVILLE: That is correct,
37 Chairman.

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, I
40 think we're ready to vote. Once again I would state
41 for the record that this would be -- the motion was to
42 adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-09 as presented on Page 247
43 of the proposal book. And this would be for a closure
44 of Federal public lands draining into Lisianski Inlet
45 and Lisianski Strait as described in the -- on Page
46 247, and that area would be closed to deer hunting from
47 October 15th to December 31st except for by Federally-
48 qualified subsistence users hunting under these
49 regulations. So that's the motion we have before us.

50

0551

1

Frank, would you do another roll call

2

vote.

3

4

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Thank you, Mr.

5

Chair.

6

7

Harvey Kitka.

8

9

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes no.

10

11

MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.

12

13

MR. ROBBINS: Harold Robbins votes no.

14

15

MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

16

17

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I vote no.

18

19

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

20

21

MR. HOWARD: I vote no.

22

23

MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

24

25

(No comments)

26

27

MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.

28

29

(No comments)

30

31

MR. WRIGHT: James Slater.

32

33

MR. SLATER: I vote no.

34

35

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

36

37

MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville votes no.

38

39

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

40

41

MR. CASIPIT: No.

42

43

MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.

44

45

MR. JOHNSON: No.

46

47

MR. WRIGHT: Frank votes no. Motion

48

fails.

49

50

0552

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
2 Frank. Thanks to the Council members. I'm going to
3 take another quick poll here of the Council, would you
4 like to move ahead on Proposal No. 10 or would you like
5 to recess for the evening and take that up in the
6 morning.

7
8 MR. DOUVILLE: Chairman Hernandez, I
9 suggest that we take it up in the morning.

10
11 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
12 Anybody else.

13
14 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, this is
15 Albert. I agree with Mike.

16
17 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody disagree.

18
19 (No disagreeing votes)

20
21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think
22 that's what we'll do. I think we'll recess for the
23 evening. The meeting will begin at 8:00 o'clock
24 tomorrow morning. I know it's publicly noticed that we
25 start at 9:00 o'clock in the mornings but seeing as how
26 this was done by a motion of the Council to extend the
27 meeting, I think we can change the time to 8:00 o'clock
28 without any objection. So once again when the meeting
29 resumes, I believe it would be appropriate, as with all
30 other days to start with public testimony on non-agenda
31 items. And I'd ask people that want to comment on
32 proposals, Wildlife Proposal 10 to give other folks a
33 chance for non-consensus testimony and then we'll
34 accept testimony on other proposals as they come up.

35
36 So recess until 8:00 o'clock tomorrow
37 morning.

38
39 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, before we
40 recess, a point -- a little clarification here. I don't
41 think we need to take any more public testimony on
42 WP22-10, that's actually -- we're done with all that
43 and all it takes is for us to put a motion on the floor
44 for it to be under our discussion and we don't need to
45 take any more public testimony on that as far as I'm
46 concerned.

47
48 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Let me think about
49 that for a minute, Cal. When we did public testimony
50

0553

1 did we ask for testimony on both 9 and 10 at that time,
2 I guess that's what the analysis was. I need to have
3 my memory jogged there, I want to make sure that
4 we.....

5

6 MR. CASIPIT: Maybe Staff can think
7 about that overnight and give us some advice tomorrow
8 morning but I think that.....

9

10 MS. WESSELS: Yeah, the Council already
11 took the public testimony on both proposals 22-9 and
12 22-10.

13

14 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, you're
15 probably right Cal, good point. Okay, going back to
16 the agenda on non-consensus or non-agenda items at the
17 start of the meeting. I think I'll allow that but if
18 it's not -- if somebody starts down testimony on an
19 agenda item I think I will cut them off but I'll offer
20 up an opportunity for non-agenda items at the start of
21 the meeting.

22

23 So, okay, thank you, everybody, this
24 has been very difficult.

25

26 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.

27

28 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Somebody else.

29

30 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I'm sorry, just for
31 broader planning, like I'm going to have to cancel
32 meetings and stuff tomorrow to attend so should I
33 assume that this is going to be an all day meeting,
34 like I have meetings -- that this RAC meeting will take
35 all day, and to cancel my afternoons as well. I'm just
36 looking for guidance, I guess, at this point.

37

38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you,
39 Ian. You know I have an appointment that I made as
40 well for tomorrow afternoon that I don't plan on
41 cancelling, I can't really reschedule. So I plan on
42 adjourning the meeting by noon and no later, so I want
43 the Council to keep that in mind. We have to get
44 through some action items and hopefully that
45 accommodates you and everybody else as well.

46

47 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I'm
48 agreeable, so see you in the morning.

49

50

0554

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank
2 you.....

3
4 MS. WESSELS: Mr. Chair, this is Katya.
5 I just.....

6
7 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:everybody.

8
9 MS. WESSELS:also want to say
10 something before we adjourn for the day.

11
12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, Katya.

13
14 MS. WESSELS: I am not going to be able
15 to be with you tomorrow so DeAnna Perry, your regular
16 Council Coordinator, she finished her training and
17 she's going to be your Coordinator tomorrow. Thank
18 you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. And thank
21 you, Katya, for being our Coordinator for this meeting.
22 Not the most easy meeting to coordinate, I bet you
23 haven't -- maybe haven't seen many like this, I don't
24 know. I pity DeAnna jumping in the middle of it, but
25 she's good, she'll handle it.

26
27 MS. WESSELS: Thank you. Thank you
28 very much. It was great working with the Council, I
29 really enjoyed it, it was a spirited meeting and you
30 all did great and we thank you for this participation
31 in this public process. Thank you very much.

32
33 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you for your
34 help. So, okay, recess until 8:00 o'clock tomorrow
35 morning.

36
37 (Off record)

38
39 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered ___ through ___ contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III taken electronically on the 7th day October;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 6th day of November 2021.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/22