

0150

SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE  
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

Cape Fox Lodge  
Ketchikan, Alaska  
October 26, 2022  
9:04 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Donald Hernandez, Chair  
Calvin Casipit  
Michael Douville  
Albert Howard  
Ian Johnson  
Harvey Kitka  
Cathy Needham  
Patricia Phillips  
James Slater  
John Smith  
Louie Wagner  
Frank Wright

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
329 F Street, Suite 222  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

0151

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Ketchikan, Alaska - 10/26/2022)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, good morning everybody. It looks like everybody's pretty well settled in, we got the Council here, so we can get underway this morning. So maybe first I'll just kind of check in with DeAnna and see if she has any new kind of housekeeping announcements for us.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to remind folks who are on the phone to please mute your phones when you're not speaking. If your phone does not have a mute button, please press star or the asterisk and the number 6, that'll mute your phone, and then if you would like to speak you just do star, six, or the mute button to come off mute.

For those who may wish to write us a public comment, you can email that to subsistence@fws.gov, that's subsistence at Frank Whiskey Sam.gov.

Let's see, I think that's probably the only thing I needed to touch on this morning, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. So we will start the meeting this morning with public testimony or comments that are not agenda items. So, you know, this is opportunity for anybody, the public, who has an issue they want to bring before the Council on any matter related to subsistence activities, this is an opportunity to do so. And just a reminder, in order to do that we like it if you're in the room if you could fill out a blue card that's on the back table there so we can kind of gather up and see who's interested, and folks who are on the telephone line who would want to comment I will check and see if we have anybody that's standing by that wants to make a public comment on the phone and maybe give a little time if anybody who wants to fill out a blue card, go ahead and do that now.

So do we have anybody on the telephone line that's standing by that wants to make a comment

0152

1 this morning.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Apparently not.

6 Tina, are there people on?

7

8 REPORTER: There's people on.

9

10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: There are people  
11 on, okay, we'll give it a minute here we're just  
12 getting started. So far I think we only have one blue  
13 card up here and that was for somebody that wanted to  
14 testify yesterday -- oh, well, we have two. Okay, we  
15 have one card from yesterday, somebody wanted to  
16 testify on our discussion we were having on co-  
17 management indigenous management. I'll offer up to  
18 that person the opportunity this morning if they happen  
19 to be on there, that would be Wanda Culp. I don't know  
20 if Wanda's on the telephone line.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: And the only other  
25 blue card we have here is for an agenda item testimony  
26 so we'll wait until we get to that item which hopefully  
27 will be this afternoon.

28

29 For people who are interested, I know  
30 we might have a lot of people that want to make  
31 comments on the rural determination and just as kind of  
32 a head's up I'm really hopeful and fairly confident we  
33 will get to that topic this afternoon so if that's what  
34 you're waiting for kind of stay tuned, probably after  
35 lunch we'll get to that topic.

36

37 (Pause)

38

39 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Maybe I'll  
40 call for last chance for folks on the telephone who  
41 want to make a comment this morning.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, I  
46 guess not. So where we left off yesterday afternoon  
47 was we were about getting ready to have further  
48 discussion. We introduced the topic of the three Unit  
49 4 deer proposals and that's where we were going to pick  
50

0153

1 up this morning. We kind of had some preliminary  
2 discussion of where kind of things stand in the process  
3 right now. So we're going to start there. And for  
4 that discussion I'm going to turn the Chair over to our  
5 Vice Chair Cathy Needham. But before Cathy gets  
6 started, I know our Coordinator, DeAnna, probably has  
7 background information on what the situation is with  
8 these proposals so I'll let DeAnna start.

9

10 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
11 Members of the Council. For the record my name is  
12 DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southeast  
13 Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And just  
14 a quick suggestion on process for this agenda item,  
15 it's on our agenda as an old business item since these  
16 three proposals have already gone through the normal  
17 proposal process up to the point of Board deliberation,  
18 I'd like to offer some guidance on how we might  
19 effectively address these proposals a second time.

20

21 The normal process for proposal  
22 presentations is in the meeting book on Page 41 but,  
23 again, since we've already been through several of  
24 these steps, if it pleases the Council, we could start  
25 with Step 1, which we did yesterday, but we could also  
26 offer the analyst a second opportunity to come up if  
27 they would like and then, Mr. Chair, or Madame Chair,  
28 it will be, you could simply ask if there are any  
29 additional agency or advisory group comments instead of  
30 going through that list individually because all of the  
31 previous comments are on record and there will probably  
32 be a few, if any, additional agency or AC comments. I  
33 understand that we may have comment from Hoonah Indian  
34 Association, along with the State comments as well.  
35 Keeping in mind that previous testimony and written  
36 comments from last fall's meeting are still a part of  
37 the record that the Board's considering, you could  
38 proceed to any new written public comments and finally  
39 any new public testimony on these proposals. Again,  
40 all comments from last fall, written and verbal are  
41 still on the record and this would be the time for the  
42 Council to hear new comments on the new information  
43 that was provided in our books and yesterday during the  
44 meeting. Depending on how much interest we have on this  
45 topic Mr. and Madame Chair, and given our stacked  
46 agenda we may need to limit the amount of time we can  
47 allow for new comments just to ensure that everyone has  
48 an opportunity to speak.

49

50

0154

1 I could also suggest that if you're  
2 giving a verbal comment, if you've already provided a  
3 written or verbal comment previously just bring that to  
4 our attention and then use your remaining time to let  
5 us know any new information.

6  
7 So then the Council can decide if it  
8 would like to take any further action on this matter.

9  
10 Thank you.

11  
12 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you,  
13 DeAnna. Good morning everyone. I think the first  
14 thing we need to decide is if we are handling each of  
15 those proposals separately or if we're bringing new  
16 information to the table collectively for the three  
17 before we get into motions.

18  
19 DeAnna, did you have a recommendation  
20 on that?

21  
22 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. I do not  
23 have a recommendation, just whatever pleases the  
24 Council. I would remind folks during our conversation  
25 yesterday afternoon that it was discussed that once the  
26 Council hears the information they could then  
27 deliberate and choose to take some action, which could  
28 be maintain the recommendation, submit a new  
29 recommendation, defer or oppose the proposal and  
30 possibly develop a new proposal for the next cycle. So  
31 if this Council feels that taking them individually  
32 would be easier for thought process I would leave that  
33 to their discretion.

34  
35 Thank you.

36  
37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you,  
38 DeAnna. What is the wish of the Council, would you  
39 guys like to gather all new information collectively on  
40 the proposals and then potentially deliberate each  
41 proposal individually after that.

42  
43 (Council nods affirmatively)

44  
45 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm seeing some  
46 head nodding. Is there any objection to that idea of  
47 moving forward.

48  
49 (No objections)

50

0155

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. At  
2 this time we're going to be talking or finishing out  
3 the old business of the Unit 4 deer proposals, which  
4 are Wildlife Proposal 22-07, 22-08 and 22-10. I'd like  
5 to ask if there are any additional information from the  
6 agencies -- from the Federal agencies on additional  
7 analysis, I know we received some yesterday I want to  
8 make sure we got the report -- all of the stuff that  
9 the Office of Subsistence Management, the U.S. Forest  
10 Service Staff has brought to us?

11  
12                   (Affirmative)

13  
14                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I see head's  
15 shaking. If there's any State representative, I know  
16 that they provided some additional and new analysis, is  
17 there anybody from the State either in the room or on  
18 the line that would like to provide additional  
19 information regarding this wildlife proposals at this  
20 time.

21  
22                   MR. SCHUMACHER: Hello, this is Tom  
23 Schumacher with the Department of Fish and Game. I  
24 believe both Steve Bethune and I are on the phone. At  
25 this point I don't have anything in addition to our  
26 revised our comments.

27  
28                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
29 you, Mr. Schumacher, are you available to take  
30 questions if Council members had questions for you  
31 regarding the written analysis that you all provided  
32 for us?

33  
34                   MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes, both Steve and I  
35 are prepared to do that.

36  
37                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
38 you. Do the Council have any questions for the Alaska  
39 Department of Fish and Game regarding the additional  
40 analysis that they provided to us yesterday?

41  
42                   Mr. Hernandez.

43  
44                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
45 Chair. My focus through these proposals has been on  
46 the question of providing for subsistence needs, which  
47 is the other rationale for a restriction to non-  
48 Federally-qualified users. As you know there are two  
49 things you look at if you're going to restrict non-  
50

0156

1 subsistence users; one is a conservation concern and  
2 the other are subsistence needs being met. So I will  
3 accept the fact that, you know, overall for the unit  
4 there is no conservation concern, but we still maybe  
5 have some questions in regard to some, you know,  
6 localized impacts to maybe heavily hunted areas that  
7 might constitute a conservation concern but I'll kind  
8 of agree with the Department of Fish and Game that  
9 overall for the unit, you know, things are healthy.

10

11 So when we get to the assessment of  
12 subsistence need, you point out in your comments kind  
13 of the difference between the Federal system and the  
14 State system. And the State has an established way of  
15 determining subsistence need and it's basically through  
16 your amount reasonably necessary for subsistence, your  
17 ANS, and you kind of have an overall number that  
18 determines the ANS for the unit. And it kind of also,  
19 at some point, kind of break it down into little more  
20 specific numbers for communities. So just kind of the  
21 review, it says the Board establishes an ANS for a game  
22 population through a review of long-term population and  
23 harvest information. And then you go on to say that  
24 you really don't have an established way in the Federal  
25 system to determine that and you're kind of contending  
26 that the State does have an established way determining  
27 an amount necessary for subsistence.

28

29 So given that, I kind of go back and I  
30 look at, you know, sort of the long-term harvest  
31 information for communities and let's see I'm looking  
32 at -- let me go through this again here.

33

34 Okay.

35

36 MR. CASIPIT: Figure 5.

37

38 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Page 5, Figure 5,  
39 right. And I believe this is the analysis for  
40 essentially the area around Angoon, I kind of use that  
41 as an example. And it says long-term records indicate  
42 a declining trend in harvest for both Federally-  
43 qualified and non-Federally-qualified users in this  
44 area and the Federally-qualified use, it says, on  
45 average, is 157 deer annually. So that's kind of a  
46 long-term average which seems to indicate that that's  
47 what you would consider for your amount necessary for  
48 subsistence for that particular area and then I look at  
49 the population trend for Angoon and I think, you know,  
50

0157

1 the population for Angoon is, you know, roughly about  
2 400 people and that kind of tells me that kind of on  
3 average, that 157 deer harvested is about a half a deer  
4 per person. So when you kind of break it down into,  
5 you know, specific numbers like that when you're  
6 talking about a community and you contend that your  
7 analysis of kind of long-term trends and harvest is a  
8 valid way to determine amount necessary for subsistence  
9 and then you come up with a number about a half a deer  
10 per person, that seems pretty inadequate to me. I  
11 know, you know, my household half a deer per person  
12 just would never do it. So I guess I'm a little  
13 concerned about using, you know, harvest data to  
14 determine need. Like you're kind of -- I mean we  
15 always have questions about, you know, how accurate the  
16 harvest data is, of course, but when you're using that  
17 to determine need, it kind of seems like something's  
18 missing. To me, determining need would require you  
19 actually go talk to people and see what they need.  
20 Because their needs might not always be indicated what  
21 your harvest statistics show.

22

23 So in my consideration of these  
24 proposals, given that need is the criteria that we're  
25 really looking at, I really think we need a better way  
26 to determine needs. I don't think the State's method  
27 is all that great even though you put a lot of  
28 confidence in it and as you say the Federal Subsistence  
29 doesn't have a real set way to determine that. I think  
30 we need to do a better job of trying to figure this out  
31 and I don't think we really have a good handle on it  
32 yet.

33

34 So I guess my question to you is, just  
35 considering Angoon and, you know, that area around  
36 Angoon that you break down where you get 157 deer is  
37 harvested annually that kind of supposedly meets the  
38 need of a community of 400 people, do you really stand  
39 by that number?

40

41 MR. SCHUMACHER: For the record this is  
42 Tom Schumacher with the Department of Fish and Game.  
43 Well, Chairman Hernandez, I think the State method of  
44 determining need, the amount necessary for subsistence  
45 is probably not aimed at the goals of the Federal  
46 system. You know it was developed by the Board of Game  
47 and is different than -- it was meant to focus on all  
48 Alaskans rather than specific communities. Our  
49 comments aren't so much focused on need although there  
50

50



0158

1 is -- I agree with you that the Federal system does  
2 need a way of measuring -- or determining need  
3 otherwise you have no benchmark against which to  
4 measure are we meeting that need are not. Our comments  
5 aren't so much focused on whether you're meeting the  
6 unknown need as saying there are trends, long-term  
7 trends in hunter participation and hunter effort and  
8 those are the trends that coincide with the decline in  
9 deer harvest in those three communities. If fewer  
10 people hunt, fewer deer are going to be harvested and  
11 you can say, well, the community's need is still way up  
12 here but if fewer people are hunting they're not going  
13 to meet that need no matter what the need is. So our  
14 comments are focused on not so much meeting need but is  
15 saying what is the best way to get that need met, what  
16 thing is going to do it. Restricting non-Federally-  
17 qualified hunters in that area isn't going to change  
18 anything because of the demands -- the hunting effort  
19 and the harvest by non-Federally-qualified hunters has  
20 declined pretty steeply around Angoon. So has the  
21 hunting effort by Federally-qualified subsistence  
22 users, the harvest has declined, the deer are abundant  
23 but if fewer people hunt fewer deer are going to be  
24 harvested. So if the Board and this Council want to  
25 make changes that actually, you know, affect a change  
26 in harvest, you know, to us the change that makes the  
27 most sense is record -- is to recruit new hunters, or  
28 to reactivate hunters, get more people out in the  
29 woods, not -- not to restrict the non-Federally-  
30 qualified users.

31  
32 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, okay, thank you  
33 for that answer. I kind of have to digest that. I  
34 guess we're also hearing a lot of testimony from local  
35 people about, you know, what is required to meet that  
36 need and, yeah, we have to kind of weigh the impacts of  
37 what they're seeing locally. So, yeah, okay, thank you  
38 for that explanation.

39  
40 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are  
41 there other Council members who have questions for the  
42 Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding the new  
43 analysis for Proposals 07, 08 and 10.

44  
45 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
46 Albert.

47  
48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Go ahead, Mr.  
49 Howard.

50

0159

1 MR. HOWARD: Thanks, Madame Chair. Mr.  
2 Schumacher a lot of your information is based on, I  
3 guess, field work but when I asked the question  
4 yesterday if I could get a list of places that the  
5 surveys were done, so I'm looking at the list this  
6 morning and I see Mitchell Bay on there and that's the  
7 only thing I see and a lot of conversation around the  
8 table has been about co-management and I think I have a  
9 lot of ideas on how I can assist in bringing the data  
10 to the State on what's impacting the area around  
11 Angoon. I'll give you an example. Is once we had a  
12 large fishing vessel go through here with four or five  
13 boats behind it, I guess you could say it's a hunting  
14 party, sir, but once they went through here hunting has  
15 never been the same and I take that from what I learned  
16 from my dad was, they may not have gotten a lot of deer  
17 but what happens is if you shoot at a deer and miss,  
18 you're never going to get that same opportunity again.  
19 And I don't see that as part of this equation for  
20 presentation that -- and my intent is only to make sure  
21 our residents here are able to take care of themselves  
22 and not rely on the State so much. And I did mention  
23 this yesterday, is some of us are bothered that the  
24 fact that this community is becoming a welfare  
25 community. I mean you said it yourself there's less  
26 and less people going out the door to go get what the  
27 resource offers.

28  
29 So I guess my question is, is there any  
30 data showing that there are vessels going through the  
31 area with hunting parties on them because that's what's  
32 having an impact.

33  
34 I'll give you an example. Last year we  
35 were down in Whitewater Bay and there was one in there  
36 and Whitewater Bay is not a very big area so if you  
37 bring a boat with three or four boats that bay is  
38 basically covered. I run a long ways from home just  
39 because I can't leave areas for people that can't run  
40 so far away from home. So there's a bunch of variables  
41 on reasons for doing this, not just to ask people not  
42 to hunt here anymore or take away what they feel  
43 they're entitled to.

44  
45 I'm trying to accomplish something  
46 within the guidelines and the rules and laws that have  
47 been put in place while I was still in high school, I  
48 guess. So I guess that's kind of my offer to be a part  
49 of the solution to this and figure out how we can work  
50

0160

1 together to make sure that Angoon gets what they need  
2 so they don't become a burden on the State.

3

4 Thanks, Madame Chair.

5

6 MR. SCHUMACHER: This is Tom Schumacher  
7 with the Department of Fish and Game. So I was  
8 wondering if Mr. Howard, did -- you talked about a  
9 number of things and I'm wondering do you have a  
10 specific question in there, I lost track a little bit?

11

12 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, you  
13 did say you had a question in there but then gave an  
14 example and I didn't quite catch what your question was  
15 either so if you had a question specifically for the  
16 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, can you restate it?

17

18 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
19 If there's any data supporting what I said about boats  
20 going into the bay and hunting that aren't residents of  
21 Angoon.

22

23 MR. SCHUMACHER: You know we don't keep  
24 track about who, you know, who -- we don't track  
25 individual boats. I am sure there are boats that go  
26 there that aren't from Angoon and in all likelihood  
27 they're from the, you know, the nearest communities  
28 which are Federally-qualified so there's plenty other  
29 Federal subsistence users as well and it's a long way  
30 from Juneau or Ketchikan to get to Angoon. But overall  
31 the trends are pretty steep declines in the number of  
32 people hunting in that area, the number of days of  
33 hunting effort in that area and the number of deer  
34 harvested in that area just because fewer people are  
35 there. So over the last 25 years there's been a big  
36 decline in the people hunting in that area.

37

38 Harvest data for people who do hunt in  
39 that area shows that they're doing very well, in terms  
40 of days per deer and terms of deer per hunter. So, you  
41 know, the Department looks at those -- that information  
42 and the only conclusion we can reach is that if you  
43 want to raise harvest in the community of Angoon you  
44 need to get more people out there hunting.

45

46 I don't know what else we can -- you  
47 know, we can't really promote, or, you know, we do have  
48 hunter education classes so, I'm not sure what else the  
49 Department can do to help people get out in the woods.

50

0161

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
2 Schumacher.

3  
4                   MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
5 Albert.

6  
7                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: You have a  
8 followup.

9  
10                  MR. HOWARD: Just that we do have a  
11 younger generation in the high school that's coming out  
12 and that's kind of exciting see because I watched my  
13 boys join the group of people that are hunting but I  
14 think the issue at hand here, Madame Chair, is if the  
15 deer are taken off before you have an opportunity to  
16 get a shot at them that doesn't fix the problem if you  
17 put more hunters out there, they're still not going to  
18 get a shot at them. And I know the vessels I've seen  
19 go through here because I know the people that used to  
20 come through here and apparently they realized they're  
21 having the same issue of trying to get the deer so  
22 maybe that problem will solve itself but it still  
23 doesn't help Angoon. They aren't Federally-qualified,  
24 that vessel from -- the city, that's not -- that  
25 doesn't have Federally-qualified hunters there. So  
26 anyway I understand the time constraints and I'm  
27 writing down a bunch of things on my own to see what I  
28 can come up with to be a part of the solution.

29  
30                   Thank you, Madame Chair.

31  
32                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
33 Howard. Are there other questions from the Council,  
34 and I just want to remind the Council that this is an  
35 opportunity to ask questions regarding analysis or  
36 testimony that we have received and we'll get into  
37 deliberations once we decide how we want to take up  
38 these proposals. So if you have questions for Mr.  
39 Schumacher.

40  
41                  MR. SMITH: A comment. A comment.

42  
43                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: It's a comment,  
44 okay, yeah, I appreciate it if we just keep it to  
45 questions so that we can move through this and then we  
46 can make comments during deliberation.

47  
48                  MR. SMITH: Okay.

49  
50

0162

1 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

2

3 MR. SMITH: There's some.....

4

5 REPORTER: You need to turn your mic on  
6 if you're going to keep talking.

7

8 MR. SMITH: .....ideas that I want  
9 to.....

10

11 REPORTER: Your mic.

12

13 MR. SMITH: .....comment and.....

14

15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are  
16 there any other.....

17

18 MR. SMITH: .....talk to.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....questions  
21 for Mr. Schumacher at this time from Council members  
22 regarding the analysis on any of the three proposals  
23 that we're taking forward.

24

25 Mr. Wagner.

26

27 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
28 I have a question on -- just to compare it with Angoon,  
29 I live in Metlakatla and my house is up on the hill  
30 over covering the breakwater, I can see from Dall Head  
31 all the way to SummitBay, just about into Blank Inlet  
32 and there's so many hunters out of Ketchikan, I can see  
33 the boats lined up on there, I could see them without  
34 binoculars. And our people are doing good early going  
35 up and hunting, and this is just a question, I want to  
36 see if he can tell me if they're keeping track of how  
37 many boats are out there? Almost consistently. And  
38 it's very hard for our villages to compete. For us, in  
39 this area, they're going out very early in the morning  
40 in the dark and if you go out after dark you're not  
41 going to find a safe place to go up in the woods and  
42 hunt, so I like what this proposal is, and just  
43 listening to everything and what Mr. Hernandez said.  
44 But I would like to know if they're keeping track of  
45 how many boats. Because my son and I was out  
46 there.....

47

48 (Teleconference interference -  
49 participants not muted)

50

0163

1 MR. WAGNER: .....two years ago, we  
2 went into Seal Cove by Dollhead and seen the Fish and  
3 Game behind the point over there and so I went up to  
4 them because I knew they were going to want to check us  
5 out, they knew who we were, they recognized my boat,  
6 and so we talked to them and they said, oh, we're  
7 leaving, you could stay here and hunt and there was  
8 already, I think, another boat in there and I said, no,  
9 we'll go down the shore here and look and we took our  
10 time and when we come out they were still sitting out  
11 there watching, so I would like to know if they're  
12 keeping track of how many boats that we're competing  
13 with from the rural to the non-rural.

14  
15 Thank you, Madame Chair.

16  
17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Wagner. We are also getting a lot of feedback on the  
19 telephone system so if you are not Mr. Schumacher, if  
20 you could mute your phone, star, six. And Mr.  
21 Schumacher, do you have an answer to Mr. Wagner's  
22 question.

23  
24 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, thank you,  
25 Madame Chair. Mr. Wagner, the Department keeps track  
26 of where people say they hunt, you know, there's a  
27 mandatory reporting requirement when you get deer  
28 harvest tickets and so we keep track of, you know,  
29 people report where they hunt to us, and so we have  
30 that kind of information, we can separate rural versus  
31 non-rural based on their community of residence so, you  
32 know, if the area is only boat accessible then I  
33 suppose, you know, there would be some way of saying  
34 those people probably accessed that area by boat but we  
35 don't keep track of like numbers of boats that are, you  
36 know, in a specific area on any particular day or  
37 anything like that.

38  
39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
40 you. Are there other questions. Mr. Kitka and then  
41 Ms. Phillips.

42  
43 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
44 Tom, I just was curious could you refresh my mind to  
45 let me know how accurate the pellet count is, knowing  
46 Admiralty Island is covered with trees and it's really  
47 hard to get an accurate count of deer that are just  
48 there unless they're on the mountain tops but if you're  
49 relying on the pellet count, how accurate is it?  
50

0164

1 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, the Department  
2 monitors deers in a number of different ways. We can't  
3 count them, we can monitor trend in the population,  
4 you know, if there more or fewer than there were. So  
5 we've done that in a number of different ways.  
6 Hunting records are one of them, you know, harvest. If  
7 harvest is up, population is probably good. If you  
8 have big decline in harvest like in 2007 we had a big  
9 decline in harvest that was because the previous winter  
10 was really bad and it killed a lot of deer and also  
11 because.....

12  
13 (Teleconference interference -  
14 participants not muted - put on hold)

15  
16 MR. SCHUMACHER: I'm getting.....

17  
18 REPORTER: Okay, hold on Tom, this is  
19 the reporter, I'm going to call the operator so just  
20 stand by a minute.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Schumacher,  
23 can you still hear us.

24  
25 REPORTER: Not really, so let me call  
26 the operator so I can have that line disconnected.  
27 It'll be a second, depending on how fast they get to  
28 us.

29  
30 (Pause)

31  
32 REPORTER: I'm at their mercy.

33  
34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are we on  
35 record?

36  
37 REPORTER: Yes, but please hold while I  
38 get the operator. Hi, somebody on this teleconference  
39 put us on hold so we're hearing music over here, could  
40 you disconnect it please. Thank you.

41  
42 (Pause)

43  
44 REPORTER: Yep, it's gone, thank you.  
45 Okay, Tom, are you there?

46  
47 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes.

48  
49 REPORTER: Okay, go ahead.  
50

0165

1 MR. SCHUMACHER: We were talking about  
2 monitoring deer populations and I talked about how  
3 hunter harvest is one way the Department monitors deer  
4 population. Other ways are pellet count transects  
5 although we have discontinued those now so we did those  
6 up through 2019 and then we had the pandemic in 2020  
7 and 2021 so we didn't do any in those years and during  
8 that time we rethought strategy and instead of doing  
9 pellet count transects we're going to switch to a  
10 camera-based monitoring system. That transition is  
11 still in progress, we really don't have any information  
12 at this point to provide to the Council. We have also  
13 done alpine surveys, so, you know, flying over the  
14 alpine and counting deer in late summer. And then as  
15 we talked about yesterday we've done both spring, or  
16 late winter body condition surveys where a biologist  
17 patrols the beach and, you know, spots deer on the  
18 beach and then assesses their body condition on a  
19 numerical scale, one through five. One being really  
20 skinny, five being looking very healthy. That's a  
21 measure of how deer came through the winter. And then  
22 we do spring beach mortality transects. So we're, you  
23 know, using a number of different ways to try to get a  
24 trend in population. And, you know, for Unit 4 the  
25 trend, every indicator is that things are good.

26  
27 So you know if all the arrows are  
28 pointing in the same direction then I think we're  
29 pretty safe to say that deer populations in Unit 4 are  
30 good, are healthy. If you have conflicting signs then,  
31 you know, maybe you'd have some questions but at this  
32 point all the signs are that everything is good.

33  
34 So that's kind of how we keep track of  
35 deer populations there.

36  
37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
38 Schumacher. Ms. Phillips.

39  
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
41 It's whistling, is it me whistling.

42  
43 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, I think so.

44  
45 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

46  
47 REPORTER: Go ahead, Patty, I'll  
48 control it over here.

49  
50



0166

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Mine is along the  
2 same line as Councilman Kitka, on Page 3 of WP22-09/10,  
3 you say that the surveys, pellet count -- or aerial  
4 counts was conducted in GMU4 southern Admiralty and  
5 northeast Chichagof and that, you know, it provides you  
6 trend basis for your population assessment for Unit 4  
7 overall. And, you know, as far as micro-climates  
8 versus macro-climates, like NECCUA is extensively  
9 logged and you can visually see deer and they, you  
10 know, population estimates, whereas in Lisianski  
11 Inlet/Strait, outside coast we border Cross Sound which  
12 is Glacier Bay, which has a Glacier right there so we  
13 have a micro-climate that drops the temperature down  
14 and gives us much more extensive heavy snows and there  
15 isn't much for the deer to feed on once that snow comes  
16 other than if they can get down to the beach and eat  
17 seaweed. So, you know, to me trying to put a trend on  
18 population for these micro areas don't fit the overall  
19 picture. So how do you factor that into your, you  
20 know, overall Unit 4 trends of population?

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to  
25 Member Phillips. We don't try to say there are -- we  
26 track populations by Game Management Units and subunits  
27 and we don't generally try to focus on small areas just  
28 because we don't have the Staff to do that much in the  
29 way of field surveys. For a small area like the  
30 proposal, the area affected by the proposal for the  
31 Pelican area, I think, you know, hunter statistics, so  
32 information reported to us by members of the Pelican  
33 community is probably the best indicator of deer  
34 population trend and hunter success. You know the  
35 information is voluntarily but it's mandatory that it's  
36 supposed to provided to us, but there's no penalty for  
37 not providing it so that's information that's  
38 voluntarily provided to us by members of your  
39 community. And the information that the members of  
40 your community provided to us and we've repeated back  
41 in our comments here are that hunters in Pelican enjoy  
42 tremendous success. And given that hunters there, you  
43 know, enjoy tremendous success suggests that the deer  
44 population is healthy. You know that's the best  
45 information we have and was recorded by the people who  
46 live there. So, you know, the only conclusion we can  
47 draw is similar to around Angoon, if there are fewer  
48 deer are being harvested it's because fewer people are  
49 hunting. It's not because the deer population is

50

0167

1 different and it's not because of outside hunters, it's  
2 because fewer local people are hunting.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
5 Schumacher. Are there other questions from Council  
6 members for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
7 regarding these proposals and the new information that  
8 they've provided.

9

10 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim  
11 Slater.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Go ahead, Mr.  
14 Slater.

15

16 MR. SLATER: Mr. Schumacher, one of the  
17 things that became obvious last year when we were going  
18 through the initial discussions was that the State  
19 relies heavily on the harvest records, or the harvest  
20 tickets and after going through the community and  
21 talking to people, a large number of people weren't  
22 reporting their harvest tickets accurately. They  
23 basically -- in the rural area you hunt quite a bit.  
24 Sometimes you hunt on the way to work, or the way  
25 driving your kids to school or this and that and you  
26 don't really count it as a day hunted, I hunt a half  
27 hour here, an hour here, two hours here and so on, no  
28 one ever counts those times as days hunted when you  
29 have -- when you ask for that. So using the success  
30 ratio of how many days hunted to harvest -- to the  
31 actual days deer were harvested, I know for the Pelican  
32 area it didn't seem to be accurate. Is there -- and I  
33 think other people have commented on this, is there a  
34 way to educate the users or do you guys have a plan to  
35 educate the hunters so that they do it accurately so  
36 you can make a good assessment. Because I know for a  
37 fact that most people only put down the days that they  
38 got a deer. And that's why when you say that you have  
39 to hunt one day -- or one and a half days to get a  
40 deer, for Pelican it looks like it's great and easy  
41 hunting, but I know for a fact people hunt a lot more  
42 than they report on those tickets. And they're  
43 starting to wake up and change now because of what  
44 happened last year. But from the State's position, is  
45 there anything you're doing to try to educate hunters  
46 or somehow get more accurate data?

47

48 Thank you.

49

50

1 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to  
2 Member Slater. Let's see there are a couple of points  
3 I want to make there. First is that you're aware that  
4 to legally hunt deer you need to have a hunting license  
5 and a deer harvest ticket. So the number of deer  
6 harvest tickets issued in a community is an index of  
7 the interest of hunting deer. Years ago, 70 or 80  
8 people in Pelican would get deer harvest tickets, you  
9 know, we have accurate records of those, there's no  
10 disputing that, you know, all the harvest tickets are  
11 individually numbered and they're issued to a specific  
12 individual. But if you're going to hunt deer you have  
13 to have deer harvest tickets, we know how many people  
14 in Pelican got deer harvest tickets. That number has  
15 declined and it has kind of stabilized in the last 10  
16 years or so. So in the last 10 years generally the  
17 number is 30 and 40 residents of Pelican get deer  
18 harvest tickets. Years ago it was more in the 60 to 80  
19 range. So the number of people legally hunting deer,  
20 you know, that's what we can say from that, is that the  
21 number of people legally hunting deer in Pelican has  
22 declined, and it's declined by 30 or 40 percent.

23  
24 In terms of harvest reporting, you  
25 know, we've changed how we did our harvest reporting.  
26 In 2011 we went from a mailout survey, then prior --  
27 then prior to 2011 surveys were mailed out to a third  
28 of the people in each community who got deer harvest  
29 tickets and half or a third of those people responded.  
30 As part of the Unit 2 deer subcommittee process back in  
31 2004/2006 the subcommittee, which was sponsored by the  
32 RAC, came up with a number of recommendations; one is  
33 they wanted improved harvest reporting and so the  
34 Department, you know, it took us a few years but we  
35 came up with this harvest reporting system that we have  
36 now, it's a mandatory harvest report. It had to go  
37 through the Board of Game to make it a regulation.  
38 However, you know, what people -- so I guess harvest  
39 reporting, when you consider yourself to be hunting or  
40 not is up to the individual hunter. It's ambiguous, we  
41 can't define it, only the hunter knows when they're  
42 hunting. That can be easier to define if you maybe  
43 lived in someplace urban and you say, well, I'm going  
44 to go out to my cabin and go hunting for a week, you  
45 went to this place, you hunted for a week. If you  
46 live in a rural community and you're going about your  
47 daily business and you have a rifle with you in case  
48 you see a deer, then are you hunting, well, only the  
49 hunter knows that. You could say, well, that's  
50

0169

1 ambiguous, yes it is. But over time, we believe people  
2 have reported in pretty much the same way. So I don't  
3 know that there's been a change in how people in  
4 Pelican have reported over the last 25 years, I suspect  
5 there has not been. The conditions, you know, people  
6 are still living the same lifestyle and doing the same  
7 things they've been doing so what we look at is trend.  
8 And the trend there is that fewer people are hunting  
9 and there's less hunting effort.

10

11 So that's -- you know, that's how we're  
12 monitoring hunting effort in that area and, you know,  
13 it's not an exact measure of how many hours every  
14 individual spent hunting but it's, I believe, a  
15 reasonable index of the hunting effort by people in  
16 that community.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Schumacher. Mr. Wright had a question.

20

21 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
22 I believe I heard you say that there were less hunters  
23 around Angoon, qualified hunters, is there any kind of  
24 reason why you think that is? Because if I don't have  
25 an income, you look at the fuel bill, I mean the fuel  
26 is going -- right now in Hoonah it's \$6.30 and I can't  
27 imagine what it's like in Angoon but, you know, in the  
28 past have you guys looked at reason why it's -- you  
29 said that there was less hunters in Angoon as qualified  
30 hunters and, you know, non-qualified hunters are people  
31 out going and having a good time, you know, and they  
32 can afford the fuel. So I'm just curious if you have  
33 any indication of why this is.

34

35 Thank you, Mr. Schumacher.

36

37 MR. SCHUMACHER: Through the Chair to  
38 Member Wright. Everyone feels the pinch of fuel, it's  
39 expensive in Juneau too, I know it's not as expensive  
40 as it is in Hoonah, I know it's not expensive as it is  
41 in Angoon. But, you know, the trend -- the data that  
42 we presented in our comments are long-term data, you  
43 know, these go back into the '90s so we're looking at a  
44 long-term trend. I can't say why fewer people are  
45 hunting, I don't know if the population trend in Angoon  
46 has been down over the years. I know that nation-wide  
47 there are fewer people hunting, period. That's just  
48 been a trend for a couple of decades, fewer people are  
49 hunting and I don't know if that's now extending to  
50

0170

1 rural communities in Southeast Alaska but I guess we  
2 don't really have a way of determining of why people  
3 aren't hunting. You know we do provide hunter  
4 education, we do try to promote hunting, but it seems  
5 like, you know, we need to interview specific  
6 individuals from that community who either started  
7 hunting or given up on it to really find out.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
10 Schumacher.

11

12 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
13 Albert.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard.

16

17 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
18 Just to kind of help answer that question, the price  
19 gas here is \$6.50 a gallon and when you have 80 percent  
20 unemployment. You heard Mayor Thompson say yesterday  
21 you have to have a job to go hunting and this is  
22 probably part of the reason why you're seeing the  
23 decline in hunters is because they can't afford to go  
24 hunting anymore. I'll use myself as an example, Madame  
25 Chair, last year I didn't have a boat because that's  
26 just the way things went, my boat broke down right at  
27 the end of summer so I didn't have a boat to hunt with.  
28 That's the other part of it, is if you go to the Angoon  
29 Harbor, there's no boats there like there used to be so  
30 the price of gas and not having a boat are the two  
31 things here. We don't have roads to hunt here so  
32 that's just to help him and add that to the equation so  
33 his data is a little more accurate as to why things are  
34 the way they are.

35

36 Thank you, Madame Chair.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
39 Howard. Are there other questions from Council Members  
40 for Mr. Schumacher regarding the additional analysis  
41 that the State provided on these three proposals.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. I  
46 have one last question for you Mr. Schumacher, I  
47 noticed that the Board of Game, there are proposals for  
48 the Board of Game regarding Unit 4 deer remainder and  
49 decreasing the potential bag limit to four deer in Unit  
50

0171

1 4. Can you remind the Council what the Board of Game's  
2 schedule is for decisionmaking on those proposals that  
3 are on the State side of the equation?

4

5 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, the Board is  
6 meeting January 20th to 25th in Ketchikan and they'll  
7 accept public comments.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So that is still  
10 currently open for public comments?

11

12 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: And do you have  
15 the deadline for public comment for Board of Game  
16 proposals?

17

18 MR. SCHUMACHER: I'm afraid I do not  
19 have that in front of me.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Perry has  
22 the deadline for us Mr. Schumacher.

23

24 MR. SCHUMACHER: Okay.

25

26 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
27 It is January 6th, the comment deadline.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
30 great, thank you. I just wanted to bring that new  
31 information. I know it's something that the Council's  
32 going to be talking about later in the meeting but as  
33 we deliberate these proposals I just wanted to make  
34 sure we were all aware that those State proposals are  
35 also being considered.

36

37 Ms. Phillips.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
40 Is the ADF&G analysis for deer proposals before the  
41 Board of Game available for public review?

42

43 MR. SCHUMACHER: The comments that are  
44 handed out there -- oh, are you talking for -- excuse  
45 me -- are you asking about the three proposals for deer  
46 that you're talking -- wait a minute, no, you're  
47 talking about the Board of Game proposals.

48

49 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

50

0172

1 MR. SCHUMACHER: I'm getting the  
2 regulatory processes confused. The Department's  
3 comments are not available yet, I believe they will be  
4 later on in November.

5  
6 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

7  
8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
9 you for your time today, Mr. Schumacher. I'll remind  
10 the Council that we're going to -- any additional  
11 information from agencies, that's what we're reviewing  
12 right now, and Mr. Johnson did give us a little teaser  
13 yesterday that the Hoonah Indian Association as a  
14 Federally-recognized tribe does have some potential new  
15 information to bring to the table that might be  
16 directly related to these proposals and so I'd like to  
17 call on him to present that information to us in light  
18 of these three proposals that we'll be going through  
19 since I know they pertain to all three of them. If you  
20 could do that now that would be great.

21  
22 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you, Madame  
23 Chair. DeAnna, were you able to print out that one-  
24 pager.

25  
26 MS. PERRY: (Nods affirmatively)

27  
28 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, so the Southeast  
29 Alaska Sustainability Strategy, which is the Forest  
30 Service money, Hoonah Indian Association had put in for  
31 some dollars following the initial proposal, the  
32 discussion, you know, a year ago now, to, you know,  
33 bring more data, local knowledge and managers kind of  
34 together into the discussion. So this one-pager that's  
35 being handed out -- sorry for members of the public who  
36 aren't receiving it, but it's a very high level  
37 overview of what we'll be accomplishing. This is a  
38 five year agreement with the Forest Service, with HIA,  
39 that was inked recently, so this is part of the reason  
40 it wasn't delivered to the Council more earlier,  
41 there's just been a lot of things in development.

42  
43 And, yeah, so one of our goals is to do  
44 long-term household surveys in the communities affected  
45 by these proposals, so Pelican, Gustavus, Angoon,  
46 Hoonah, to shore up the knowledge of usership. And,  
47 you know, I jotted down a couple questions, you know, I  
48 think that could be directly on the survey but these  
49 are concepts of need, and meeting priority and other  
50

0173

1 things, I mean those are all things we can better  
2 integrate into this process as we're trying to learn.  
3 And there's a local capacity developing component to  
4 this so there's money set aside for each community to  
5 train local individuals on the process, this non-  
6 structured interview process and pay them each year to  
7 do that so it's meant to fill some of this capacity gap  
8 that has been acknowledged by the State to do work in  
9 local communities. And in the same light we're going  
10 to be bolstering the camera trap network and other  
11 biological monitoring opportunities around in the North  
12 Chichagof area especially thinking about winter deer  
13 habitat.

14  
15 I'm sorry, I say we -- I'll just take  
16 off my RAC hat really quick, and put on my HIA hat, I  
17 run the Environmental Program for Hoonah Indian  
18 Association and the sponsor of this work so I'll just  
19 remove the confusion there.

20  
21 And we -- let's see, yeah, and, Jim to  
22 your point about just education around harvest  
23 reporting, I mean it's become very apparent how much  
24 the current participation in harvest reporting is  
25 impacting and kind of influencing the decisions that  
26 are coming forward in all of the analysis, so there  
27 just will be an education component to this to try to  
28 help people understand why their data matters and to  
29 more accurately represent their communities in the  
30 harvest reporting. So we are also very interested in  
31 the issues of competition within the community, so  
32 trying to tease apart where competition is occurring  
33 and how prevalent it is. We've heard these questions  
34 about boats, I jotted that down, it's an option, I  
35 don't know how to do drone surveys or something during  
36 deer season but, I don't know we'll think of something,  
37 it'll be interesting because you do see it on the beach  
38 a lot, trying to find a spot to park on the beach.

39  
40 Anyway, I'm happy to answer any  
41 questions about that but that's where -- again, it's a  
42 five year agreement. It's a pretty good award to get  
43 some of this work done but it's not going to be enough  
44 money to cover every gap. And to Cal's question  
45 yesterday to Staff about extra money, I think there  
46 will be other funds that may be needed to like support  
47 and round out this effort too.

48  
49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank  
50



0174

1 you, Mr. Johnson. Are there questions for Ian in his  
2 capacity of Hoonah Indians Association's project for  
3 Unit 4?

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: We'll get to  
8 deliberations soon, hopefully. You have a question,  
9 Mr. Hernandez.

10

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I was just  
12 wondering, do you think your efforts here can maybe  
13 shed some light on this overarching question here as to  
14 why there are fewer hunters in these communities, do  
15 you think that could be something you could tease out  
16 in your questioning?

17

18 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I do think so.  
19 Yeah, I wrote that down too, it's an interesting  
20 question that I think we can definitely, you know, get  
21 better data on. You know many communication with both  
22 Tom and Steve on the phone already about this project  
23 and quite a few, honestly probably quite a few members  
24 in this room, too, so, you know, I'm saying that  
25 because the actual questions to be asked are yet to be  
26 determined but will be driven by what's needed, you  
27 know, what's most useful going forward and to advise  
28 us. So, you know, we'll be assembling a steering  
29 committee group essentially for this project and to  
30 figure all those out and pin them down. But, yeah,  
31 absolutely the opportunity for that exists.

32

33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Followup.

34

35 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, just as a  
36 suggestion, you know, something I see in the rural  
37 communities is we do seem to have an aging population.  
38 And, you know, when I hear that there's less hunters I  
39 mean I can understand why maybe older people might  
40 start giving up on hunting. But I guess my question  
41 is, you know, are there younger hunters out there that  
42 are actually trying to provide more, you know, to kind  
43 of pick up the slack for elders and what not, that  
44 could be something to start investigating.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I agree. And when  
47 the household surveys have occurred in Hoonah, most  
48 recently, some of those questions were asked. I mean  
49 you can start to tease apart sharing networks and like

50

0175

1 identify, you know, that is one of the things that came  
2 to mind as Mr. Schumacher was reflecting on decreasing  
3 hunting numbers is that, you know, for a lack of a  
4 better term I'll call them super users, but there are  
5 super users within every community that, you know, hunt  
6 a lot of deer and distribute a lot of deer, you know,  
7 underneath the right mechanisms and everything and so  
8 the -- yeah, so that was on my mind, too, as elders are  
9 aging out and proxies happen and everything else.  
10 There is proxy -- proxy is a big deal.

11

12 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
13 you. Are there other questions for Mr. Johnson  
14 regarding Hoonah Indian Association's project.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I have one -- so  
19 do you expect -- so you said you were going to be  
20 collecting data regarding trying to tease out some of  
21 the competition questions and stuff that are had, do  
22 you anticipate having any information prior to sort of  
23 our next regulatory cycle on the Federal side that we  
24 would be able to incorporate or hear for maybe a new  
25 round of proposals by our next -- like by our spring  
26 meeting, do you know will you have data to kind of to  
27 report back out on by then?

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that's the goal.  
30 Initially I've had some good discussions with Lauren  
31 about initiating this process and trying to give it  
32 enough focus initially that we can probably really  
33 focus on the deer hunting issue, not think about --  
34 because we could use this opportunity to really like  
35 understand pretty comprehensively resource use in  
36 communities, too, and dive into other issues. But,  
37 anyways, yeah, the goal right now is to have like data  
38 in hand and analyzed to some extent by January or  
39 February so we can meet these spring deadlines.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank  
42 you. Are there any further questions for Mr. Johnson.

43

44 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim  
45 Slater.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater.

48

49 MR. SLATER: I don't have a question, I

50

0176

1 just wanted to thank Ian -- yeah, thank you. I just  
2 wanted to say thanks to Ian for taking the initiative  
3 and getting this going. I think it was needed and he  
4 really stepped up and has done a nice job here. Thank  
5 you, Ian.

6  
7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are  
8 there any other agencies, Federal, State, tribal  
9 agencies, Regional Advisory Councils, Fish and Game  
10 Advisory Committees or Subsistence Resource Commissions  
11 that have new information to bring to the Council  
12 regarding Wildlife Proposals 22-07, 08 or 10?

13  
14 (No comments)

15  
16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. I  
17 understand we have a written comment. Ms. Perry, would  
18 you please give us the written comments, an overview of  
19 the written comments that came in regarding new  
20 information.

21  
22 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair. We have  
23 received one written comment from Nicholas Orr on the  
24 new revised analysis. It's short so I'll read it  
25 verbatim.

26  
27 This proposal was sent back to the RAC  
28 by the Federal Subsistence Board with the goal of  
29 coming up with a better solution supported by more  
30 evidence. Both ADF&G and OSM responded by compiling  
31 reports with additional evidence that, again, show no  
32 biological concern and there is no competition concern.  
33 The data shows deer populations are near carrying  
34 capacity and it also shows minimal effort by non-  
35 Federally-qualified users. Furthermore, there was  
36 testimony at the Federal Subsistence Board from long-  
37 term users of the area in question that supported  
38 ADF&G's findings of minimal effort by non-Federally-  
39 qualified users. The data also shows Federally-  
40 qualified users are having increased success as  
41 measured by number of days to harvest a deer per ADF&G  
42 data. I realize that data collection is subject to  
43 reporting issues but those issues are not unique to  
44 Federally-qualified users. Both non-Federally-  
45 qualified users and Federally-qualified users often  
46 only report successful hunts or claim they didn't hunt  
47 at all. There has also been concern shown that there  
48 is no priority as required by ANILCA because the State  
49 and Federal bag limits are the same. This concern is  
50

0177

1 miss-founded as Federally-qualified users have an  
2 extended season into January as well as the Federally-  
3 designated hunter program. This extended season and  
4 Federally-designated hunter program are consistent with  
5 the implementation of priority in other Federally-  
6 managed areas within the State of Alaska. This  
7 proposal does not meet the standards set forth in  
8 ANILCA and I urge you not to send it back to the  
9 Federal Subsistence Board.

10

11                                   Again, that was a comment from Nicholas  
12 Orr.

13

14                                   Madame Chair, quick question. He also  
15 provides a comment for Wildlife Proposal 22-08 and 10,  
16 do you want those read at this time or are we taking  
17 them separately?

18

19                                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
20 Perry. I think we're doing everything combined right  
21 now until we get to Council's deliberation on the  
22 proposal so if you could also provide those now that  
23 would be great.

24

25                                   MS. PERRY: Okay. Mr. Orr's comment on  
26 Wildlife Proposal 22-08 is:

27

28                                   This proposal was sent back to the RAC  
29 by the Federal Subsistence Board with a goal of coming  
30 up with a better solution supported by more evidence.  
31 Both ADF&G and OSM responded by compiling reports with  
32 additional evidence that, again, show no biological  
33 concern and there is no competition concern. The data  
34 shows deer populations are near carrying capacity.  
35 Competition from non-Federally-qualified users should  
36 not be a factor given the extensive road system which  
37 allows all users to spread out provided they actually  
38 get out of their vehicles to hunt. ADF&G notes that  
39 days of hunting for deer has been trending down, i.e.,  
40 hunters are having to hunt less time for their deer. For  
41 Federally-qualified users in the Hoonah area. This  
42 would suggest that non-Federally-qualified users are  
43 not impacting Federally-qualified users. I realize  
44 that data collection is subject to reporting issues but  
45 those issues are not unique to Federally-qualified  
46 users. Both non-Federally-qualified users and  
47 Federally-qualified users often only report successful  
48 hunts or claim they didn't hunt at all. I would note  
49 that the FSB, the Federal Subsistence Board, has tasked  
50

0178

1 the RAC with working together to come up with a better  
2 solution. At the 2021 RAC meeting one of the public  
3 comments suggested that the proposal be changed to  
4 three deer, bucks only. Since 2013 this would equate  
5 to a roughly 26 percent reduction in non-Federally-  
6 qualified user harvest. Such an amendment to the  
7 proposal would seem to meet the goal the Federal  
8 Subsistence Board has set forth for the RAC. To  
9 conclude, this proposal, and, again that's 22-08 does  
10 not meet the standards set forth in ANILCA and I urge  
11 you not to send it back to the Federal Subsistence  
12 Board in its current form.

13

14 That concludes Mr. Orr's comment on 22-  
15 08.

16

17 He also provided a comment on WP09 --  
18 let me rephrase that, WP22-09/10. This proposal was  
19 sent to the RAC by the Federal Subsistence Board with a  
20 goal of coming up with a better solution supported by  
21 more evidence. Both ADF&G and OSM responded by  
22 compiling reports with additional evidence that, again,  
23 show no biological concern and there is no competition  
24 concern. The data shows deer populations are near  
25 carrying capacity and it also shows minimal effort by  
26 non-Federally-qualified users. ADF&G notes that days  
27 of hunting for deer has been trending down, i.e.,  
28 hunters are having to hunt less time for their deer for  
29 Federally-qualified users. I realize that data  
30 collection is subject to reporting issues but those  
31 issues are not unique to Federally-qualified users.  
32 Both non-Federally-qualified users and Federally-  
33 qualified users often only report successful hunts or  
34 claim they didn't hunt at all. I would urge the Board  
35 to not take action on this proposal, not only because  
36 it does not meet the standards set forth in ANILCA but  
37 also because there was a significant amount of written  
38 testimony provided by residents of Pelican that opposed  
39 WP22-09/10. Several of the comments from residents of  
40 Pelican suggested that these proposals originated out  
41 of some sort of personal dispute with one calling it a  
42 Hatfield and McCoy situation. The RAC should not be  
43 putting itself in a situation where it's being used to  
44 settle disputes nor should it claim to know what  
45 regulations are needed over the protest of area  
46 residents.

47

48 That concludes all three comments  
49 received by Nicholas Orr on these proposals.

50

0179

1 Thank you, Madame Chair.

2

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
5 Perry. All right, at this time the Council will  
6 consider public comment regarding these three  
7 proposals. You can make a public comment on Wildlife  
8 Proposal 07, 08 or 09. First I'll call on anybody in  
9 the room that wishes to make a public comment to come  
10 forward.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Is  
there anybody on the telephone that would like to  
provide new public comment regarding Wildlife Proposals  
07, 08 or 09 -- sorry, 07, 08 and 10. Go ahead.

MS. DINOVELLI-LANG: So my name is  
Danielle Dinovelli-Lang. I'm an anthropologist --  
academic anthropologist currently teaching in Ottawa,  
Ontario but I did my dissertation in Hoonah and was  
(indiscernible ) the SERAC, some people there probably  
know me back in the early 2000s and my first winter in  
Hoonah happened to be the winter of '06 and '07, and I  
know that that's kind of the pre-history of these  
proposals so I'd like to speak in support of Wildlife  
Proposal 22-08 in light of that experience.

I want to make three quick points.

What I see in the charts provided both  
by OSM and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is  
that the winter of '06/07 deer population may have  
fully recovered, urban deer harvest has definitely  
returned to pre-2006 levels, and rural subsistence  
harvest in the NECCUA has not remotely returned to pre-  
2006 levels. I don't see a long-term trend in decline  
but just not recovering from that. Given that the  
population of Hoonah has actually increased in the same  
time period, I think the disparity and participation  
between rural and urban hunters is quite alarming and  
this in itself is a problem that is incumbent upon  
SERAC and the Federal Subsistence Board to address.  
It's a sign that the current regulatory structure is  
providing neither a meaningful rural priority nor a  
substantial opportunity for the continuation of  
customary and traditional subsistence uses, something  
must be done. I understand everyone's considering  
multiple options, but in the meantime I think that the

0180

1 proposal might address some issues.

2

3

4 So my second point, that the situation  
5 in the NECCUA is unique in a few ways that are likely  
6 to be compounding the problem. As everyone knows  
7 there's the issue of scant winter forage, difficult  
8 wildlife passage through dense second growth and an  
9 abundance of bears, that, together, mean there can be a  
10 genuine conservation concern for deer in NECCUA even if  
11 populations in the remainder of Unit 4 remain healthy.  
12 The winter of '06/07 demonstrated this quite clearly.  
13 These factors also drive deer especially in groups of  
14 does towards the beaches and roads where they're easy  
15 to take in large numbers.

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

And, third, much of the NECCUA is  
corporation land that is subject to State management  
and at least for the west side of Port Frederick to Mud  
Bay affected by the controversial increase in the State  
bag limits.

The proposed restriction limiting urban  
hunters to two bucks from Federal public lands will  
provide some refuge for does and give rural hunters the  
opportunity to take them in key parts of their home  
territory according to custom and tradition without  
fear of overharvest.

And my third and final point, is that  
Hoonah hunters were horrified by the winterkill they  
saw on the beaches in the spring of 2007, almost no one  
tried hunting that summer or fall even though ADF&G  
didn't announce the closure until November, I think it  
was. And since that time people have worked tirelessly  
to help the deer population in the NECCUA to recover.  
First of all by foregoing doe harvest for five years  
(indiscernible) substantial community resources in  
terms of money and labor to do tree thinning and other  
deer habitat restoration work on corporation and Forest  
Service lands throughout their territory  
(indiscernible) that effort. And they did so because  
they know the growth and well being of their community  
depends on a flourishing deer population close to home,  
and the adoption of this proposal would help ensure  
that all their hard work did not go to waste.

I'd like to thank the Council for  
listening to my testimony and for the work on this  
proposal and so many others over the years.

0181

1 Thank you.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
4 you. Are there questions from Council members.

5

6 Mr. Kitka.

7

8 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
9 just had one question. Looking at the map and they  
10 show Shee Atika's land which is recently Forest Service  
11 -- the government has bought it back.

12

13 MS. DINOVELLI-LANG: Hum.

14

15 MR. KITKA: Is that accurate or am I  
16 wrong?

17

18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm not sure  
19 with the public testimony that we heard if that's the  
20 correct person to answer that question. Do you have an  
21 answer to that question?

22

23 MS. DINOVELLI-LANG: No, I'm sorry, I  
24 wish I did.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
27 you. Is there anyone, any agency representative in the  
28 room that can answer that question for Mr. Kitka?

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, we'll  
33 try to get that information back to you Mr. Kitka.

34

35 Are there any other folks on the  
36 telephone that have public testimony regarding these  
37 three proposals at this time.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. This  
42 will be a last call for any new public testimony for  
43 Wildlife Proposal 07, 08 and 10.

44

45 MR. BEASON: This is Ryan Beason,  
46 can.....

47

48 REPORTER: Cathy, there's someone on  
49 the phone.

50



0182

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: There's someone  
2 online.

3  
4                   MR. BEASON: This is Ryan Beason, can  
5 you hear me?

6  
7                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, go  
8 ahead, Ryan.

9  
10                  MR. BEASON: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
11 Chair. My name is Ryan Beason, I am the President of  
12 Territorial Sportsmen in Juneau. My comments will be  
13 on all three of these proposals. I'll keep it brief, I  
14 know we're already on record opposing all three of  
15 them. Kind of like Chairman Hernandez previously said  
16 we've kind of come to the conclusion there is no  
17 conservation issue based on the information that's been  
18 submitted from OSM and Fish and Game, and that kind of  
19 comes down to Mr. Tom Schumacher's comments, too, is  
20 the biggest issue here is the reduction in hunters.  
21 Whether it's Federally-qualified or non-Federally-  
22 qualified, that's the key driving force here. If you  
23 have less hunters, there's going to be less deer kill.  
24 I think that's the thing we need to focus on here, is  
25 getting the next generation to hunt and I don't know  
26 the best way to do that but I think that's the heart of  
27 the issue here.

28  
29                  I know a lot of the smaller  
30 communities, a lot of the younger generations are  
31 moving to bigger towns for work or they're just not  
32 into hunting and that's causing the aging population to  
33 get less deer. But, again, the deer are happy -- are  
34 healthy, the conservation -- there's a healthy number  
35 of deer out there is what I'm saying. And by making  
36 these closures you're affecting a lot of other families  
37 who there is this, you know, almost a surplus of deer  
38 out there that we can no longer harvest or severely  
39 limited to harvest and I don't think that's the  
40 intention that anybody would like to do. I like the  
41 work that HIA is doing, it sounds like it'll be a great  
42 effort to kind of do a further study there. And I  
43 think -- I agree further studies need to be done before  
44 any decisions are made on this. We've had mild winters  
45 the last 10 or so winters, there's been little  
46 winterkill, and I know many of you know winterkill can  
47 do a lot more damage than any hunter can do.

48  
49                  So to kind of keep it brief, I'll just  
50

0183

1 say Territorial Sportsmens is on record opposing these  
2 and I would ask you, as the Council, to look at the  
3 information presented in front of you and it doesn't  
4 make sense to do these closures right now when we've  
5 had mild winters, little winterkill and the population  
6 is healthy.

7

8 Thank you for your time.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ryan.  
11 Are there questions from Council members.

12

13 Mr. Douville.

14

15 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
16 I'd like him to identify himself and who he represents,  
17 I didn't catch that part.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ryan, can  
20 you.....

21

22 MR. BEASON: My name is Ryan Beason  
23 and I'm with the Territorial -- sorry -- Madame Chair.  
24 My name is Ryan Beason, I am President of the  
25 Territorial Sportsmen in Juneau.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

28

29 Mr. Casipit.

30

31 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Beason.  
32 Ms. Chair, for recognizing me. I understand your  
33 position on the three proposals, I understand the  
34 reasoning, you know, I listened to Fish and Game and  
35 our own Staff. But my question for you is maybe a  
36 little more broader than that. You might have heard me  
37 talk earlier in the meeting about our responsibility as  
38 a Council to ensure that there is a meaningful priority  
39 for Federally-qualified users, and I don't mean to put  
40 you on the spot, if you don't want to answer that's  
41 fine, but what do you think a meaningful priority for  
42 Federally-qualified users in the remainder of Unit 4  
43 should look like?

44

45 MR. BEASON: Thank you, Mr. Casipit.  
46 There is no, I guess the answer to that that I would be  
47 able to give you. I think we'd have to rely on the  
48 data that we're provided and like I mentioned, is,  
49 obviously the population is aging and, you know,

50

0184

1 they're not hunting near as much as they used to and  
2 that may limit people. I didn't mention this, but the  
3 beach hunting, and that would still be allowed, as on  
4 State land, it's the beaches, so these proposals could  
5 do harm and the exact opposite of what they're intended  
6 and create more issues than they're intending to with  
7 more beach hunter competition. I know I kind of veered  
8 off your question there. But I don't see -- I can't  
9 give an answer to that, I apologize.

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ryan.  
12 Is there any further new public testimony for Wildlife  
13 Proposal 22-07, 08 or 10 on the telephone.

14

15 MR. BETHERS: Yes.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
18 please state your name.

19

20 MR. BETHERS: Mike Bethers.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, go  
23 ahead.

24

25 MR. BETHERS: Thank you for this  
26 opportunity. I'm Mike Bethers. I'm a lifelong 74 year  
27 old deer hunter. I live in Auke Bay. I do most of my  
28 hunting in Tenakee, where I have a place. So I've been  
29 asked by four other Juneau non-qualified hunters to  
30 speak in their behalf too, we all think alike. And all  
31 these guys, they know several other people who would  
32 love to participate in this meeting but they're on the  
33 job and they can't take a break but thank you for this  
34 opportunity.

35

36 I wanted to note that yesterday when I  
37 listened to the rural community reports I was kind of  
38 surprised I didn't hear any comments or complaints  
39 about the deer hunting there. I know that it's kind of  
40 a contentious area at times and it was good, I guess,  
41 not to hear those. The analysis -- in the analysis, I  
42 know that some of the users don't believe too much in  
43 the Fish and Game harvest data because they don't  
44 typically -- typically don't report unsuccessful  
45 hunting trips and in my past career as a biologist, I  
46 was included in a lot of sampling programs and it's  
47 well known that it's real typical for resource users,  
48 whether they be Federally-qualified or not, or  
49 sportfishermen or subsistence fishermen, it's common to  
50

0185

1 under estimate things because people -- it's just  
2 natural for people to try and not report unsuccessful  
3 outings. And I wanted to make that comment there, if  
4 there's -- probably if there's any error, it's error in  
5 both the non-qualified hunters and the Federally-  
6 qualified hunters as well.

7

8 I made -- I have commented on these  
9 proposals before, I'm only trying to make new points.

10

11 On the efficiency of hunters, I know  
12 that fuel prices are high for everybody in Southeast  
13 Alaska. And back in the olden days nobody was spending  
14 anything to hunt and the evolution of powerboats it  
15 cost all of us. I know I prefer to hunt in the woods  
16 with a call for that very reason. And I would predict  
17 it's a much more efficient and effective way to put  
18 deer in the freezer than continuing to cruise up and  
19 down snowless beaches or heavily hunted roads, you  
20 know, when there isn't a good snow to keep the deer on  
21 the move.

22

23 Also in regard to the recreational  
24 versus the.....

25

26 (Teleconference interference -  
27 participants not muted)

28

29 MR. BETHERS: .....hunt -- hello, am I  
30 still on.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, we can  
33 hear you but there is some feedback from somebody else  
34 but you can continue your testimony.

35

36 MR. BETHERS: It's okay to go ahead --  
37 thank you. In regard to the recreational sport versus  
38 subsistence hunting and attitudes therein, I'm a non-  
39 qualified hunter, always have been, I hunt for meat. I  
40 do have a few trophy racks on the wall but I got them  
41 all meat hunting. You know I don't know of any non-  
42 qualified local people who just trophy hunt deer. I  
43 don't know of any hunters that hunt just for recreation  
44 and I don't know of any non-qualified hunters that  
45 would go climb through the wet brush and devil's club  
46 if there wasn't a possibility of a little meat at the  
47 end of the trail.

48

49 I'll omit some of this stuff which I

50

1 mentioned before.

2

3

4                   And in Hoonah, I know that originally  
5 hunting was -- Northeast Chichagof was based in the  
6 woods on foot or from boats on the beach and I remember  
7 some really good hunts from there in the olden days  
8 before -- before the logging and the road system went  
9 in. I know that the old clear-cuts now have regrown to  
10 the point where there's pretty poor deer habitat and  
11 the deer have learned not to live next to the road.  
12 That's natural selection, the deer that live there  
13 don't survive anymore. And I know that road system is  
14 the basics of quite a few problems there on Hoonah. I  
15 know that the less ferry service that we've had the  
16 last couple of years hopefully have meant lesser  
17 numbers of non-qualified hunters there. And I think  
18 here, again, the hunting in Hoonah kind of evolved on  
19 to the road system and I think that'd be very very  
20 efficient if it were to evolve back into the woods and  
21 up the hill where deer can be found, you know,  
22 regardless of the snow level.

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

                  All of these proposals would require a  
very complicated -- if they were adopted, would require  
very complicated bag limit regulations on the beach and  
it would be a huge enforcement job, if it's even  
possible.

                  To make this short I feel that the  
Federally-qualified hunters already have a priority for  
deer. I don't have a problem with that at all in times  
of conservation, the Federally-qualified season extends  
through January when deer are most available and there  
is no competition from any other user group except your  
neighbor. There's a designated hunter option, I know,  
that seems to work well for people who are unable to  
get their own meat, and Federally-qualified hunters  
typically live right in the hunting area which -- you  
know, it doesn't require near the travel for say  
somebody in Juneau to get to the hunting area. Not one  
of these proposals will do what the authors asked for.  
They're not supported by any substantial evidence.  
They're not based on a conservation issue. They will  
all require a complicated bag limit regulation, be very  
difficult to enforce, and if these were adopted in all  
likelihood there would be more non-qualified effort  
directed towards the State managed tidelands and there  
would be more conflict between Federally and non-  
Federally-qualified hunters. I would urge you not to

0187

1 adopt any of these proposals, that is, Wildlife  
2 Proposal 22-07, 22-08 or 22-10.

3

4 I think it might be a good idea for the  
5 subsistence group maybe in cooperation with the State  
6 or whoever.....

7

8 (Teleconference interference -  
9 participants not muted)

10

11 MR. BETHERS: .....go to the villages  
12 and establish a hunter education program and try and  
13 interject some good deer hunting tactics back into the  
14 subsistence lifestyle. I think that would be a much  
15 more effective way for you to get some meat in the  
16 freezer.

17

18 That's it for me, thank you very much.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
21 you. Are there any quick questions from the Council.

22

23 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
24 Albert.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.

27

28 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
29 guess a question is, where does hunting only the road  
30 system in Hoonah, where does that data come from in the  
31 gentleman's comments?

32

33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: We're getting  
34 some feedback over the lines so if you could mute your  
35 phones and if the gentleman who just provided public  
36 testimony could answer Mr. Howard's question that would  
37 be appreciated.

38

39 MR. BETHERS: I'm sorry, I thought that  
40 was for Staff. Yeah, I would assume that the -- I know  
41 that there has been check stations on the Hoonah road  
42 side in years past. I believe the -- probably that  
43 data would come from the State Division of Game, you  
44 know, harvest and effort surveys, off of the hunter  
45 reports. I am not sure if that is specified on the road  
46 side or not, I'm not aware of that. But at least in  
47 that area it would all come from the State hunting and  
48 hunter harvest and effort survey, I'm sure.

49

50

0188

1 Thank you.

2

3 MR. HOWARD: Followup, Madame Chair.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr.

6

Howard.

7

8 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. I

9 have a lot of nieces and nephews in Hoonah and I spent,  
10 I'd say 5 months in Hoonah, when the season wound down  
11 I decided to go riding, just to go riding and I've  
12 learned that the nieces and nephews do go up into the  
13 alpine, they don't stay on the road system, Madame  
14 Chair. So to assume that that's how they hunt now is  
15 incorrect. A lot of the young guys in Hoonah go up in  
16 the alpine but I also seen the issue they have with  
17 once the ferry came in that was a whole different --  
18 you have to hunt a whole different way because there's  
19 cars on the road. So I think we have to figure out how  
20 to incorporate local knowledge to come up with a  
21 formula on what's really happening to the resource.

22

23 Thank you, Madame Chair.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
26 you, Mr. Howard. Are there any other questions for the  
27 gentleman who provided public testimony.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are  
32 there any other.....

33

34 MR. BETHERS: Madame Chair.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, I'm not  
37 sure who just.....

38

39 MR. BETHERS: Madame Chair.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is that you Mr.  
42 Howard -- no. Can you identify yourself please.

43

44 MR. BETHERS: Mike Bethers. Mike  
45 Bethers, I just provided testimony.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Oh, right, okay,  
48 Mr. Bethers.

49

50

0189

1 MR. BETHERS: I would add that I am  
2 totally aware that not everybody hunts on the road in  
3 Hoonah. There are some people who still hunt in the  
4 woods and I've got two or three friends that are  
5 serious hunters and they do very well hunting off the  
6 road side. But I know the road side is where a lot of  
7 the people are not being successful. And the deer, I  
8 think, through natural selection have learned not to  
9 live there especially after doe season opens when  
10 anything is legal. And, yeah, I'm aware that it's not  
11 a road system hunt, that there's a pretty good portion  
12 of that hunting effort is on that road side.

13  
14

Thank you.

15  
16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. In  
18 the interest of time I'd like to take a quick count of  
19 individuals who are on the phone that are hoping to  
20 testify on these three proposals. We need to know how  
21 many people are going to do it and whether or not we  
22 should put a time restriction on it, we have a lot of  
23 business that we need to get through today and the  
24 Council still needs to do their deliberations. And so  
25 at this time if you can just one by one state your name  
26 then I can write a list of how many folks we have still  
27 left that are wanting to provide public testimony.

28  
29

30 MR. MEYER: This is Kevin Meyer and I'd  
31 like to testify.

32  
33

34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you,  
35 Kevin.

36  
37

(Pause)

38  
39

40 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there anyone  
41 else on the phone that is going to provide public  
42 testimony for these wildlife proposals besides Kevin.

43  
44

(No comments)

45  
46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
48 you for that. It's hard for us in the room to know how  
49 many of you guys are out there listening in on our  
50 meeting and we want to make sure that we continue to  
provide this opportunity for that. So the last public  
testimony that we'll take on these wildlife proposals  
before the Council takes a quick break and then comes  
back to decide how we're going to deliberate on the



0190

1 proposals, is Mr. Meyers, so Kevin if you can go ahead.

2

3

4 MR. MEYERS: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
5 Chair. Thanks for the opportunity, I'll be especially  
6 brief as I've submitted comments on behalf of the  
7 Department of Fish and Game, Juneau/Douglas Advisory  
8 Committee several times and attended the hearing this  
9 summer as well. I listened in.

9

10 And the message that I want to deliver  
11 today is the same that I've submitted in written and in  
12 oral comments in each of those, and that is that we're  
13 a relatively high functioning body in Juneau and we're  
14 standing by to, in any way possible address this  
15 conflict between non-Federally-qualified and Federally-  
16 qualified hunters. We would love to be able to use the  
17 Board of Game process to do this and would be happy to  
18 participate in any sort of programs, any sort of  
19 listening sessions to address this. And I guess I was  
20 thinking of the question to Mr. Beason earlier of what  
21 would constitute a preference there, and the Advisory  
22 Committee has begun thinking that through, and I know  
23 that there are Board of Game proposals including one  
24 that I personally submitted, not on behalf of the  
25 Advisory Committee, to reduce the bag limit in the  
26 remainder of Unit 4 from 6 down to 4, going to that  
27 historic level which creates a fairly clear preference  
28 for Federally-qualified hunters.

29

30 I'll leave it at that and just say that  
31 the Juneau/Douglas Advisory Committee is standing by  
32 and hopes to help if at all possible through the Board  
33 of Game process.

34

35 So thanks for your time.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
38 you. Are there any questions for Mr. Meyer.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
43 Council, we will take a short break. I think we could  
44 use a little stretch -- Mr. Johnson.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry, Madame Chair. I  
47 have one written and three kind of verbal comments from  
48 Hoonah that have been submitted to me recently. Is it  
49 -- I don't know process-wise, is it appropriate for me  
50

50

0191

1 to like talk about those right now and like have them  
2 in the record, like how does that work?

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

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I believe if they want them in the record, right now we're collecting new information regarding these proposals. It's not appropriate to bring that to the table when we're deliberating so if you want to provide those now, please do so.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you. I'll just read the one I have written. These will all be very brief. This is from Ernestine (Indiscernible). I support non-rural hunters having limited deer. Spring and summer tourists take over the roads. Winter is mostly out of town people after deer and their ways of hunting are different, only cutting out parts that they want, realizing they killed a bambi and leaving it. The attitude of hunters on the ferry is different and I think two is generous. So that's just the written comment from Ernestine.

And then I also have permission from the other three members I'm going to reference, to use their names so I can have them -- named on the record. So Billie Mills, William Mills is a member of the Icy Straits RAC and supports the limitation and concept but had concerns that it wouldn't -- of the State issue that's been identified and just that it doesn't address the beach side of things but likes having does in Hoonah control, and the limitation of bucks, or, you know, the bucks only regulation for non-Federally-qualified. So that's the end of his testimony.

Ralph Knudsen communicated to me that he liked the two bucks only for non-Federally-qualified. He also had concerns about law enforcement, especially Federal law enforcement presence on the Hoonah road system and out towards Freshwater Bay, that there wasn't enough presence there. He also did state, actually explicitly, a conservation concern for the deer in the Freshwater Bay area just from non-local pressure. So that's the end of Ralph Knudsen's testimony as he told to me.

And then the last is Bill Miller, he's a member of the Icy Straits Advisory Committee and he supports the proposal as written, also, though, having concerns about the non-effect on State lands but thinks

0192

1 that the doe regulation and -- and the -- the buck  
2 regulation is appropriate for Hoonah area and has seen  
3 the firsthand, the issues that have been identified in  
4 the proposal.

5

6 So that's the end of what I've received  
7 from Hoonah people. Thank you.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
10 thanks. So we're going to take a break. When we come  
11 back from the break the Council is going to deliberate  
12 each of these three proposals. I'll likely need a  
13 motion. I've jotted down our potential options. One  
14 is take no action, which I think in essence maintains  
15 our recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board on  
16 these proposals, as written. Another option is to make  
17 a new recommendation or change our recommendation,  
18 whether that includes modification, we would have to  
19 get to that in deliberation. A third option would be  
20 to defer the proposals, which essentially probably  
21 defers it to our next meeting and means we don't  
22 necessarily do any more deliberation on them but just  
23 remember if we defer the proposals, they remain as  
24 written so it doesn't address any new concerns or  
25 information that we've received at this meeting or  
26 between the last meeting and now regarding the new  
27 analysis and things like that. So those are  
28 potentially three options to be thinking about over  
29 break. We'll break for 10 minutes, so be back at 10:55  
30 and hopefully we can move through these fairly quickly.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 (Off record)

35

36 (On record)

37

38 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it's  
39 been 15 minutes so if I could get the Council to come  
40 back to the table that'd be great.

41

42 (Pause)

43

44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
45 welcome back everybody. The Council is going to be  
46 working on Wildlife Proposals 22-07, 08 and 10. I  
47 understand that we have a Council member prepared to  
48 make a motion to get us started in our deliberations  
49 and so I'll ask Mr. Casipit to give us your motion and  
50

0193

1 see where we go from here.

2

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
5 Yeah, I do have a motion. I'll read it in right now.  
6 After I get a second I'll provide a little  
7 justification. But at this point I move to take no  
8 further action on WP22-08, and WP22-10 so that our  
9 original recommendation to the Federal Subsistence  
10 Board would remain unchanged.

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

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a  
second.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.  
All right, we have a motion on the table. Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Okay, for a little  
justification I just wanted to go over a few things.  
First of all, I view these two proposals as -- to me  
they're really not closures, they're a reduction in the  
bag limit for non-Federally-qualified users, so in my  
mind they're not really a closure. They're -- like I  
said they're just bag limit reductions for non-  
Federally-qualified users. So I don't think that the  
high criteria for closures is appropriate in these two  
particular proposals because we aren't asking for  
closure, just a bag limit reduction.

I also wanted to state that there still  
is opportunity for harvest by the non-Federally-  
qualified users in these areas because they can still  
hunt bucks. And from the testimony that I heard from  
our original meeting, a lot of people, non-Federally-  
qualified users are only interested in bucks anyways,  
so I'm -- you know, I don't really think it's an  
unnecessary restriction on the non-Federally-qualified  
users, they can still harvest a couple bucks.

I think it will be beneficial to  
subsistence users because it would reduce competition.  
I do understand this issue of a boat going into a cove,  
or a little area where it -- you know, it's the only  
place along that whole shoreline that you're going to  
get your boat in and be safe going ashore and if one  
boat's already there, you go on to the next spot,  
that's how I hunt. You know I got my favorite spots  
over there on the north shore of Chichagof and if I go

0194

1 there and there's some other boat there I move on, I go  
2 find another spot, so I understand the issue of, you  
3 know, one boat from -- or a couple boats from a non-  
4 rural area coming in can really disrupt a Federally-  
5 qualified users use.

6  
7 So anyway, that's just a little bit of  
8 the justification, a little bit of what I was thinking  
9 about. And I'd be happy to hear more from other folks.

10  
11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
12 Casipit. Any other Council members who would like to  
13 speak to the motion at hand, questions or discussion at  
14 this time.

15  
16 Ms. Phillips.

17  
18 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
19 I support the motion, generally, however, I would like  
20 to suggest a modification to WP22-10. To reconsider  
21 the Pelican ADF&G Advisory Committee consensus to  
22 support a two deer bag limit for non-Federally-  
23 qualified hunters, with further support for a reduced  
24 bag limit to two deer, bucks only. This would be  
25 consistent with the Hoonah proposal, which is a two  
26 deer bag limit, bucks only. And I would further like  
27 to request that in the next wildlife cycle, that a  
28 proposal be considered to extend this across from  
29 NECCUA WAAs all the way over to Lisianski Inlet/Strait  
30 WAAs, including Port Althorp and Idaho Inlet to add  
31 connectivity to these WAAs within the Hoonah Ranger  
32 district so that there's less of an enforcement issue.  
33 We can't add those areas in now because these are the  
34 proposals before us.

35  
36 And, you know, I will support this  
37 motion but I request that we modify the Lisianski  
38 Inlet/Strait bag limit to bucks only.

39  
40 Thank you.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
43 you, Ms. Phillips. I think we should discuss Ms.  
44 Phillips' recommendation. If we decide that we want to  
45 modify it we may need to separate the two proposals out  
46 because that basically makes it no -- I mean there is  
47 action, we are taking action because we're modifying  
48 the proposal. So is there any comments or discussion  
49 regarding whether or not we want to modify Wildlife  
50

1 Proposal 22-10 to include what Ms. Phillips has brought  
2 to the table.

3

4

Mr. Smith.

5

6

7 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I'd like to share a  
8 perspective. When Raven went to release the box of  
9 daylight, the sun, the moon and the stars, he grabbed  
10 the last box of light and flew off. And when he went  
11 to the fishermen of the night, he stopped in to visit  
12 them because he could hear them, (makes sound) and they  
13 were trying to catch fish. And, of course, on there  
14 there was many ethnicities, many families, some of them  
15 were wearing seal skin deer hides, some were wearing a  
16 bear hide, and when he started sharing them -- to  
17 prepare them for opening this box, and they didn't  
18 believe he had this box, so he showed them, and, of  
19 course, they didn't believe who he was and now, because  
20 he showed them that, he believed -- these men did  
21 believe, so he was warning them, sharing them, that he  
22 was going to open this box and it's going to be soon,  
23 so he was preparing them. And as he left he did open  
24 the box sooner or later, but the ones who did prepare  
25 themselves and the ones who didn't prepare themselves,  
26 the ones who didn't, they became the helper people, the  
27 one that was wearing the bear, he became the bear, the  
28 one that was wearing the seal, he fell into the water,  
29 the two legged, the four legged, the flying, these  
30 became our helper spirits. And, of course, the deer  
31 was one of them. And the deer is looked at -- our  
32 people, and you say (In Native), they're our spirit  
33 people, our spirit man, our helper, our intelligent,  
34 our smart person, our scientists, our healer, is called  
35 (In Tlingit), and the reason that is is because I'm a  
36 hunter and I have 11 kids, 15 grandchildren and I've  
37 taught them, they're providers (makes sound) the deer  
38 call. The deer is very calm. when you take a shot at  
39 him, don't be afraid that he's going to run from you,  
40 the reason our people use that as a spirit is because  
41 they can come to calm very quickly. When I shoot at a  
42 deer and if I miss, which doesn't happen much, but when  
43 you do scare a deer and it runs, you'll watch that it  
44 might run really quickly but it's going to stop, it's  
45 going to come to calm very quickly, and so if you are  
46 listening, try that and keep following him because  
47 you'll find that he's going to calm quickly.

48

49

But the wolf, when we were talking  
about the wolf the other day, the wolf is a spirit that

50

0196

1 our family uses, the panting wolf, where we learned the  
2 respect and the responsibility and a being safe and  
3 kind and helping people. When I talk about the wolf,  
4 don't forget the killer whale, they have the same  
5 structures, their arms are very similar, their jaw is  
6 the same. Our culture stories that are very old talk  
7 about the wolf running out of the woods into the water  
8 and then the killer whale.

9

10 So sharing how intelligent the wolf,  
11 just like the killer whale, you have a protector, love,  
12 love forever, protection, sharing, family. So even  
13 sharing where the wolves, when there's other wolves,  
14 and other clans that come together, there's not a  
15 heaviness, there's actually an introduction and a  
16 connection between the two bull wolves of relationship.  
17 So there's an introduction there. And not to mention  
18 that our wolves are protective, they follow the deer,  
19 they only take what they need, but they follow them  
20 because they know, they're managing the system. So  
21 understanding all this, our people, and our uncles  
22 talked about how the wolf would actually hunt the seal,  
23 hide in the grass, wait for them to come on to the  
24 beach and they would attack -- they taught -- and these  
25 stories came from an uncle that ran into a wolf and he  
26 helped them so here's where the love and the care  
27 amongst each other, amongst humans and animals, where  
28 the jaw, he had a bone in there, and he said, hey,  
29 don't hurt me, I'm just going to help you, so he pulled  
30 the bone out of his jaw and then he -- because it was  
31 late when that happened he fell asleep but the spirit  
32 of that wolf came to him in his dream and the same  
33 incident happened but as that wolf was walking to him  
34 he became human and then that's when he said, hey, I  
35 heard what you asked me about teaching you about  
36 hunting so he taught him about the deer call that you  
37 heard just a few minutes ago that I made, and talked  
38 about the wind, but also talked about how they worked  
39 together and they were a team and they were a family  
40 and so sharing a lot of this and realizing the -- how  
41 important all these animals that are out there in the  
42 world and how, even to the squirrel, might be the  
43 answer to some of our tree issues, you know, connecting  
44 the metaphor assimilability that we receive and the respect  
45 that we have to our animals.

46

47 I look at living in Hoonah for many  
48 years, I raised all my kids, and I know that there's  
49 many people who hunt from the road and some of our  
50

0197

1 young people, I know a lot of our families climb the  
2 hills and climb the mountains so I know that a lot of  
3 it is because some of it I know -- some of my friends  
4 are in wheelchairs, some of them are older, so even  
5 when I went up to Anchorage, I went up just to visit my  
6 boy but the moose season was going on, my son was  
7 driving us around and I was watching how many people  
8 were driving around chasing moose and I finally told my  
9 son because my niece and nephew were with me, my  
10 grandkids, I mean were with me, 5 and 7, I was like,  
11 hey, are we going to get out of the truck, I said,  
12 let's go up into the hike, I see that area over there,  
13 so I encourage my boy was worried about the kids and I  
14 told him don't worry about the kids, we have a 45-70  
15 and a .30-06 but what I'm sharing -- and another thing  
16 I'm sharing too is just respect. And when we come into  
17 (In Tlingit) some of our relatives and the Kaagwaantaan  
18 and we manage all the way from Mt. St. Elias to the  
19 Portland Canal, the Mouse River and we shared it with  
20 many people and we were trade -- we traded, that was  
21 how we became rich and we managed from the land. And  
22 just like the wolf, we manage the land. If there is  
23 too many sea lion, we harvest them and use them as  
24 tools and use them as food, use the fat to preserve our  
25 food. When the sea otters got too many of them, we  
26 would -- we would harvest them for their furs and hides  
27 so we managed the land. And encouraging that we still  
28 do that. But also when we go into somebody else's  
29 country, like anybody would come into our uncle's land,  
30 he didn't mind you coming into his property, he would  
31 be more at the point of honoring you for coming up and  
32 saying hi and hello and that you were there and he  
33 would say, yeah, it's good to see you, the floor is  
34 open, there's a lot of deer up here I saw, not many  
35 over here, I'd suggest going up this way. And he would  
36 do that. But if you didn't stop in and say hello he  
37 would be upset and consequences can be heavy.

38  
39 So I would suggest, in some way, Ian, I  
40 love you, what you're doing is awesome over there in  
41 Hoonah, and the documentation -- I'm just thinking of  
42 censuses when they used to come and knock on our door  
43 and see how many people we had in our family, I really  
44 believe that kind of relationship with their community  
45 could be put into place, even on the digital. And I  
46 think -- I really think that we need to get better  
47 relations between the Fish and Game officers and a  
48 friendlier relationship to data, is so important to us,  
49 and you can hear it today, that we actually need the  
50



0198

1 community to take ownership and put that on the  
2 importance, because we can't, as a Council member, even  
3 the scientists can't do this without your help, so even  
4 this, is like my granddaughter shot a deer in Hoonah  
5 just the -- I'm just proud of her, and I really think  
6 that everybody needs to be participating in this, even  
7 if they're not hunters. What if somebody drove down  
8 the road and saw a deer, let's report it. If  
9 somebody's hiking and they're just going somewhere,  
10 report it. How convenient is this, almost everybody  
11 has one, but not everybody, but I've realized that  
12 there is a lot of Fish and Game sites. Any time I  
13 Google something, boom, it's right there. I Google  
14 anything. So all that information is there, we just  
15 need to (In Tlingit), not be lazy, and take some time  
16 to research but also take time to be respectful to the  
17 land, air and sea, and do your reporting.

18

19 Gunalcheesh. Hoho.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
22 you, Mr. Smith. Are there other Council members that  
23 want to weigh in on the motion on the floor that we  
24 take no action on Wildlife Proposals 08 and 10, and we  
25 do have one Council member who has suggested we might  
26 want to consider modifying 10.

27

28 Mr. Johnson.

29

30 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, Madame Chair.  
31 Yeah, I would support the no action for the one around  
32 Hoonah. I would like to add that the -- from the  
33 meaningful priority standpoint, that I think one of the  
34 really significant parts of that regulation is the  
35 bucks only aspect of it and keeping does in Hoonah  
36 control, so I think that does provide some ability for  
37 Hoonah users to respond to hard winters and other  
38 things, that kind of response probably wouldn't exist  
39 for non-Federally-qualified users coming in.

40

41 In regards to Council Member Phillips'  
42 request to modify, I don't -- I think it would be fine  
43 by me. I don't know if it complicates -- how much it  
44 complicates the process but in terms of thinking about  
45 the analysis between the different proposals, or  
46 between Hoonah and Pelican's there were -- I didn't see  
47 anything in there that would suggest that the three  
48 versus two was really taken into consideration. You  
49 know I didn't see any differentiation in the analysis

50

0199

1 there between two and three and so it seems like two  
2 isn't a significant modification and wouldn't seem to  
3 impact the analysis. And, you know, the consistency  
4 between the two may lend some benefit and weight.

5

6 That's my thoughts.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
9 you for that Mr. Johnson. Any other Council members --  
10 I'll go Mr. Douville, Mr. Wright and then Mr. Smith.

11

12 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
13 I would like you to reread the motion that was made, we  
14 seem to have lost track of things here, and I would  
15 like to hear the intention.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Mr.  
18 Casipit, can you shed that light.

19

20 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
21 Mr. Douville. Yes, I will reread my motion. I move to  
22 take no further action on WP22-08 and WP22-10 so that  
23 our recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board  
24 remains unchanged from our last meeting. And then I  
25 had some justification that I talked about, I can do  
26 that again if you'd like.

27

28 MR. DOUVILLE: (Nods affirmatively)

29

30 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. Justification was  
31 that I thought that these two proposals aren't really  
32 closures, that they're merely bag limit reductions and  
33 so they don't have that higher level of evidence that  
34 we need for closing to non-Federally-qualified users.  
35 Basically non-Federally-qualified users will still have  
36 an opportunity to hunt around Hoonah and around Pelican  
37 for bucks. And that, you know, it's not a complete  
38 closure like the other one was, they're only bag limit  
39 reductions.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Did that answer  
42 your question, Mr. Douville.

43

44 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
45 I struggled with this proposal and I did support it,  
46 however, I had second thoughts about it, and I still  
47 do. I don't see how it gives a meaningful preference.  
48 I can't get it through my mind how it would be a  
49 meaningful preference to just cut a bag limit because  
50

0200

1 you're essentially starting off at the same time, I  
2 mean none of that changes. The areas are still open  
3 and you're starting to hunt at the same time, but  
4 you're reducing a bag limit. It doesn't seem like to  
5 me that it's a meaningful preference. I can't get past  
6 that somehow but maybe somebody could explain it to me  
7 a little better to where it does show there is a  
8 meaningful preference.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
11 you, Mr. Douville. Mr. Wright.

12

13 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
14 I don't know if I'm right or wrong, but I think that  
15 there might be a little point of order here because I  
16 think that Patty had made a change in No. 10; is that  
17 right, so it would be an amendment to 08 and 10?

18

19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I think the  
20 motion is on the floor and we can turn that motion down  
21 and start over and address them individually if the  
22 Council wishes to make the amendment to 22-10. Because  
23 that essentially pulls them apart and right now the  
24 motion includes them together.

25

26 Mr. Casipit.

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
29 At this time with the consent of the second I'll  
30 withdraw my motion.

31

32 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

33

34 MR. CASIPIT: Okay, my motion is  
35 withdrawn.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay.

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: I do want to address  
40 Mike's question about meaningful priority. I'm not  
41 saying that my motion that I put forward before, that I  
42 just withdrew, provides for that, I never said that. I  
43 was just trying to move us forward and, you know, try  
44 to get us down the road.

45

46 On the subject of meaningful priority,  
47 you know, I don't think I can get there with these  
48 proposals because to me part of the meaningful priority  
49 was the difference between 4 and 6, that's no longer  
50

0201

1 there. You know, quite frankly in the last  
2 Administration when they -- I think, they were  
3 purposely trying to hamstring FACA Committees, of which  
4 we are, so that's kind of where I'm at. I understand  
5 the concern about meaningful priority, but I don't see  
6 where I have -- the way things are written now and  
7 where we are, I don't know that I have the ability to  
8 make a motion to make that happen.

9

10 So, you know, on some of this stuff  
11 we're going to have to wait until the next cycle, or I  
12 don't know. We should be -- in my opinion, we should  
13 be making some really strong comments to the Board of  
14 Game on the two proposals that are in that book to  
15 reduce the bag limit in the remainder of Unit 4.

16

17 Anyway, that's where I'm at.

18

19 If the Chair would like me to provide a  
20 modified motion for just 22-08 so we can move forward  
21 I'd be happy to do that.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Mr.  
24 Wright, that answered your question about point of  
25 order, right.

26

27 MR. WRIGHT: Right.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. And right  
30 now we do not have a motion on the table regarding  
31 these proposals so Mr. Smith, I know you've had your  
32 hand raised and I did say, order, did you have  
33 something you wanted to specifically say about how to  
34 move forward with these proposals?

35

36 MR. SMITH: Yeah, and just a thought of  
37 how we can -- you know, having the boats and you're  
38 talking about people coming into your -- certain  
39 locations -- how do we have a site to where you pre-set  
40 your hunting trip on a site and that it has to be done  
41 before, and you actually check in to the Fish and Game,  
42 or even to Ian and let him know that, hey, I'm in town  
43 and that way you're being respectful and letting people  
44 know and knowing where you're going, just a thought of  
45 how can we put that in there and looking at.....

46

47 MR. WRIGHT: Point of order, Madame  
48 Chair.

49

50

0202

1 MR. SMITH: .....comforting the.....

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Right now we don't have --  
6 thank you, Madame Chair. Right now we don't have a  
7 motion on the floor because it was withdrawn from Cal,  
8 so we need a motion on the floor to go on with  
9 discussion. So we need a motion for 08 and then we  
10 move on and then we could discuss later on.

11

12 Thank you, Madame Chair.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
15 you, Mr. Wright, for putting us on track. Mr. Casipit  
16 did volunteer that he had a potential motion, are you  
17 ready to put that forward at this time.

18

19 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, Madame Chair, I'd be  
20 happy to. I move that we take no further action on  
21 WP22-08 so that our recommendation to the Federal  
22 Subsistence Board at our last meeting remains  
23 unchanged. My justification would be.....

24

25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: We need a second  
26 before you get to justification.

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm  
29 sorry.

30

31 MR. JOHNSON: (Hand raised)

32

33 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll second that.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ian had his hand  
36 raised first, so Ian's the second on that. All right,  
37 Mr. Casipit, if you could provide your justification.

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. Justification,  
40 similar to last one. I don't view these as full  
41 closures, they're only -- they're merely a bag limit  
42 reduction. Opportunity for harvest by non-Federally-  
43 qualified users is still available under the two buck  
44 harvest limit.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
49 Casipit. Are there comments, deliberations, support,

50

0203

1 opposition to the motion that is on the table regarding  
2 Wildlife Proposal 08.

3

4 Ms. Phillips.

5

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

7 I, too, struggle with what is meant by meaningful  
8 preference, and so I did some thinking about it last  
9 night -- I've been thinking about it for days actually.

10 So I looked up in the dictionary what is meaningful:

11 Full of meaning. Significance. Purpose or value.

12 Purposeful. Significant purpose. An intended or

13 desired result and aim or goal. Preference. A

14 practical advantage given to one over others.

15 Therefore, in my thinking a meaningful preference is an  
16 intended practical advantage given to one over others.

17

18 So on Federal public lands, in our  
19 analysis, we have the State system saying their word  
20 is, reasonable opportunity. Reasonable opportunity  
21 applies to non-Federally-qualified users. On Federal  
22 public lands, meaningful preference applies to  
23 Federally-qualified users. These proposals provide a  
24 meaningful preference for Federally-qualified users.  
25 These proposals provide a meaningful opportunity for  
26 non-Federally-qualified users. Based on the analysis  
27 in our booklet within Game Unit 4, 83 percent of non-  
28 Federally-qualified users take two or fewer deer, and  
29 nine percent of non-Federally-qualified users take  
30 three deer, five percent of non-Federally-qualified  
31 users take four deer, 1.5 percent non-Federally-  
32 qualified users take five deer, 1.5 percent non-  
33 Federally-qualified take six deer. Federally-qualified  
34 users take more than one deer per day of hunting, and  
35 13 percent of Federally-qualified users take more than  
36 four deer.

37

38 So we're providing a meaningful  
39 preference for Federally-qualified users with this  
40 proposal.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for  
45 that Ms. Phillips. Other comments from Council  
46 regarding Wildlife Proposal 22-08.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50

0204

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to  
2 recognize that we have two Council members on the  
3 telephone, do either of you gentlemen have comments  
4 regarding the motion on the floor to take no action on  
5 Wildlife Proposal 08?

6  
7                   MR. SLATER: Madame Chair.

8  
9                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.

10  
11                   MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim.  
12 I want to say I support most of what was said,  
13 especially the insight that Council Person Phillips  
14 just made about the percentages of how things will be  
15 affected and so on. It seems at first blush that it  
16 doesn't affect things but if you look at the data it  
17 does.

18  
19                   The other thing that is, I think, is  
20 significant that we are leaving off the table, or not  
21 discussing, is the buck restriction. That, in itself,  
22 will offer a meaningful preference to Federally-  
23 qualified hunters and will also have a dual purpose of  
24 actually protecting the population, or supporting the  
25 population.

26  
27                   I'll have more comments later when we  
28 get to the 22-10 proposal.

29  
30                   Thank you.

31  
32                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
33 Slater. any other Council members. Mr. Kitka.

34  
35                   MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
36 Harvey Kitka here. And I support this motion.  
37 Basically I got some reasons I want to support.

38  
39                   Meaningful preference may not have a  
40 real meaning here but it does in a lot of ways. The  
41 number of stores that they got in Angoon and where they  
42 get their food and how stocked their shelves are  
43 because of the transportation, they became a rural  
44 community because they have no real road system. They  
45 had a ferry system that used to come by almost daily  
46 but now it's a long ways in between. The cost of food  
47 because of that. The cost of fuel because of that.

48  
49                   And also I had another question that  
50

0205

1 maybe we'd need Staff for. Do we address this National  
2 Monument different than we do north Chichagof.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
7 Kitka.

8

9 (Pause)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez  
12 reminded me we're talking about Wildlife Proposal 08  
13 and I don't believe that is -- there's not a National  
14 Monument in that particular proposal area so that  
15 question could be brought back up when we discuss 07.

16

17 MR. KITKA: My mistake.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Other -- and I  
20 could be wrong, Harvey, I see you're looking -- any  
21 other Council members regarding the motion on the floor  
22 for Wildlife Proposal 22-08.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are we ready to  
27 vote.

28

29 MR. CASIPIT: Question.

30

31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The question's  
32 been called. All right, we're voting on Wildlife  
33 Proposal 22-08 to take no action thus effectively  
34 maintaining our original recommendation for this  
35 proposal back to the Federal Subsistence Board. All in  
36 favor say aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed say  
41 nay.

42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 MR. SLATER: Aye.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: On the phone was  
48 that an aye for support.

49

50



0206

1 MR. SLATER: Aye for support.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. It  
4 was a little delayed and I kind of jumped the gun  
5 there. So the motion passed unanimously.

6

7 All right, two more you guys, hopefully  
8 before lunch, so this will be how hungry you are. Does  
9 anybody have a motion to put on the table for Wildlife  
10 Proposal 22-10 or 22-07. I believe with 22-10 we  
11 pulled it out of the no action so the proper thing to  
12 do would be to make a motion in the positive, to get it  
13 back on the table for discussion, you'd move to support  
14 22-10 as written and then we can discuss if we want to  
15 change our recommendation and go from there.

16

17 MR. CASIPIT: Madame Chair, let me try  
18 a different tact. I think I can modify my motion to  
19 include Member Phillips' concern and have one motion  
20 that we can deal with instead of having another  
21 amendment, if that's okay and with consent from Mr.  
22 Wright as our parliamentarian.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 MR. WRIGHT: I was never appointed.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I appoint you.

31

32 (Laughter)

33

34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Casipit  
35 that would be great.

36

37 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright.

40

41 MR. WRIGHT: I think Mr. Cal can make  
42 the motion then when we start discussion that goes into  
43 changing the motion so when Cal makes the motion then  
44 discussion starts and then everything gets modified. I  
45 believe that's the way it goes.

46

47 Thank you, Madame Chair.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for

50

0207

1 that. Mr. Casipit.

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: With advice from our Parliamentarian, that's the way I'll proceed. I move to take no further action on WP22-10 so that our original recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board remains the unchanged. My -- and then if I get a second I'll provide justification but it sounds like we'll modify it right away anyway so.

MR. SMITH: (Raised hand)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr. Smith seconded it. You have a justification, Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes. My justification is pretty much the same as the last one. I don't view these as a full on closure, these are merely bag limit reductions to ensure subsistence priority, reasonable -- to ensure a meaningful priority.

It would be beneficial to subsistence users. And it will -- I don't think it will unnecessarily restrict other users because -- other non-Federally-qualified users, they can still harvest bucks.

That's my justification.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you for that Mr. Casipit. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I don't know whether to make a motion or feel the Council out. But I would like the Council to reconsider the recommendation of the Pelican ADF&G Advisory Committee which had consensus to support a two deer bag limit for non-Federally-qualified hunters with further support for a reduced bag limit of two deer, bucks only.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for that. Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame Chair. I think with the concurrence of our Secretary, who seems well-versed in these, I think what you would need to do now is to make a motion to amend the

0208

1 proposal.

2

3

MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.

4

5

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

6

7

MS. PHILLIPS: Move to amend the motion to support the Pelican ADF&G Advisory Committee's support for a two deer bag limit for non-Federally-qualified hunters with further support for reduced bag limit, two deer, bucks only. Is that appropriate.

10

11

12

13

MR. CASIPIT: I second.

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

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, now we are discussing and deliberating the amendment to the main motion regarding changing the language from four deer to two deer, bucks only.

(Pause)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Does someone want to provide a justification.

MR. SLATER: Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Yes. To start out with I believe that one of the justifications is, is that it won't affect the majority of the non-Federally-qualified hunters. And another big one is that from a regulatory standpoint having the Lisianski area aligned with the Hoonah area will make enforcement easier, will make the regulations easier to understand, will avoid having one group, or one area getting more hunting because the regulations are slightly different and so on. So that's some simple rationale for supporting the amendment itself.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Slater. Ms. Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair. This is an effort to minimize complex regulations to put it in line with the NECCUA proposal, which is two deer, bucks only. And it provides a meaningful

0209

1 preference to Federally-qualified users, which is an  
2 intended practical advantage given to one group over  
3 another, which is what ANILCA provides us. Within Game  
4 Unit 2 [sic] 83 percent of non-Federally-qualified take  
5 two or fewer deer, nine percent of non-Federally-  
6 qualified users take three deer, five percent of non-  
7 Federally-qualified users take four deer, 1.5 percent  
8 non-Federally-qualified users take five deer, 1.5  
9 percent non-Federally-qualified take six deer.  
10 Federally-qualified users take more than one deer per  
11 day of hunting, this is customary and traditional  
12 practice, and 13 percent of Federally-qualified users  
13 take more than four deer. And the buck restriction  
14 provides a meaningful preference for Federally-  
15 qualified users.

16

17 Thank you, Madame Chair.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
20 Phillips. Other Council discussion regarding the  
21 amendment.

22

23 Mr. Casipit.

24

25 MR. CASIPIT: I, too, will be  
26 supporting this amendment for the same reasons that  
27 Patty and Jim did. I also am pleased that the  
28 regulations will be consistent in both areas so that in  
29 the future when we do try to talk about this bigger  
30 area, at least we'll be starting with the same  
31 regulations in both places, so I support that.

32

33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any  
34 other justification, comments regarding the amendment  
35 to the main motion.

36

37 Mr. Kitka.

38

39 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, I call for  
40 the question.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
43 Kitka. The question's been called, so we are now ready  
44 to vote on the amendment to the main motion. The  
45 amendment was to change the number from four deer to  
46 two deer, bucks only -- excuse me, sorry -- I wrote it  
47 in the wrong place in my book. So to change from three  
48 bucks to two deer, bucks only. All in favor say aye.

49

50

0210

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed  
4 signify by saying nay.

5

6 (No opposing votes)

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carries.

9 Now, we're back to the main motion was to take no  
10 action on the proposal thus effectively taking the  
11 amended -- our amended support -- or our amended  
12 modification to the proposal back to the Federal  
13 Subsistence Board. Is there further discussion on the  
14 main motion.

15

16 MR. WRIGHT: Call for the question.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Question's been  
19 called. So we're ready to vote on Wildlife Proposal  
20 22-10. All in favor signify by saying aye.

21

22 IN UNISON: Aye.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed  
25 signify by saying nay.

26

27 (No opposing votes)

28

29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
30 motion carries. Now, we have Wildlife Proposal 22-07,  
31 is anybody prepared to provide a motion for 22-07.

32

33 Mr. Hernandez.

34

35 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame  
36 Chair. I guess this would be a new motion but I move  
37 to support Wildlife Proposal 22-07. And with a second  
38 I'll give my justification.

39

40 MR. SMITH: Second.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Second by Mr.  
43 Smith.

44

45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. I  
46 made the motion to support, which is necessary to get a  
47 positive motion on the floor but for this proposal I do  
48 plan to vote against it. And I know this is a very  
49 important issue to the folks in Angoon and with that in  
50

0211

1 mind, I'd like to point out that this is a closure, in  
2 my view a closure requires a higher level of  
3 justification. And we have the opportunity here of a  
4 new effort by the Hoonah Indian Association to get more  
5 detailed information on some of the issues that are  
6 involved in this proposal so I think it would be a good  
7 move for us at this point to essentially ask the  
8 Federal Subsistence Board to take this proposal off of  
9 the table for their January cycle, which would be an  
10 out of cycle proposal during a fish meeting, and gather  
11 this new information and with the intent of for our  
12 next wildlife cycle having a proposal put forward that  
13 could incorporate some of this new information that we  
14 hope to gain and, you know, we may end up putting the  
15 same proposal forward again or we might get some ideas  
16 how to better address the situation in the Angoon area.

17

18 So that's my rationale for opposing  
19 this proposal at this time.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
24 Hernandez. Are there other Council members that would  
25 like to speak to the motion on the floor for supporting  
26 Wildlife Proposal 22-07.

27

28 Ms. Phillips.

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
31 In my review of the analysis for this proposal, the  
32 RAC, the Southeast RAC modified it by removing a WAA  
33 from the original proposal and in the analysis, the  
34 number of hunters was reduced by one-third, from 101.6  
35 hunters to 33.1 just by removing the one WAA, that  
36 means the impact is reduced to the resource and to the  
37 affect on Federally-qualified users. So, you know, one  
38 of my thinkings was that perhaps we should further  
39 reduce the WAAs to the three WAAs 4042, 4054, 4055.  
40 But I understand, you know, what Mr. Hernandez is  
41 saying about, you know, a closure requires a higher  
42 level of standard than a bag limit reduction. And so  
43 I'm wondering maybe we should support a closure for  
44 just 4042, which is the Angoon area. But I don't know,  
45 that wouldn't necessarily -- I mean that would just put  
46 in hunters into those other -- non-Federally-qualified  
47 hunters into those other WAAs. So I know that ANILCA  
48 specifically addresses Angoon's subsistence rights  
49 should not be diminished and it's complicated. So I

50

0212

1 don't -- I don't think I'll be supporting the motion.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
6 Phillips. Are there other Council members who would  
7 like to provide justification regarding the motion.

8

9 Mr. Wagner.

10

11

12 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
13 I agree with Patricia over there. And these proposals  
14 take a lot of work to write and a lot of time to get  
15 them to the table and you folks have already done all  
16 of this before I got on board, and I like what she has  
17 to say, you know, with less water in the Lower 48 we're  
18 going to have more people moving to Alaska, and the  
19 people coming across the Border is millions and  
20 Alaska's going to get hit here pretty soon. We already  
21 got some from Russia, I understand, on islands out  
22 there, that didn't want to join Putin's war there.  
23 But, you know, they've been patient waiting a long time  
24 so -- and growing up in Metlakatla, I know what it's  
25 like now to have to face these other hunters with their  
26 high speed boats up to 600 horsepower on some of them.  
27 Back in the day when I was learning to hunt with my  
28 dad, and got older, we would go out on the family seine  
29 boat and you rarely seen anyone. If you did it was  
30 another Native hunter, another Native boat, and from  
31 what Cal said earlier, half a deer, you know, that  
32 they've gotten last year, what is that, like 15 pounds  
33 of meat after you get it boned out, you know. Enough  
34 for a week, if you eat a lot of fish like most of us do,  
35 but, yeah.

35

36

Thank you, Madame Chair.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
39 Wagner. Mr. Johnson.

40

41

42 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
43 I am concerned if the motion were voted down on the  
44 impact of the two supported no action motions on Angoon  
45 users. You know, we're -- there's a potential to  
46 squeeze the balloon of usership and exacerbate Angoon's  
47 issues so I'm just not sure how that fits into the  
48 equation here but, you know, the bag limit reductions  
49 and other things wouldn't be in effect in Admiralty  
50 area and so people may end up seeking that area further

50

0213

1 should the Board choose to adopt the other two  
2 proposals.

3  
4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka, and  
5 then Ms. Phillips.

6  
7 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
8 was looking at this proposal a little different  
9 probably but realizing that the Southeast RAC submitted  
10 this, it's up to -- basically I assume it's up to us to  
11 either modify it or make an amendment and change the  
12 wording on it. It seemed like -- it seems like if the  
13 Council would be -- would look at a reduction of bag  
14 limit for non-qualified users within the area, maybe  
15 even just for a certain length of time which would  
16 allow the rural users to have a chance to harvest their  
17 deer.

18  
19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
20 Kitka. Ms. Phillips.

21  
22 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. My  
23 apologies, I think I confused things. I said I wouldn't  
24 support the motion but the motion is to support the  
25 existing proposal and so I support the existing  
26 proposal, I would vote yes. Also if we -- doing what  
27 Mr. Kitka suggested which is to do a two deer bag  
28 limit, bucks only would require a new proposal because  
29 this analysis is for a closure. So if this vote -- if  
30 this motion, and anyone can correct me if I'm wrong, if  
31 this motion is -- what Ian has brought up, if this  
32 motion fails, then it stays six deer, Federally-  
33 qualified and non-Federally-qualified until the next  
34 proposal cycle. If a proposal comes out of that cycle.  
35 Or if the Board of Game passes their proposal, which  
36 reduces the bag limit to four deer, but that's still a  
37 deer -- I'm not sure how long it would take for that  
38 one to go into effect. But I'm sorry I confused  
39 things.

40  
41 Thank you.

42  
43 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
44 you, Ms. Phillips. I understand that we have some  
45 clarifying information that needs to come before the  
46 Council regarding this proposal from legal Council so I  
47 would ask Lisa Grediagin to please come forward.

48  
49 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
50



0214

1 Chair. Lisa Grediagin with OSM for the record. And I  
2 apologize I didn't come forward sooner but I just  
3 wanted to make sure my understanding of this was  
4 correct before I threw a wrench in everything but this  
5 actually applies to all three proposals, I just wanted  
6 to confirm with our legal counsel before I stepped in  
7 and opened this can of worms.

8  
9 But both closures and bag limit  
10 restrictions, or reductions to non-Federally-qualified  
11 users are considered restrictions that are addressed in  
12 .815(3) of ANILCA. And so under .815(3) as you guys  
13 are well aware, you can only authorize a restriction if  
14 necessary for conservation or the continuation of  
15 subsistence uses, public safety, et cetera. And so it  
16 seems like the Council is thinking about bag limit  
17 reductions in the same terms as extending the season  
18 for Federally-qualified subsistence users as a  
19 meaningful preference. And while, you know, the Board  
20 would certainly want -- I mean I would think the Board  
21 and everyone would want to adopt the least restrictive  
22 thing that would address the issue and so I mean, yeah,  
23 bag limit reduction is much less restrictive than a  
24 full closure so if that would address the need for  
25 conservation or continuation of subsistence uses, then  
26 that would be a better option than a closure.

27  
28 But I just felt the need, you know, to  
29 let the Council know that, while closures and bag limit  
30 restrictions -- or bag limit reductions, they're both  
31 considered restrictions and that that falls more under  
32 the .815(3) of ANILCA and so you really have to think  
33 about if it's necessary and that term, necessary, has  
34 been, you know, drilled into me by legal counsel, that  
35 you really have to think in terms of what's necessary  
36 in terms of conservation and continuation of  
37 subsistence uses.

38  
39 So, thank you, and, again, I apologize,  
40 I'm just -- want to -- bringing this to your attention  
41 now but I just had to confirm my understanding and  
42 interpretation of that was correct, so, thank you.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Ms.  
45 Phillips you have a question.

46  
47 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes. Thank you, Madame  
48 Chair. So can we go from a closure to a reduced bag  
49 limit on this proposal?

50

0215

1 MS. GREDIAGIN: I would say -- I mean  
2 typically the Council is able to recommend whatever  
3 they would like. I mean OSM is usually more  
4 constrained in its recommendations within the scope of  
5 the proposal but I would think, yes, that that would be  
6 a viable option here. I mean like I said they're both  
7 considered restrictions. I mean when you think of  
8 terms, meaningful preference, that's usually more the  
9 Federally-qualified users have a longer season or a  
10 higher bag limit, or not as many antler restrictions,  
11 things like that, you're not restricting non-Federally-  
12 qualified users under what they could normally do under  
13 State regulations. So I would think if that's  
14 something the Council is interested in here for 22-07,  
15 that -- I mean you could certainly make that  
16 modification.

17  
18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Casipit, do  
19 you have a question for Ms. Grediagin?

20  
21 MR. CASIPIT: (Nods affirmatively)

22  
23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.

24  
25 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, I do. I'm going to  
26 try -- I apologize in advance if I say something wrong  
27 or I'm or -- I'm not trying to insult anybody or attack  
28 anybody. But the -- I -- if we wanted to -- to me --  
29 okay, the bag limit, let's talk about the bag limit  
30 thing, okay. And this is where I'm sitting. There was  
31 a difference in bag limit under Fed and State, there  
32 was four under State and six -- that was part of the  
33 meaningful preference, the State changed to six,  
34 changing what we -- basically taking away a part of  
35 that meaningful preference. So you're saying that we,  
36 as the Federal Program, can't reduce that bag limit  
37 back again to maintain our meaningful priority? Is  
38 that -- can the State, through an action purely on  
39 their own reduce our meaningful priority and then we  
40 have no way to correct that other than the State  
41 system; is that what you're saying?

42  
43 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, thanks for that  
44 question. And technically in that example that you  
45 just gave -- I mean a meaningful preference would be,  
46 then, under the Federal system, the harvest limit is  
47 then reduced to eight -- or increased to eight deer,  
48 you know, which is -- I'm just -- this is as far as how  
49 it works whereas if you're restricting what non-  
50

0216

1 Federally-qualified users can do under State  
2 regulations, it's just authorized a different way. I  
3 mean you just have to think of that not so much in  
4 terms of -- not only in terms of providing that  
5 meaningful preference, but that you're authorizing a  
6 restriction on non-Federally-qualified users.

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: Followup.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Casipit.

11

12 MR. CASIPIT: I understand that. But  
13 to me it just doesn't make sense because then we get  
14 into a tit-for-tat thing, okay, we raise it to eight,  
15 the Board of Game says, oh, we'll raise it to eight,  
16 too. I mean I don't see an end to that. I'm sorry,  
17 maybe I'm getting off course.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Ms.  
20 Grediagin.

21

22 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, I just wanted to  
23 point that out and just make you all aware of this  
24 because when it comes before the Board, this is how the  
25 Board's going to have to consider your recommendations,  
26 is not just what's providing a meaningful priority but  
27 is this restriction necessary for conservation or  
28 continuation of subsistence uses. So I guess I'm  
29 mostly compelled to let you all know that if you make  
30 this recommendation, kind of just based on meaningful  
31 priority, just acknowledging how the Board will have to  
32 consider this.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
35 you for that clarification from legal counsel. Are  
36 there -- we have a motion on the floor so Mr. -- did  
37 you have a question, Mr. Kitka, for Ms. Grediagin, or  
38 do you have a justification for the motion.

39

40 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
41 just had a question. Being that Admiralty Island is a  
42 National Monument for the most part, is the State rule  
43 higher than the Federal on this on the hunting, are the  
44 State regulating hunting for non-qualified users, as  
45 well as qualified users? Is the regulation more for  
46 the State or is it more for the Federal?

47

48 MS. GREDIAGIN: I'm not quite sure I  
49 fully understand your question. I mean on Federal

50

0217

1 public lands, Federal regulations always can quote,  
2 trump State regulations. I mean if there's a closure  
3 restriction to non-Federally-qualified users on Federal  
4 lands, I mean that takes priority precedent over State  
5 regulations. So I'm not sure if that fully answers  
6 your question or not.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka,  
9 followup.

10

11 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
12 That answers some of my question. But it is -- if I  
13 understood the people from Angoon when they -- when the  
14 President made this a National Monument there was some  
15 written things that went to the agreement to the people  
16 of Angoon, which gave them the right to kind of almost  
17 manage what happened on their land. So I was just  
18 curious as to whether we, as a Council, would have any  
19 say in this as advisors to the Federal Subsistence  
20 Board.

21

22 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you, Member  
23 Kitka. To my knowledge, I'm not aware of any  
24 difference that being a National Monument would make in  
25 terms of the Federal Subsistence Management Program but  
26 I would invite, if there's anyone else in the room that  
27 could speak more definitively to that, please do so.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I'm  
30 not seeing anyone else in the room volunteering to  
31 answering that. So thank you, again, Ms. Grediagin.  
32 Other Council members, we have a motion.....

33

34 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
35 Albert.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....on the  
38 floor to support Wildlife Proposal 22-07. We have  
39 heard some justification for opposing the proposal. We  
40 have heard some support -- justification for supporting  
41 the proposal. Are there any other Council members that  
42 would like to speak to the motion on the floor.

43

44 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
45 Albert.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.

48

49 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

50

0218

1 Just to shed a little light on what Mr. Kitka's  
2 referring to is Proclamation 4611 signed into law by  
3 President Carter. In the language it states the  
4 National Monument is created for the health and well  
5 being of the indigenous people of the island, that  
6 public law, I have to go back and look through, but it  
7 was signed into law and it hasn't been changed since.  
8 It was in 1978. So in that amendment to that in 1990,  
9 the corporation, which I'm a board of director of, and  
10 the city of Angoon, are co-managers of the island in  
11 the 1990 Act which amended that proclamation. So that  
12 takes us to another variable in that. And at the  
13 corporation level, with attorney's help, we're looking  
14 at what that means to Angoon, that we are supposed to  
15 be co-managers, not just the Forest Service saying this  
16 is how it's going to be done and that's all. According  
17 to that the city should have a say as well the  
18 corporation. Now, I also -- my (indiscernible - cuts  
19 out), Madame Chair, was the speech by William Paul to  
20 AFN when they were talking about doing all of this and  
21 I didn't have the opportunity to ask the Territorial  
22 Sportsmen why they opposed this, what's in it for them,  
23 because as you recall Madame Chair, I adjusted the  
24 boundaries to try to address Gustavus' concerns on the  
25 fact that there'll be more hunters moving over in that  
26 area if we do what we're doing, so it was adjusted  
27 then, and if you look at the map, all of the east side  
28 of Admiralty Island is open for Juneau hunters and  
29 that's where Juneau is, it's on the east side of  
30 Admiralty. So I'm wondering what's so important to  
31 them that they feel like they need to -- and there was  
32 no justification from them other than to say, well,  
33 based on Fish and Game reports we had no reason to  
34 close it down other than what I had reported to the  
35 Board. Now, I just don't wake up one morning and  
36 decide I'm going to make something up. A lot of this  
37 is based on what I see when I'm out and around.

38  
39 I did say I didn't have a boat last  
40 winter, that doesn't mean I wasn't out with my cousin  
41 or something like that. I mean him and I are getting  
42 old enough now that people looked at us, and were like,  
43 oh, how cool, look those two old guys are out hunting  
44 and that's fine. So there is the question and we may  
45 need a legal opinion on this but eventually I think  
46 what's going to happen is if we can't come to a  
47 conclusion here and give meaningful preference to  
48 Angoon to get what we need to put on the table -- I  
49 appreciate Mrs. Phillips -- everything she has to say,  
50

0219

1 she does her research and her homework, you know, all  
2 the data shows, and when I made the original adjustment  
3 to the map was there weren't any hunters from Juneau  
4 hunting within that -- the area, so I removed the parts  
5 where there were hunters. That was me being a good  
6 neighbor. Now, we heard from Tenakee opposing this,  
7 and I'm willing to make an amendment to this if I can  
8 get full support from the Board and I would remove  
9 4404, 4454 and 4043 from the map and stay with 4042  
10 with a bag limit of two bucks only for non-Federally-  
11 qualified hunters. But even if this Council decides  
12 not to support this we know we have other options to  
13 take this back to the Federal level and ask that they  
14 do, in fact, honor what is in the books on the National  
15 Monument that states the Monument was created for the  
16 health and well-being for the indigenous people of the  
17 island and we can ask them to take a look at this and  
18 then -- so we already have the corporation's attorney  
19 looking at what that means to Angoon, and what our  
20 options are.

21

22 But I would rather make an amendment to  
23 this than see it voted down completely. And attorney's  
24 opinions -- I have been on this Earth long enough to  
25 realize that attorneys aren't always -- it's based on  
26 what they're reading and it's not necessarily without  
27 all the -- all the facts there, and I'm starting to  
28 think that the Proclamation 4611 may benefit Angoon  
29 more so than the direction we're taking now. But for  
30 now, Madame Chair, I'd like to make the motion to  
31 remove 4044, 4054, 4043 with the remaining having a bag  
32 limit of two bucks only for the non-Federally-qualified  
33 hunters. That would be my motion, Madame Chair.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Before I ask for  
36 a second, Mr. Howard, can you repeat your motion so  
37 that I can make sure that I got each of those -- I'm  
38 sorry, I'm assuming your making a motion to amend, not  
39 -- you're not making a new motion, you're making a  
40 motion to amend; is that correct?

41

42 MR. HOWARD: Yes, I am, Madame Chair,  
43 and making a motion to demonstrated to the Federal  
44 Subsistence Board that I, Albert Howard, am actually  
45 trying to find a solution to the problem.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Right. But we  
48 have a motion on the floor to support the proposal.....

49

50

0220

1 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair.....

2

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....that is  
5 before us for WP22-07, so if you're not making a motion  
6 to amend that proposal then we need to finish our  
7 deliberation on the motion on the floor and then  
8 address any new considerations that you're making. So  
9 I just need to clarify from you, are you making a  
10 motion to amend the proposal at this time?

10

11 MR. HOWARD: Yes, Madame Chair.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Can  
14 you restate your motion to amend, please.

15

16 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
17 I'd like to make an amendment to the original proposal  
18 under this motion so it's also an amendment to this  
19 motion. The amendment would remove areas 44 -- Or  
20 4044, 4054, 4043, leaving areas 4042, 4055, 4051 as a  
21 part of the original -- I lost my train of thought,  
22 Madame Chair.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.

25

26 MR. HOWARD: As a part of the original  
27 proposal.....

28

29 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair. Albert.....

30

31 MR. HOWARD: .....with consideration of  
32 also instead of a full closure, Madame Chair, two bucks  
33 only from those three areas. Thank you, Madame Chair.

34

35 MR. SLATER: Through the Chair, to  
36 Albert, this is Jim. Albert, I think you said the last  
37 region was 4051 but I think you meant to say 4041?

38

39 MR. HOWARD: Through the Chair,  
40 correct. Thank you.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So Mr. Howard  
43 had a motion to amend. Is there a second.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, we're not  
48 hearing a second to the amendment so the main  
49 motion.....

50

0221

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll second -- I made  
2 the main motion so I.....

3  
4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

5  
6 MS. PHILLIPS: I'll second the motion.

7  
8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Ms.  
9 Phillips has seconded the amendment. So now we can  
10 discuss the amendment to the main motion. The  
11 amendment is to remove a number of Wildlife Analysis  
12 Areas that hopefully you guys were able to keep track  
13 of and then reduce the -- do you need me to state the  
14 amendment to you guys.

15  
16 (Council nods affirmatively)

17  
18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. The  
19 amendment is to remove Wildlife Analysis Area 4044.....

20  
21 MR. HERNANDEZ: 4054.

22  
23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: 4054.

24  
25 MR. HERNANDEZ: 4043.

26  
27 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: 4043.

28  
29 MR. HERNANDEZ: And then in the  
30 remaining Wildlife Analysis Areas of 4042 and 4055,  
31 4041.

32  
33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: And then to  
34 reduce the bag limit to two bucks in 40.....

35  
36 MR. HERNANDEZ: 42.

37  
38 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: 42.....

39  
40 MR. HERNANDEZ: 55.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....4055.....

43  
44 MR. HERNANDEZ: 41.

45  
46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....and 4041.  
47 Any discussion on the amendment. Ms. Phillips.

48  
49 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I wish to  
50



1 clarify that the SERAC had already modified it to  
2 remove 4044 and 4043 so that left 4054, 4042, 4055 and  
3 4041, and the motion -- the amendment from Mr. Howard  
4 removes 4054 and also changes it from a closure to a  
5 reduced bag limit. And I would like to say that non-  
6 Federally-qualified users could have presented sort of  
7 options to this effect in our open meetings that we've  
8 had. So Mr. Howard, I mean you could have left the  
9 WAAs as is and just said I'd like to remove the closure  
10 and change it to a reduced bag limit, two deer, bucks  
11 only for those four WAAs. I just wanted to bring that  
12 to your clarification. But if you're okay with  
13 reducing it down to those three then I support you.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, did  
18 you have a response to that.

19

20 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
21 Part of it is the testimony from the gentleman from  
22 Tenakee. He's also our neighbor and my dad owns land  
23 there and my dad has spent a lot of his younger life  
24 there so there is ties to Tenakee as well. So I think  
25 by making this footprint a little bit smaller, and the  
26 reason why I'm thinking about the bag limit -- I mean I  
27 would have loved to have meaningful dialogue with  
28 Territorial Sportsmen and why they want -- they didn't  
29 want it at all. Just to be a friendly neighbor and try  
30 to understand and not just say no because it's in the  
31 meeting minutes -- and I'm old enough now, Madame  
32 Chair, I can hear the tone of voice from people and in  
33 their presentations on everything on why they feel like  
34 things should be the way it is and what I took away  
35 from the meeting was a gentleman said, well, we'll just  
36 hunt the beaches then. And to me that says, well -- to  
37 me that kind of bothered me to hear it in the tone of  
38 voice that was presented with no meaningful dialogue  
39 behind that to justify why they oppose it other than  
40 they just oppose it based on the State's data, which I  
41 believe is inconsistent. When I looked at the  
42 information that I received today, the only place they  
43 did any -- or where they gathered their data was in  
44 Mitchell Bay, so that's not consistent of the whole  
45 island as a whole. Mitchell Bay is a small part of  
46 Admiralty Island. So I understand not being able to do  
47 surveys out in the open of Chatham Strait and trying to  
48 get into certain places so Mitchell Bay at some point  
49 seemed to be the place to be doing the surveys, so why  
50

1 do Angoon residents take more deer than non-Federally-  
2 qualified deer hunters. So here's some examples of why  
3 we rely on deer more than other areas. Our ferry  
4 service. When we don't have a ferry the store shelves  
5 are empty. So we have to get our food somewhere and  
6 the resource outside, our front door, helps us through  
7 the winter. The cost of living is pretty high here as  
8 it is in Hoonah, and, Madame Chair, just so -- Hoonah  
9 -- I spent the summer there and I'd go to the store and  
10 I figured out I better go to the store when the ferry  
11 comes in because the shelves there are empty as well  
12 after the ferry comes in and leaves, everyone runs to  
13 the store and then the shelves are empty again until  
14 the next ferry. Not completely empty but everything you  
15 want is no longer there. So you're comparing apples  
16 and oranges when you compare the Territorial Sportsmen  
17 to Angoon because we don't have a Costco to go to if we  
18 aren't successful. We have our freezer to go to but if  
19 -- and then you have -- as an example, I'll put 20  
20 gallons away and watch what the weather's doing and  
21 pick and choose my days as do a lot of people here, so  
22 I think -- I'm trying to meet everybody half way and be  
23 reasonable without giving up too much because if I  
24 start giving up too much then the community suffers.

25

26 So thanks, Madame Chair.

27

28 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
29 Howard. Mr. Hernandez, you have a position and  
30 justification for the amendment.

31

32 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. So I made the  
33 original motion to support and then I gave my reasons  
34 why I was going to vote against that. I want to make  
35 it very clear that I fully support Angoon in their  
36 efforts to protect their way of life out there and I  
37 could support even a full closure for those areas  
38 immediately surrounding Angoon. My concern is that,  
39 you know, this, for lack of a better word, this  
40 threshold, we need to achieve on justifying that it is,  
41 as Ms. Grediagin, that it is necessary for the  
42 continuation of subsistence uses, I guess my concern  
43 was that we didn't have a strong enough justification  
44 for that, you know, given all the testimony that we've  
45 heard on this.

46

47 So I mean I firmly believe that the  
48 whole way of life in villages like Angoon and other  
49 villages is in peril. I think we do need to take some

50

1 actions to protect that way of life, and it's a multi-  
2 faceted problems. It involves changing demographics  
3 and changing economies and changing situations in food  
4 security, all these issues we've talked about with  
5 obtaining food to eat in the villages and how expensive  
6 it is, you know, all those need to be addressed. And  
7 I'm really looking forward to hearing our Regional  
8 Forester's presentation on, you know, this  
9 Sustainability Strategy because that speaks to the  
10 whole economic viability of our rural communities and  
11 it's all tied together with our subsistence gathering.  
12 So there really needs to be a lot of investigation in  
13 all of these factors. And, you know, I guess, the  
14 State makes a strong argument in defending their  
15 amounts necessary for subsistence and I think we need  
16 to counter that and we need to do it in a strong way  
17 and I guess my biggest problem with that is their  
18 rationales are based on past practices. They look at,  
19 you know, trends, and past harvest histories and all  
20 that stuff, well, you know, the times they are a  
21 changing and, you know, looking into the future we have  
22 to address this.

23  
24 So, you know, I'm very glad to hear  
25 that, you know, Mr. Howard has offered up a compromise  
26 essentially in this proposal and I think that may -- I  
27 could support that because I think that will get us  
28 through this cycle of proposals but I'm also really  
29 looking forward to seeing the efforts from the Hoonah  
30 Indian Association find and moving forward and I think  
31 it could generate a whole new round of proposals in the  
32 coming years, possibly the next cycle. It might take  
33 longer than that to address some of these issues.

34  
35 You know, that's where I'm coming from,  
36 you know, I want to make sure that Albert Howard and  
37 the people of Angoon, you know, understand where I'm  
38 coming from on this. So like I say, once, again,  
39 Albert, I appreciate you offering up a compromise and I  
40 would support that, I think it can certainly move us  
41 forward but I don't want that to be the end of the  
42 discussion by any means, so, thank you.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
45 Hernandez. I'm reminding the Council that we're  
46 speaking to the amendment on the table so Mr. Casipit  
47 and then Mr. Smith had comments regarding that.

48  
49 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, Madame Chair, I,  
50

0225

1 too, will be supporting this amendment. I do think the  
2 removal of those Wildlife Analysis Areas and reducing  
3 the bag limit instead of a full outright closure in  
4 that wider area is a good compromise and I'll be  
5 supporting that. And for the same justifications as  
6 the other ones, I understand Staff's interpretation  
7 about restrictions, but I do think an outright closure  
8 is a lot less impact on non-Federally-qualified users  
9 than just a bag limit reduction.

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr.  
12 Smith.

13

14 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I echo that.  
15 Gunalcheesh. I found the Proclamation and I sent it to  
16 you on the email, of 1978 from Mr. Carter, if you  
17 wanted to see that. I also sent it on a text so you  
18 guys probably might have some of that.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. We  
21 have an amendment on the floor to modify the proposal  
22 to -- the original proposal was already modified so I  
23 won't read those into this but the new amendment is to  
24 reduce -- to remove Wildlife Analysis Area 4043 and  
25 then reduce the bag limit in 4054, 4042, 4055 and 4041  
26 -- I'm sorry, I got that wrong -- I'm going to start  
27 over.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The amendment is  
32 to remove Wildlife Analysis 4054 and reduce the bag  
33 limit to two bucks in 4042, 4055, and 4041. Are we  
34 ready to vote on this amendment or is there further  
35 discussion needed.

36

37 MR. CASIPIT: Question.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Question's been  
40 called. All in favor say aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed  
45 signify by saying nay.

46

47 MR. SLATER: Aye.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

50

0226

1 Slater. Any opposed signify by saying nay.

2

3

(No negative votes)

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

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the motion to amend the proposal passes unanimously. Now, we're back to the main motion to support the proposal as amended. Is there discussion regarding the main motion. Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I will support the proposal, like I did the other two before. But I do not believe that it solves the problems. It also -- it does put a restriction on a user group and Title VIII of ANILCA protects all users and there's no conservation concern but there are other issues that concern real estate. I don't think that what we're doing solves all those issues. What I would like to see down the road, in fact, I think I'm just punting back to the Federal Board, but we need to have better reporting. We need to get these user groups -- affecting user groups, or those that feel negatively affected and both groups, non-rural and rural users into the same room like we did the Unit 2 deer planning and try to resolve some of these issues and come back and fix it, better than we're doing. I don't think we're solving all the problems but we're -- with what we're doing here we are trying somewhat but it isn't addressing everything.

My concern is there's no conservation concern, there's plenty of deer but it's a real estate issue for sure.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Douville. Other discussion, justification for the main motion. Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, in regards to the conserva -- oh, thank you, Madame Chair. In regards to the conservation concern, I think if we look across the whole unit that's probably the case but I just really think that access to the resource and these localized resource concerns is really what's at stake. And part of the conflating issue in all this is because Unit 4 is so enormous. So I also agree it's not solving all the problems, but we're also thinking about these at

0227

1 the local scale instead of three of the largest islands  
2 in Southeast Alaska scale. Yeah, it really is a  
3 conflating thing, so as we go forward, how to better  
4 divide and subdivide and conquer -- or not conquer,  
5 sorry, whatever it is, of Unit 4 and break that down  
6 into more understandable units and the local effect of  
7 micro-climate and everything else, and that's of  
8 interest to me. But I will support this as it's  
9 stated.

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
12 Johnson.

13

14 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair.

15

16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater.

17

18 MR. SLATER: Yes, I wanted to follow  
19 along the lines that Mr. Douville and Mr. Johnson  
20 stated. In looking at this over the last year, it  
21 seems as though instead of trying to look at a broad  
22 region where there's conflicts, what if we try to  
23 identify the area more closely and my guess is that if  
24 you -- the situation is, is that, the rural communities  
25 are being used basically a staging area or a base camp  
26 area because of the access, their float plane facility,  
27 their harbors and the ferry terminals and lodging as  
28 well, and then most of the conflict is going to come  
29 within the immediate are of these small rural  
30 communities and start to roll off immensely as you get  
31 out of skiff range. So if we really did look at this,  
32 and I'm talking about the areas without roads, so this  
33 really wouldn't apply to Hoonah because of the road  
34 system there, but for places like Pelican or Angoon,  
35 the actual conflict area is maybe easier to define.  
36 And I don't know for sure about Angoon, but I do know  
37 in Pelican, that in the inlet there as you -- it's  
38 confined and as you get away from Pelican I think the  
39 conflict areas go down quite quickly once you get to  
40 the 45 minute or hour skiff ride out of Pelican,  
41 there's less and less hunting pressure and less and  
42 less conflict. So as we move forward and look at  
43 things in the next generation, that may be something we  
44 look at. But as it stands now with these current  
45 proposals as they sit, you know, I supported WP08 and  
46 WP10, and I plan on supporting WP07.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50

0228

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
2 Slater. Mr. Kitka.

3  
4                   MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
5 I'm going to support this amendment. Basically when a  
6 community says their needs aren't being met that means  
7 an awful lot to me. If their needs are not being met  
8 then that is more than a conservation concern, it's a  
9 conservation of our way of life.

10  
11                   Thank you.

12  
13                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Kitka. Other comments from Council members.

15  
16                   Ms. Phillips.

17  
18                   MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
19 This modified proposal would have very little effect on  
20 non-Federally-qualified hunting effort, or harvest by  
21 non-Federally-qualified users because 83 percent of  
22 non-Federally-qualified users take two or fewer deer,  
23 nine percent of non-Federally-qualified users take  
24 three deer, five percent of non-Federally-qualified  
25 users take four deer, 1.5 percent non-Federally-  
26 qualified users take five deer, and 1.5 percent non-  
27 Federally-qualified take six deer. Whereas, Federally-  
28 qualified users take more than one deer per day of  
29 hunting and 13 percent of Federally-qualified users  
30 take more than four deer. And the buck restriction  
31 provides a meaningful preference for Federally-  
32 qualified users. And this is at a time of year when  
33 the deer are in rut, the buck deer are in rut and  
34 everybody wants to hunt when they're in rut. The  
35 January hunt is basically a hamburger month. I mean  
36 the deer get skinnier and skinnier, who wants a skinny  
37 deer. I mean we will get a skinny deer because we want  
38 to make hamburger but, I mean in January you're not  
39 getting a fat deer. I mean it is a meaningful  
40 preference but it's a limit -- you're not getting --  
41 you know, why you hunt in October is to get a nice fat  
42 -- a thick fat layer of deer -- a nice thick layer of  
43 fat on those deer.

44  
45                   So anyways that's my comment, thank  
46 you, Madame Chair.

47  
48                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
49 Phillips. Mr. Casipit.

50

0229

1 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, I just wanted to  
2 add one thing to that as far as meaningful priority.  
3 In terms of meaningful priority for me for Unit 4  
4 remainder, it's more than just one thing. It was -- to  
5 me it's a whole suite of things: It's January hunting;  
6 it was the four versus six; it was the provisions for  
7 designated hunting. And in my mind it's all wrapped  
8 together. And I just -- I just want to point out that,  
9 you know, in this one I think we've made really good  
10 progress by still allowing some hunting by non-  
11 Federally-qualified users, we reduced the area where  
12 it's -- we reduced the area where this reduced bag  
13 limit is going to occur so I think we've tried to limit  
14 unnecessary restrictions on non-Federally-qualified  
15 users. I think we've tried to provide that meaningful  
16 priority by changing the limit to bucks only for non-  
17 Federally-qualified users and I think this is -- like  
18 other people said, this is only the beginning, there's  
19 a lot more work that we need to do and we need to look  
20 at, you know, like Ian was saying, looking at the  
21 entire unit and how that works for the communities.

22  
23 So, anyway, I will be supporting this  
24 motion. Thank you.

25  
26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
27 you. Mr. Johnson, are you raising your hand half-way.

28  
29 MR. JOHNSON: Call for the question.

30  
31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Before the  
32 question I was going to offer my comments for the  
33 proposal. I am going to take an opposition on this.

34  
35 I want to first state my justification  
36 -- or I want to first acknowledge the fact that I do  
37 recognize that there is a problem in Angoon and around  
38 Angoon. I'm not entirely sure that I completely  
39 understand that. I think there are opportunities for  
40 us to collect additional data before the next  
41 regulatory cycle in order to better understand the  
42 concern. I think that our discussion and deliberations  
43 that we have had through the regulatory process  
44 regarding this proposal has convinced me that,  
45 definitely there is a concern, and I don't want the  
46 folks in Angoon to think that I'm opposing trying to  
47 address that concern for them. So I do recognize that  
48 there is a problem.

49  
50



0230

1                   However, I want to oppose this --  
2 continue to oppose this proposal as we have now amended  
3 it, as it was amended before. We've had numerous  
4 discussions when we first deliberated this proposal for  
5 these things. At that time we could have changed it  
6 for a bag limit reduction and I remember even  
7 suggesting that and it wasn't something that we did at  
8 that time, and I feel like if we had did at that time  
9 then if we had gotten to the point where they were  
10 coming back to us again we would have analysis to help  
11 us understand better whether or not a bag limit  
12 reduction actually addresses the issue, and we haven't  
13 had that liberty because we're just coming -- this is  
14 coming back to us and we've just now at the table made  
15 that bag limit reduction, so we don't really have -- I  
16 don't understand how that is necessarily going to help  
17 just based on the brief conversation that we've had and  
18 so I feel like that's an important enough, or big  
19 enough change to the proposal that we do need  
20 additional information to move forward with that.

21  
22                   I agree with Mr. Douville, that we --  
23 that this proposal, you know, doesn't necessarily  
24 address the concern and that we do have time with some  
25 of the Board of Game proposals that are coming before  
26 the Board of Game to start addressing Angoon's concern  
27 as well as additional data collection that is happening  
28 before our next meeting. Our next meeting, I believe,  
29 we will be crafting proposals for the next regulatory  
30 cycle and I feel like that would be a really good  
31 opportunity for us to have better understood what the  
32 concern is based on new data that's being collected and  
33 interaction with the community and the people from  
34 Angoon so we can craft the right, potential fixes. I  
35 personally don't think that we should be just pushing  
36 this forward, this particular proposal forward, back to  
37 the Federal Subsistence Board and -- but also like  
38 having our justification saying, it's something, but we  
39 don't think that it's even addressing the concern at  
40 this time.

41  
42                   And so those would be my reasons for  
43 opposing the proposal again. But that's one vote and  
44 I'm happy to take it to a vote at this point, I don't  
45 think it necessarily results in further discussion  
46 unless Council members disagree with that and want to  
47 add to it.

48  
49                   Mr. Hernandez.  
50

0231

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
2 Chair. That does leave one question in my mind, kind  
3 of a procedural question. You made a good point there.  
4 So if the Council were to not support this motion, what  
5 does that mean to the Board in regards to the original  
6 proposal, is that still on the table or would that go  
7 away? I mean we haven't -- you know, this is kind of  
8 like a new proposal now, I don't know if that one is  
9 still -- you know, the original proposal was still on  
10 the agenda of the Board to take up again at their next  
11 meeting. I'm a little unclear on that.

12  
13 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair. For the  
14 record this is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. You  
15 are correct, Member Hernandez, the original motion --  
16 the original proposal is still pending before the  
17 Federal Subsistence Board. The action that the Council  
18 takes during this meeting will just be a  
19 recommendation, but that does not negate anything that  
20 goes before the Board at its next meeting in January.  
21 Does that answer your question?

22  
23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

24  
25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. So  
26 the motion on the floor is to support Wildlife Proposal  
27 22-07 now as amended. If this motion passes then.....

28  
29 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
30 Albert.

31  
32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....this goes  
33 to the Federal Subsistence Board and then they'll close  
34 out or they'll deliberate or address this proposal as  
35 it is now, correct?

36  
37 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair. We  
38 could forward this as an additional recommendation or  
39 in place of recommendation to the Federal Subsistence  
40 Board.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: And then if the  
43 motion.....

44  
45 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
46 Albert.

47  
48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: .....does not  
49 pass -- one moment, Mr. Howard -- if the motion does  
50

0232

1 not pass, if everybody opposes the motion then the  
2 justification for opposition goes to the Federal  
3 Subsistence Board for their consideration of the  
4 original proposal?

5

6 MS. PERRY: For the record, again, this  
7 is DeAnna Perry. The original recommendation is still  
8 of record and will be considered by the Board, but this  
9 Council, if the motion fails, could offer an additional  
10 comment if it wanted to make further points. We've  
11 done that in the past.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you,  
14 DeAnna, for that clarification for what we're doing.  
15 Mr. Howard, you have a comment regarding the main  
16 motion.

17

18 MR. HOWARD: Well, Madame Chair, just  
19 on some of the topics you covered as to the reason of  
20 your opposition to this. An example, we've gone  
21 through the Board of Fish and Game process on many  
22 different occasions to address local needs and none of  
23 those were ever considered. I testified in front of  
24 the Board of Fish in Sitka and then we put six  
25 proposals in and only one was accepted and that was to  
26 shut down all of Chatham Strait. So it was almost like  
27 well, let's do this one because we know it's not going  
28 to pass. My point being is I'm bringing it to this  
29 Board because I know traditional ecological knowledge  
30 is a big part of what we do and we respect each other  
31 enough to realize that when a Council member speaks on  
32 what's happening in their respected areas, it has a --  
33 it's a little more valid than someone who's never put  
34 boots on the ground, so to speak.

35

36 I made an amendment to the original --  
37 to demonstrate to the Federal Subsistence Board that  
38 we, in fact -- I, as Albert Howard, is trying to find a  
39 solution to this without giving up a whole lot of what  
40 I'm trying to accomplish for the community, whereas  
41 other people that opposed it, 57-1, none of them gave a  
42 reason than the only thing they had was based on what  
43 the Fish and Game had told them and none of it was  
44 based on what this Council had originally considered;  
45 the 80 percent unemployment, the ferry service, the  
46 fact that we rely on the resource more than anybody and  
47 that's even in the Fish and Game's report.

48

49 And I agree that at some point we

50

0233

1 should all come to the table, that was mentioned  
2 earlier in this meeting, that we all should come to the  
3 table and figure out how to solve some of these  
4 problems. I think co-management should consist of all  
5 user groups -- affected user groups working together to  
6 create and maintain a sustainable resource for future  
7 generations to experience at a minimum of what we  
8 experience today but it would be nice to have the  
9 future generations experience what I have had  
10 experienced in my lifetime, which means we've never had  
11 to have this conversation or ask anybody to not hunt.  
12 I mean the gentleman referred to going somewhere in a  
13 seine boat a long time ago and there was nobody there,  
14 and that's how I grew up, there was never anybody here  
15 with vessels that had 600 horsepower.

16  
17 Now, Madame Chair, keep in mind, you're  
18 wondering how this gives meaningful preference, now  
19 anyone that does the math, are two bucks in areas 4042,  
20 4055 and 4041 were to live in Juneau for burning all  
21 that gas to go get two bucks out of those area, which  
22 means they probably won't so that leaves those areas  
23 for just the Federally-qualified subsistence hunters.  
24 I mean I know if I lived in Juneau I wouldn't burn all  
25 that gas or diesel just to come down here and get two  
26 bucks out of there. The other thing it does, Madame  
27 Chair, is in rough weather, when I'm out hunting in my  
28 15-foot Lund, I have somewhere to hide that I know  
29 there isn't going to be anybody there because this  
30 Council decided to set that aside for me, as a  
31 Federally-qualified subsistence hunter, to go hunt,  
32 during these times. So that gives me meaningful  
33 preference and the ability to decide I'm going there  
34 because I know they're not supposed to be there and if  
35 they're there, they only take two bucks, not a whole  
36 herd.

37  
38 I hope that helps get us to where we  
39 need to be, Madame Chair. I'm trying to demonstrate  
40 what I believe the Federal Subsistence Board wants us  
41 to find a solution, and offer that up. So I'm offering  
42 it up from my standpoint and I haven't heard one  
43 offered up from anywhere else.

44  
45 Thank you, Madame Chair.

46  
47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
48 Howard. Mr. Douville.

49  
50

0234

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
2 I am still struggling with these proposals. Because it  
3 shows that only two deer are taken by Juneau hunters,  
4 or non-rural hunters. Reducing the bag limit doesn't  
5 change anything. It doesn't change the season.  
6 They're both going to be hunting in the same place at  
7 the same time, although with a reduced bag limit that  
8 really doesn't -- is meaningless, so it really doesn't  
9 change anything in any of them. Because you're  
10 reducing the bag limit to what they're already taking  
11 anyway on paper, and the season doesn't change so I'm  
12 not -- I've changed my mind and I will not support the  
13 proposal for those reasons.

14  
15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
16 Douville. I do want to provide one clarification  
17 regarding my justification. I do acknowledge there is  
18 a problem in Angoon and I do appreciate Member Howard  
19 is trying to provide amendments to get the right  
20 regulation, or the right regulatory language, he's  
21 showing that he wants to compromise in order to address  
22 this and I acknowledge that. I, personally, feel like  
23 we would be better if we started with a clean slate at  
24 our next regulatory cycle because amending and amending  
25 just to basically try to come to a solution to try to  
26 get this proposal to pass, I don't feel like it's  
27 substantiated with any of the new information that we  
28 have received. And so I just wanted to make that  
29 clarification.

30  
31 But I do, and I also wanted to state  
32 that I appreciate that we're trying to find the right  
33 compromise, I just don't think we have all of the right  
34 information right now to be able to do that, and I  
35 think the next regulatory cycle we will be better  
36 served by putting proposals through that can go through  
37 the analysis of what those effects of those proposals  
38 will be to address the concern.

39  
40 Are we getting close to being ready to  
41 vote.

42  
43 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, if I may.

44  
45 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, I  
46 think that the question has been called once, we're  
47 still deliberating, so if you have, you know, want to  
48 state your position for supporting or opposing the  
49 proposal and the justification to do so, that's good  
50

0235

1 information for us to have, but if it's a continued  
2 debate, I think that, you know, we're getting to the  
3 point where we need to make a decision and kind of get  
4 to the rest of our agenda. So if you are going to do  
5 that, please do so, otherwise I think we'd like to go  
6 to a vote soon.

7

8 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
9 I realize the question has been called but you've also  
10 had two comments after the question was called, just  
11 for clarification. Also I'd like to invite you to  
12 Angoon so you could look at the shelves at our store  
13 and maybe that will help people understand more where  
14 I'm coming from, trying to find a solution to a problem  
15 based on data the State's given you, and I know you're  
16 data driven, doesn't give you the data that I see here  
17 everyday and I think somehow we need to incorporate  
18 that going forward. And that's kind of the important  
19 thing that's missing here, I could sit and talk about  
20 this all day long but if you look at the map, all the  
21 places that are on that map currently are the places a  
22 small 16 foot boat can get in and out of the weather  
23 from. And if there's already a boat in there, that  
24 affects our ability to hunt in there. I heard a  
25 gentleman say, well, if there's somebody there, I just  
26 move on, we don't have that option, to be honest,  
27 Madame Chair. We can't just move on because we may  
28 only have 10 gallons of gas to go where we went and  
29 most of the times it's in hopes there isn't anybody  
30 there already.

31

32 So I guess I'm trying to be reasonable  
33 even though I know a lot of this is State data driven  
34 and a lot of that data is flawed when you're only  
35 looking at Mitchell Bay as the data.

36

37 So, thank you, Madame Chair.

38

39 Also I'd like to call for a roll call  
40 vote.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
43 Howard. We're prepared to do a roll call vote. We are  
44 voting on the motion to support Wildlife Proposal 22-07  
45 as amended here in this meeting.

46

47 Mr. Wright, roll call vote.

48

49 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair.

50

0236

1 Ian Johnson.

2

3

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

4

5

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

6

7

MR. CASIPIT: No.

8

9

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

10

11

MR. DOUVILLE: No.

12

13

MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.

14

15

MR. SLATER: Jim Slater votes yes.

16

17

MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.

18

19

MR. HOWARD: Yes.

20

21

MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

22

23

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.

26

27

MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

28

29

MR. WRIGHT: Louie Wagner.

30

31

MR. WAGNER: Yes.

32

33

MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

34

35

MR. KITKA: Yes.

36

37

MR. WRIGHT: John Smith, III.

38

39

MR. SMITH: Yes.

40

41

MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

42

43

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: No.

44

45

MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes yes.

46

47

Motion passes, Madame Chair.

48

49

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

50

0237

1 Wright. All right, we're at a point where we can take  
2 a break for lunch. So is an hour and 15 minutes, be  
3 back by 2:15 so we can finish old business.

4

5 (Off record)

6

7 (On record)

8

9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it  
10 looks like most of our Council members are back. I'd  
11 like to check to make sure that Mr. Howard and Mr.  
12 Slater are on the line with us.

13

14 MR. SLATER: I'm here, Madame Chair,  
15 this is Jim.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank  
18 you, Jim. Albert are you back with us?

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. I  
23 think we have, at least a quorum for Council to  
24 continue on with our business. We have a guest in the  
25 room, Mr. Willard Jackson, if you could come forward.  
26 Mr. Jackson has requested to give some testimony on  
27 non-agenda items before us and we're going to allow him  
28 that opportunity now since he's here with us and won't  
29 be back in the morning.

30

31 So, Mr. Jackson, please, proceed.

32

33 MR. JACKSON: First, I want to thank  
34 the Regional Subsistence Board for allowing me speak on  
35 behalf of the Tongass Tribe. I am one of the (In  
36 Tlingit) Speaker of the House, for the Teikweidi Brown  
37 Bear. We originated in the 1800s when we first came  
38 here two miles south of Ketchikan. I told a story to  
39 this Board years ago in regard to the fishery of the  
40 halibut and what I told was the migration at the Unuk  
41 River, our lifeline, and we have many of those. The  
42 Stikine, the great Naas, where the Tongass Tribe merged  
43 out of. And others. I have family on the Board from  
44 Metlakatla. I have family on the Board from Hydaburg.  
45 We're all connected on this great vast land that we're  
46 on at the moment. The Saanya Kwaan and Taanta Kwaan,  
47 Cape Fox, Cape Fox as well as Tongass.

48

49 We merged here in the early 1892 with

50



1 Sheldon Jackson, two miles south of Ketchikan. When  
2 you go out to Saxman you'll see their city hall, the  
3 old building, the oldest building, I'm going to tell  
4 you that's in existence in the village, would be that  
5 one. That particular building was built as a  
6 Presbyterian Church and a school when we migrated here  
7 with Cape Fox, Tongass Tribe. Sheldon Jackson was a  
8 part of that as well as William Saxman, who drowned,  
9 leaving Tongass Island coming this way, it was this  
10 time of the year, and that canoe capsized and he  
11 drowned. That is why that village is named after him.

12  
13                   There's a fishery throughout Southeast  
14 Alaska in the great state of Alaska and we're having  
15 problems with this global warming that has hit all of  
16 us, it affects all of us. My (In Tlingit) brother and  
17 sisters, my White brothers and sisters. That's a good  
18 way to address you, as my grandfather taught me. My  
19 White brothers and sisters, it's not offensive, it's  
20 good, because I have children, grandchildren that  
21 merged into that category as well, they're my  
22 grandchildren and I love them very much.

23  
24                   There's a story at the beginning of  
25 time, it talks about placing the trees and the Forest  
26 Service will come up later, talking about trees --  
27 placing trees on the mountain, how are they going to  
28 grow. We're talking about the conception of time, very  
29 old story. There were tribe leaders and grandmothers  
30 were down by the fire and they were trying to talk  
31 about how can we place these trees up on the mountain  
32 so they can firmly grab Mother Earth because it was all  
33 rock, so they could firmly grab Mother Earth and grow.  
34 They sent the first tree up, and like it is today, the  
35 wind brought it down. It came back down to the fire.  
36 They're discussing it some more. There was a grandma  
37 there and she was talking and her little granddaughter  
38 was grabbing her robe, grandma, grandma, I got an  
39 answer grandma, grandma, grandma said (In Tlingit) go  
40 away, (In Tlingit) go away. And they discussed it some  
41 more. They sent three trees up on the mountain and the  
42 wind and the rain and the snow brought them down. So  
43 they came down and discussed it some more. The little  
44 girl would not give up on her grandma. She was pulling  
45 away on that robe for all (In Tlingit) her belongings  
46 she was wearing, grandma, grandma I got an answer.  
47 Grandma finally give in, she stood up and she said I  
48 want my granddaughter to speak on my behalf, she has  
49 something to say. I have something to say, on behalf  
50

0239

1 of my grandchildren, that's why I'm here. I'm not a  
2 well man, I'm dying from Agent Orange and I'm speaking  
3 on their behalf. The young lady got up and this is  
4 what she said: Let's all go up -- let's all go up on  
5 the mountain with the tree people and hold hands until  
6 they can firmly grab Mother Earth, it takes that to  
7 grow as human beings. Our preexisting rights as Native  
8 peoples was never given up and I'm fighting for my  
9 land, and the Vietnam (indiscernible) allotment and  
10 that was my greatest statement. My grandparents did  
11 not give up their right to the land. They did not give  
12 up the right to the fishery. And I'm here to tell you  
13 that the future of the fishery is being eliminated with  
14 the amount of fishing that's going out there and global  
15 warming. Fish will die when the water heats up and  
16 have a heart attack, read your history on them, they'll  
17 die in that heat and have a heart attack. That's  
18 what's happening to them. The warmth.

19

20 I made this (In Tlingit) up in Juneau  
21 and Douglas when I was on the Council for KIC for eight  
22 years and I'm going to make it again to this Board. I  
23 believe in the future of the fisheries for all IRS  
24 villages, which is KIC, Saxman, Sitka, Craig, Klawock,  
25 Hydaburg, I really believe in the future of it, we need  
26 to allow seiners in just one fish for that village to  
27 bring in their fish for process because they're not  
28 getting it up the (indiscernible) Bay or any other  
29 areas anymore but they are catching them here.  
30 Sometimes not the greatest, and that could be divided  
31 up from the tribal level, let them manage it. When you  
32 look up in the Interior of Alaska, part of the Unuk,  
33 they're not getting any fish at all, and this is what  
34 I'm talking about; our way of life is diminishing  
35 because we're not paying attention to Mother Earth and  
36 what it provides for us. I am taking traditional  
37 medicine to stay alive. I came off of 14 medications,  
38 I was telling my brother from Sitka and I'm feeling a  
39 lot better. I'm not looking for any pity, I'm looking  
40 for the future of children and grandchildren, they  
41 can't be here to testify but there'll be some day  
42 they're going to say my grandpa spoke on behalf of us.

43

44 Gunalcheesh. Gunalcheesh, thank you  
45 very much.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
48 Jackson, for that. All right, we're going to move into  
49 our last item under old business so if Regional

50

0240

1 Forester Schmidt would like to come forward and give  
2 his update for us that he has been waiting for.

3

4

5 MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Madame Chair  
6 and Council. Again, I'm Dave Schmidt and serve as the  
7 Regional Forester. I'm with the Forest Service here in  
8 Alaska based out of Juneau and I also have the seat on  
9 the Federal Subsistence Board. But I had a couple of  
10 things -- first of all Mr. Jackson, you just touched my  
11 heart, that's pretty hard to follow.

11

12

13 So my topics are actually a couple of  
14 the same here, I've been asked to report back or update  
15 on the Southeast Alaska Sustainability Strategy with an  
16 update of the Alaska Roadless Rule. And maybe I could  
17 just start setting a little bit of the context of how  
18 we got from there to here to today.

18

19

20 So I believe it was three years ago  
21 here at a RAC meeting, was at the same time, in the  
22 last Administration, that we were moving forward with a  
23 proposal to eliminate the Roadless Rule here in Alaska.  
24 I think Chris French, actually, the Deputy Chief  
25 presented, we were on the road doing public meetings  
26 with that. But before we got to there, we had been  
27 working here in Alaska, this is on the Roadless Rule,  
28 of trying to find a way -- this has ping ponged back in  
29 forth in Alaska -- back in 2001 when the Roadless Rule  
30 nationally came into play I was a much younger Ranger  
31 on Prince of Wales, so I've been working with this all  
32 of my career since it was in play and without going  
33 through a lot of history I think you know the Roadless  
34 Rule was applied to the Tongass and then it wasn't  
35 applied to the Tongass and then it was and back and  
36 forth so we embarked on an effort to try and find a  
37 path here, something that would keep us from every time  
38 there was either an Administration change or court  
39 case, that we could find something durable, something  
40 that worked for Alaska. And I had some history in  
41 Idaho working with the state of Idaho, they had a state  
42 roadless rule, Colorado also had a roadless rule that  
43 was aimed at local -- some of the local conditions and  
44 things like that. So we started -- and we did  
45 something also at that time that we hadn't done here in  
46 Alaska, is we invited any of the Federally-recognized  
47 tribes that wanted to come into that process as  
48 cooperating agencies and five tribes did that. They  
49 were involved and I think it was pretty hard for some  
50 of the tribes, looking at, you know, where they wanted

50

1 to go. They were willing to come to the table and they  
2 spent quite a bit of effort looking at, you know, what  
3 would work best if they tailored a roadless rule in  
4 their community use areas and across the Tongass. So  
5 folks were at the table working really hard. There  
6 were some areas, I know, that folks identified within  
7 an alternative that we were developing that looked at  
8 traditional homelands, community use areas and, you  
9 know, what might work in the community of Kake and what  
10 might work -- something different down in Hydaburg or  
11 Kasaan or other areas. And so we worked through that  
12 effort and then as we were moving towards finalizing  
13 that rule, as many of you know, it was -- it was the  
14 Secretary's Decision but in the last Administration,  
15 that changed, and it took the wind out of the sails of  
16 a lot of folks who had worked on it and it sure broke a  
17 lot of trust and work that we had with the cooperating  
18 agencies, the tribes and the efforts that they had put  
19 forward. It left us in a pretty rocky place, to be  
20 honest with you, myself and other members of the team  
21 that had worked through that effort. And I know that  
22 the Administration made a decision to basically exempt  
23 the Tongass National Forest from the Rule, that came  
24 into play in 2020. And so we found ourselves there  
25 again, the pendulum swung back and forth, and so we  
26 started -- I started trying to mend some relationships  
27 and looking forward. We had a change in Administration  
28 and we had an opportunity as we moved -- started to  
29 move forward here, and we began consulting and when  
30 Secretary Vilsack came on board we certainly briefed  
31 the Secretary, he had certainly been involved with the  
32 Tongass back in the Obama Administration, he was  
33 Secretary of Agriculture for all eight years there and  
34 returned. And so working with the Secretary and  
35 working with the new Administration, there were some  
36 areas that we really wanted to relook at Alaska, and  
37 most of that in Southeast Alaska, was based on the  
38 information and the broken trust with the cooperating  
39 agencies, which eventually involved most of the tribes  
40 here in Southeast Alaska, as well as a lot of the  
41 issues around old growth logging in the area, and what  
42 they heard from, not the thousands of people that  
43 commented on that effort, many thousands of people,  
44 most of those outside of Alaska, but really listening  
45 to Southeast Alaska, listening to the communities and  
46 certainly my commitment to the communities and so  
47 working together for some time and reevaluating and  
48 consulting, in July of last year the Secretary had an  
49 announcement, SASS was the acronym, I don't know if  
50

0242

1 that's the best acronym for it but it was the Southeast  
2 Alaska Sustainability Strategy. And it was how are we  
3 going to -- what can we do as an agency to look at  
4 something more sustainable and, my gosh we're right in  
5 the middle of Covid and the communities, it became very  
6 clear. We've heard it today, just hearing from the  
7 communities around deer proposals, what was going on in  
8 Southeast. Our ferries weren't meeting some of the  
9 needs. Food security issues. If you really wanted to  
10 look at under served communities in this country --  
11 across the country, it was in Southeast Alaska.

12

13 So the Secretary came out with an  
14 announcement and there were four -- I think four big  
15 components to that announcement.

16

17 The first, which was, and after a lot  
18 of land exchanges and a number of things that have  
19 happened here with the Southeast Alaska between the  
20 corporation as well as the Mental Health Trust, the  
21 first component was to end large scale old growth  
22 logging in Southeast Alaska. How you define large  
23 scale is a little bit out there, but it was to go ahead  
24 and move towards the transition, and it's in line with  
25 where we're at with the transition to a young growth  
26 and how we manage the 400-some thousand acres of young  
27 growth that are on the Tongass National Forest. But  
28 that was the first piece of that.

29

30 The second was to repeal the Roadless  
31 Rule and restore all of the protections to the National  
32 Forest on the Tongass that were part of that, and I'll  
33 give you an update on that in a minute, but that was  
34 very loud and clear.

35

36 The third one was to, I guess restore  
37 some of those relationships, certainly with tribes here  
38 in Southeast Alaska and really honor and stand up to  
39 our government to government relationship, our trust  
40 relationships and start looking at things differently.  
41 Not that we weren't but there were some areas that we  
42 really needed to doubledown on, and some of that  
43 started with a couple of national consultations. One  
44 of those is on the Roadless Rule and I'll, again,  
45 update that, and that was delegated to Chris French,  
46 the Deputy Chief to the Secretary, was involved to be  
47 the lead on that. The other is a petition we received,  
48 it's not on our topics here, but it was a homelands  
49 petition conservation rule that came to the Secretary  
50

0243

1 and we are working on that as well. I can talk a  
2 little bit about that if you have questions, but we're  
3 moving that right behind the Roadless Rule and I was  
4 delegated that on behalf of the Secretary to move that  
5 forward. And, again, that was part of talked about  
6 during the work we were doing with the cooperating  
7 agencies around community use areas.

8

9 And then the fourth one, which is what  
10 everybody really jumps to with SASS, and that was the  
11 -- an investment and really looking at -- starting to  
12 invest resources here in Southeast Alaska to make that  
13 a sustainable strategy. And how do we do that, and  
14 where do we go in terms of investing in that effort.  
15 And so the Secretary announced \$25 million and it  
16 sounds like a lot of money, it is a lot of money, and  
17 even a little bit of that's a lot of money in some  
18 communities, but that was announced and it took a while  
19 to get that into play here in terms of how we could  
20 move that. And we took a very different approach, some  
21 of you have probably been involved more with SASS, I  
22 know a couple of members here have, in the investment  
23 side. So we flipped it on its side, instead of the  
24 Forest Service going out and saying, hey, we got \$25  
25 million, you all send us a proposal and we'll see how  
26 you can fit that into our agreements and our  
27 instruments and stuff, and we went out to the  
28 communities and we said, what do you want, you tell us,  
29 and we'll try and fit those needs. And so it was  
30 really a very different way of looking at how we were  
31 going, it wasn't just granting money, it was how do we  
32 do that and, again, it was about really how do we  
33 enhance community resilience, how do we conserve some  
34 of these, you know, resources, but how do we do -- how  
35 do we support where the communities are.

36

37 And I -- we did some amazing work  
38 internally. The first thing we did, which is different  
39 than we've also operated in, which is, one, USDA. So  
40 Forest Service isn't the only game in town with USDA.  
41 And many of you know of Rural Development, if you know  
42 Keith Perkins over in Sitka, he's been a one man band  
43 here for awhile but he's got some pretty big wallets  
44 and there's authorities in areas that Rural Development  
45 can do that we can't do as a land management agency and  
46 then the other bigger entity was the Natural Resource  
47 Conservation Service, NRCS, we're all housed under  
48 USDA. And so we brought that together at the  
49 Department level, the UnderSecretaries, the Deputy  
50

0244

1 UnderSecretaries and here in Alaska to see how we could  
2 leverage each other in funds and how we could work  
3 within different authorities to make this happen. And  
4 so we did, we did a big public engagement process and  
5 we started by asking folks what they wanted. Oh, my  
6 gosh, we had 25 million, I don't know how many -- we  
7 had a lot of -- a lot more proposals than we had money  
8 to go around. But as of the end of September, a few  
9 weeks ago, we actually got all of that money obligated  
10 and there's a lot of mechanics, I won't go into, we've  
11 worked through some strengthening groups, through a  
12 couple of areas, the Southeast Sustainable Partnership,  
13 worked through Southeast Conference and through, I  
14 forgot the third one, help me.

15

16 MR. JOHNSON: T&H.

17

18 MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, thank you, T&H,  
19 Tlingit and Haida Counsel as strengthening groups. But  
20 there is 76-some projects, yeah, I think you've got a  
21 list of those under there that are moving in a  
22 direction. And this is really refreshing and it's just  
23 really turned the needle, I think, or turned the page  
24 here, I guess in Southeast Alaska, and -- but I would  
25 say it wasn't just the 25 million, if you look at the  
26 funds from Department of Agriculture, it's closer to  
27 \$100 million invested this last year, if you start  
28 looking at broadband, if you start looking at other  
29 parts and pieces that we've been able to bring  
30 together.

31

32 There have been three big Legislative  
33 actions that have happened here recently.

34

35 The first one was the Great American  
36 Outdoors Act, which was really rebuilding recreation  
37 infrastructure but there's a piece in there in our  
38 communities and the region has been very -- the Forest  
39 Service region here has finally competed well  
40 nationally because we put things in the criteria, like  
41 how are we serving our underserved communities and not  
42 just going to the big urban areas and other places just  
43 because you got a lot of people. It was equally as  
44 important. And the old criteria, you know, were like  
45 cost benefit, well, our costs are higher. There were a  
46 number of things that we just couldn't compete and so  
47 we've competed really well for that and we've been  
48 putting a lot of money.

49

50

1                   The big one, as you all know, was the  
2 bill, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Legislation -- or  
3 Law that was put into place and our delegation all  
4 supported that, and there's a lot in there in Alaska.  
5 And so that is really starting to flow and we're using  
6 the SASS principles. And so it's not the same kinds of  
7 monies but we got a pile of money in for -- as we look  
8 forward into how we thin our young growth, and if you  
9 read the language, I think one of our Senators put  
10 subsistence right next to that thinning so we've been  
11 very successful with that as well as we move forward  
12 and managing for deer and other Forest health issues  
13 that we have moving forward. So there are a lot of  
14 components to that as well as the last Inflation  
15 Reduction Act, the IRA. Some of those, there's big  
16 funds going to the west -- western states in the Forest  
17 Service for wildfire risk reduction. Recognition, I  
18 heard some of that earlier here in our discussions  
19 about concerns over, you know, some of our bug kill and  
20 changing conditions, but while a lot of that's targeted  
21 elsewhere that's also freeing up other funds for Alaska  
22 here and so I feel pretty confident going there.

23  
24                   I'm starting to ramble, Madame Chair,  
25 so I will move back and take some questions. I think  
26 you got a list of some of the projects and those are  
27 just highlights. What I would end with, though,  
28 regarding SA -- well, I'm sorry, the Roadless update,  
29 almost missed that.

30  
31                   So we're there. We did get a ton of  
32 comments back -- I think they closed in January, we've  
33 had teams working on those, we've had counsel working  
34 on those, we moved that all up through our agency  
35 through the Department as it went to the White House  
36 and tomorrow it actually goes to OMB for that final  
37 review, which is a good place. And it's been intact to  
38 get there. We've been trying to give timelines. I  
39 have continued to say it will be done by the end of the  
40 calendar year and I think we're going to be within  
41 that. We were hoping more like November, but it's  
42 probably going to be a Final Rule published in  
43 December. They're looking -- every two weeks that the  
44 Federal Register comes out. But I think we will see  
45 that here barring something totally unforeseen that is  
46 moving through and I really appreciate the input from  
47 this Council and all of the communities have been, and  
48 hopefully that will serve us well going into the  
49 future.  
50



0246

1 So at that point, Madame Chair, I will  
2 pause.

3  
4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
5 you for that. Are there questions from Council members  
6 for Regional Forester Schmidt.

7  
8 MR. WAGNER: I got a couple.

9  
10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wagner.

11  
12 MR. WAGNER: I don't see Metlakatla in  
13 your.....

14  
15 REPORTER: Louie, your mic.

16  
17 MR. WAGNER: .....paperwork, all this  
18 money you're giving away here.

19  
20 REPORTER: Louie, your mic.

21  
22 MR. WAGNER: We haven't had government  
23 to government.....

24  
25 REPORTER: Louie -- Frank or Mike,  
26 could you turn his mic on.

27  
28 MR. WAGNER: .....for a long time since  
29 Shane Walker left. He was the last one to come over  
30 and have government to government.

31  
32 MR. SCHMIDT: I appreciate that,  
33 Councilman Wagner. I was not aware that Metlakatla had  
34 not been involved. I know when we began with a lot of  
35 our public outreach we tried to reach folks, but  
36 certainly followup up there as well, yes.

37  
38 MR. WAGNER: Our Secretary's been out  
39 on her health back and forth to Anchorage.....

40  
41 MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

42  
43 MR. WAGNER: .....and without her in  
44 there we're kind of at a loss, so she's been in and  
45 out. My other question is, where are you planning on  
46 doing this logging, we're the last RainForest in the  
47 world basically and I keep hearing about climate  
48 change, you know, I mean we have to protect some  
49 Forest.

50

0247

1 MR. SCHMIDT: Correct. So the  
2 announcement was to end our old growth logging with, I  
3 would say with some small exceptions, we provided for  
4 cultural and community use. The plan on the Tongass,  
5 when it transitioned was looking at envisioned about 5  
6 million board feet a year that would come to very small  
7 mills that operate across the Tongass here, but the  
8 amount of that old growth RainForest that would be  
9 coming off of the public lands would be reduced.

10

11 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Schmidt.

12

13 MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

14

15 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Smith.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Thank you for all that  
20 information. Question, I heard you about the tree  
21 thinning or the tree planting, can you share a little  
22 bit of that, there's funds to followup with that and  
23 like who's receiving that and who's land is that  
24 serving and like, you know, just share a little piece  
25 of that? Because I know that through the years that,  
26 you know, when I was younger and they started logging  
27 in Hoonah, that not much of that was done but there was  
28 a bunch of us younger folks that, you know, encouraged  
29 that process and Hoonah Totem started to come -- and  
30 Sealaska started -- we started to do some thinning and  
31 planting a year after we would log a unit. But through  
32 -- go in there and supporting the family -- or the --  
33 the group that was doing that realized that there  
34 needed to be more strategies put on the table and  
35 process with teaching them how to properly do that.  
36 Just some thoughts, yeah.

37

38 MR. SCHMIDT: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
39 Smith. So we have been doing pre-commercial thinning  
40 for a long time on the Tongass and looking at that as  
41 there's that period of time, you know, you've clear-cut  
42 -- I think you all know this, you clear-cut the land,  
43 you get this big flush comes up, you can see a lot of  
44 deer, they like that summer habitat really well and  
45 then at some point you get to that stem exclusion  
46 stage, where everything grows it's dog hair, and in  
47 some areas it becomes almost a biological desert, and  
48 if you just let natural -- over time, that Forest will  
49 evolve again. So we have been thinning that up to --

50

0248

1 oh, our target right now, what we think we need to thin  
2 is about 9,000 acres a year and there's a window of  
3 time in there between about 10 to 15 years, to 20  
4 years, or 25 years where that can be most effective.  
5 And there's a prescription for that. So when we used  
6 to thin, primarily, for pre-commercial thinning we  
7 selected for say more cedar, more spruce, higher value  
8 versus hemlock, and so the prescriptions were  
9 different. We've been tweaking some of those  
10 prescriptions that have more of a wildlife objective,  
11 wildlife emphasis so you don't want to leave a lot of  
12 slash so they're operating a little bit differently.

13

14 We just put together and got in place,  
15 it's called an IDIQ, an indefinite quantities contract,  
16 and so there's a prospectus went out, and a number of  
17 people can all bid on that prospectus and so what that  
18 will help us to do is it makes it real efficient so  
19 that you can move through those businesses and award  
20 those contracts a lot more expeditiously, and I believe  
21 they're set up for about 3 million bucks and moving  
22 forward. And so our goal is to get to those areas  
23 where you can have the most impact and do that  
24 expeditiously with hopefully mostly some local  
25 contracts.

26

27 MR. SMITH: Is there a team that you  
28 have that's working on this or that you talk about the  
29 -- you know this process of our big gardens that you're  
30 talking about, I feel myself -- I was a logger 28 --  
31 for Whitestone Logging, so I'll just share with you, I  
32 was a hook tender for them, but realize that, you know,  
33 we need to take care of it in a better process. Even  
34 as -- when we log it, we need to get everything out of  
35 the woods, the whole tree, all the limbs and  
36 everything, bring the resource to the landing so that  
37 we could make methane or other things and -- and  
38 pellets or use the resource. When we leave it out  
39 there I really believe it kind of disturbs its -- over  
40 nitrogen, or, you know, because of the wood that's on  
41 it. Just the thought of being part of the group or  
42 even testifying the things that I've seen in my  
43 lifetime logging that I truly believe that there could  
44 be a better process, you know.

45

46 MR. SCHMIDT: Yeah, thank you.

47

48 MR. SMITH: Just an opinion.

49

50

0249

1 MR. SCHMIDT: No, I thank you, Mr.  
2 Smith. Yes, we have silviculturists here that have  
3 been working for years. What we're trying to do  
4 through some of the sustainability is get the work  
5 force development out in the communities and where we  
6 can get folks that -- and that gets a lot closer in  
7 some of these communities to co-stewardship, co-  
8 management, and how we go back. Because some of the  
9 techniques that we might use, you know, may not be  
10 perfect for cultural logs, tigergrain logs, you know,  
11 maybe not thinning in some areas and some other areas.  
12 So we are open to that. But I wouldn't hesitate to  
13 reach out to the folks on the Tongass Forest here.

14  
15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Johnson.

16  
17 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
18 Mr. Schmidt, I'm wondering, you described it as a ping  
19 pong match, you know, which it has been, is there  
20 anything when this new rule is released that will  
21 protect it from Administrative changes, or is it still  
22 going to be at the same whim, potentially, down the  
23 road, the Roadless Rule?

24  
25 MR. SCHMIDT: So it's a rule, okay.  
26 It's put in place. The decision's made by the  
27 Secretary, it will stay there unless a different  
28 administration wanted to change it again. I believe --  
29 I honestly believe that our strategy that we have here,  
30 when you look at the economics in Southeast Alaska and  
31 what -- and where that goes, the Roadless Rule in place  
32 still provides a lot of exemptions in places, you know.  
33 We've got rare Earth minerals we -- you know, that may  
34 need to be developed, but they may need to be developed  
35 differently. We don't necessarily need to have that in  
36 place. I've looked at -- I mean it's subsistence,  
37 commercial fishing, recreation, economy has really  
38 shifted, and so I'm hoping that we won't see this come  
39 back and if there's enough support out there, but that  
40 would -- that's just my crystal ball, Ian, as I think  
41 we're going to be too far down that road to come back.

42  
43 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Ms.  
44 Phillips.

45  
46 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
47 Thank you, Regional Forester Dave Schmidt. So you were  
48 a District Ranger on POW, which district?

49  
50

0250

1 MR. SCHMIDT: I was on the Thorne Bay  
2 district in 2000.

3  
4 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

5  
6 MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

7  
8 MS. PHILLIPS: So you're well aware of  
9 the issues that we face, both resources, fisheries and  
10 wildlife. So on POW there were a lot of land trades,  
11 you know, between Federal public lands and Mental  
12 Health Trust and corporations, and that put more of the  
13 timber into harvest, old growth timber into harvest,  
14 and I hope those sort of land trades get more scrutiny  
15 and aren't, you know, aren't going to happen more.  
16 That's just a comment I wanted to make.

17  
18 Also on thinning, you know, we -- you  
19 know the Forest is in need of some thinning, but not so  
20 much pre-commercial thinning for industrial logging,  
21 but for habitat management.

22  
23 MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

24  
25 MS. PHILLIPS: And then we -- this  
26 Program needs more funding for FIS, and wildlife  
27 studies, we used to get a lot more money for those sort  
28 of programs and it helped build the capacity at the  
29 tribal level for some of these resource monitoring  
30 projects. And as you heard, you know, this indigenous  
31 management, these FIS programs could help -- and  
32 wildlife programs could help facilitate that. And also  
33 our Regional Advisory Council budget. You know we used  
34 to be able to go on field trips to see some of these,  
35 you know, in the field.....

36  
37 MR. SCHMIDT: Uh-huh.

38  
39 MS. PHILLIPS: .....land management  
40 activities and it helps us make better decisions, or  
41 recommendations. And so those are my comments, thank  
42 you, sir.

43  
44 MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Ms. Phillips.  
45 Yes, so when I mentioned subsistence in the same  
46 sentence as thinning that was intentional. And it was  
47 really looking at wildlife objectives as much as the  
48 pre-commercial thinning. And as far as the land  
49 exchanges, those were all legislated, so when Congress  
50

0251

1 -- it's a very hard thing for us, at times, to  
2 implement, you know, the language in that, there were  
3 land selections and then there have been some  
4 exchanges. The Mental Health Trust was one that was  
5 legislated and it took us a lot of work to make that  
6 happen and did that. So I don't -- Alaska's different  
7 than the Lower 48, we continue -- we have a big lands  
8 program and we have lots of -- every year there are  
9 other proposals but, yeah.

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are  
12 there other Council questions for Mr. Schmidt.

13

14 Mr. Wright.

15

16 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
17 Approximately how many acres is 5 million board feet,  
18 do you have any idea, that's what you quoted, I think  
19 you said that.

20

21 MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, I did. So that's an  
22 average that the plan that's currently in place, the  
23 Tongass Land Management Plan that envisioned after a  
24 full transition to young growth, is that we would have  
25 the ability to produce about 43 or 44 million board  
26 feet in young growth and approximately 5 million board  
27 feet that would be targeted for cultural and community  
28 use, very small operators. I'd have to ask one of our  
29 silviculturists what that translates to but I can share  
30 that on North Prince of Wales when logging was  
31 cranking, that was about 200 million board feet a year.  
32 This is a very small slice. Most of those sales are a  
33 couple of acres. So when you would put that over the  
34 landscape, I could get a better answer for your, Mr.  
35 Wright, but I'm not exact on the acres. I know -- I  
36 know that -- well, I can get close to that, so Viking  
37 has talked about it, they need a thousand acres a year  
38 to produce 24 million board feet, so if somebody could  
39 do the math that's approximately what they estimate.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
42 you. Mr. Smith.

43

44 MR. SMITH: Yeah, a question. It takes  
45 about, approximately, what, about 40 years for a tree  
46 to actually grow and be loggable again, so 40 years ago  
47 was there a unit that we had that's actually ready to  
48 harvest now?

49

50

1 MR. SCHMIDT: So it takes a little  
2 longer than that, and we should have the silviculturist  
3 here, it's approximately about 80 years or so,  
4 somewhere in that somewhere in that 70 to 80 year range  
5 is -- to begin to harvest. So we've had stands, we've  
6 got a -- actually it's over here in Valner just across  
7 the Bay here that was -- those early beach log stands  
8 that are at that age and that are merchantable and  
9 there's stands, I know out on Kosciuszko that Sealaska  
10 had, but our stands, it's about three to five years  
11 from where we're at before we would get to that.

12  
13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Perry.

14  
15 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
16 just wanted to let Mr. Smith know that I could make  
17 some connections and get some answers to your question  
18 regarding the questions you've been asking here. I  
19 know Mr. Schmidt has to catch a plane, so I just wanted  
20 to let you know that I can follow up with you.

21  
22 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

23  
24 MS. PERRY: Thank you.

25  
26 MR. SCHMIDT: I did get the answer to  
27 your question, Mr. Wright, 250 acres. About a 17  
28 million, you know, 250 acres a year, approximately.

29  
30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, any  
31 last call for questions from the Council for Mr.  
32 Schmidt.

33  
34 MS. PHILLIPS: I have.

35  
36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

37  
38 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
39 I apologize, I forgot to bring this up about  
40 enforcement. That keeps coming up, enforcement on the  
41 Tongass. And I live in a wilderness LUD2 area and  
42 it's good to see the Guardian Network's been funded  
43 but, you know, we would like to see more enforcement by  
44 boat in our region, in our subregion.

45  
46 Thank you.

47  
48 MR. SCHMIDT: Yeah, thank you, Ms.  
49 Phillips. I do know that our, at least our law  
50

0253

1 enforcement is finally back to about full Staff here.  
2 We've got some more folks to do that. So, thank you.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.  
5 Well, I just want to thank you for your time. You've  
6 been diligently listening to all of our proceedings  
7 thus far and we've had good conversation over the last  
8 day and a half with you and so I appreciate the time  
9 that you've taken to be with us at this meeting as well  
10 as your very thorough update on Alaska Roadless Rule. I  
11 thought I knew all that was happening but I learned  
12 even more today at the table today for that, so thank  
13 you for your report.

14

15 MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
16 And probably more than you ever wanted to know.....

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. SCHMIDT: .....but I thought it was  
21 important to get some of that out. And I do have to  
22 catch a flight tonight, but breaks I'd be happy to  
23 visit with anyone while I'm here yet.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
26 you.

27

28 MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, so  
31 we've now concluded our old business and we can move  
32 into new business. We did make an agenda change and we  
33 have a presentation regarding caribou from Ms. Lisa  
34 Grediagin who's coming before us and so that will be  
35 our first item under new business.

36

37 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
38 Chair. Lisa Grediagin with OSM for the record. And  
39 I'm presenting an announcement about the North American  
40 Caribou Workshop and Arctic Ungulate Conference that  
41 will be held in Anchorage next May. And before I get  
42 too far into my spiel, I just wanted to gauge the  
43 interest of this Council on this agenda item and this  
44 conference because I recognize the Southeast Council is  
45 the one region in Alaska that doesn't have any of these  
46 species. You guys don't have an Arctic ungulates and  
47 so the other -- all the other Councils we're requesting  
48 input on some -- on a management symposium regarding  
49 these species as well as to nominate a Council member

50



0254

1 to attend the conference but -- and, we, of course,  
2 want to extend the same opportunity to all Councils but  
3 I guess I'll just pause and ask you if you want me to  
4 continue, if there's interest amongst the Council in  
5 this conference, even though these species don't occur  
6 in your region.

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: Just a quick question.  
9 Moose aren't considered Arctic ungulates?

10

11 MS. GREDIAGIN: Oh, I'm sorry, yeah, I  
12 guess I'm so focused on caribou and then muskox and  
13 dall sheep but, yes.

14

15 MR. CASIPIT: Because we do have moose  
16 populations in Southeast and they are of a concern to  
17 many of us here at the table.

18

19 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. Okay. So, yeah,  
20 I'm sorry, I guess I get too focused on the caribou  
21 aspect of this conference. So, okay, well, I'll  
22 continue on then with that. So an informational flier  
23 about the conference is in your meeting books and, I'm  
24 sorry I don't have the exact page number off the top of  
25 my head, but it's in your meeting books, and so a joint  
26 meeting of the North American Caribou Workshop and  
27 Arctic Ungulate Conference will be held in Anchorage  
28 from May 8th through 12th 2023. The meeting will bring  
29 together an international group of managers,  
30 researchers and indigenous and local knowledge holders  
31 who want to share their knowledge of caribou, muskox,  
32 dall sheep, moose -- it's right there in my talking  
33 points.....

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 MS. GREDIAGIN: .....and reindeer. The  
38 theme for the meeting is crossing boundaries, Arctic  
39 ungulates regularly cross landscape boundaries  
40 connecting ecological processes between different  
41 systems. This necessitates collaboration across  
42 geographical boundaries and also calls for crossing  
43 boundaries between Western science and local and  
44 indigenous knowledge. The conference will include  
45 sessions on co-management, the status of caribou  
46 globally, integrating Western science and indigenous  
47 knowledge and the effects of climate change on caribou.  
48 Field trips, workshops, research talks, symposiums and  
49 a poster session will also be part of the conference.

50

0255

1 The conference web address is included on the flier in  
2 your meeting books, and I encourage you to visit that  
3 website for more detailed information.

4

5 So before I move on, any questions  
6 generally about the conference.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. So next I'd like  
11 your input as a Council. One of the events that will  
12 take place during the conference is a facilitated  
13 discussion on Alaska State and Federal ungulate  
14 management. This session is intended to be a neutral  
15 forum for Council members such as yourselves, State  
16 Fish and Game Advisory Committee members, Federal and  
17 State agency Staff and other interested partners to  
18 discuss ungulate management in Alaska specifically  
19 regarding harvest regulations.

20

21 My question for the Council is what  
22 topics and issues would you like to be discussed during  
23 this session. It can be anything of concern related to  
24 harvest regulations and ungulate management.

25

26 Madame Chair, I will now turn this  
27 discussion over to you on this topic and your  
28 suggestions will be very important in setting the  
29 discussion agenda for this symposium.

30

31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
32 you, Ms. Grediagin. Does the Council have any input  
33 into what would be discussed for this session.

34

35 MS. GREDIAGIN: Sorry, I'll just also  
36 quickly add that if you guys have additional ideas  
37 outside this meeting and would like to email DeAnna and  
38 myself, you know, that works too, if you think of  
39 something later tonight or even next week or whenever,  
40 would be great.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Any  
43 feedback at this time for Mr. Grediagin. Mr. Johnson.

44

45 MR. JOHNSON: I don't have a topic in  
46 mind yet but I'll hopefully give people enough time to  
47 think about one. But it sounds like a great  
48 conversation to have still digital format, so I'm just  
49 wondering if even we can't attend in person, if we'll  
50

0256

1 be able to call in to something like that?

2

3

4 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, right now, I  
5 think that's still under discussion. My understanding  
6 right now is that they're focused on it being primarily  
7 an in-person conference but I don't think there's been  
8 any hard determination on whether or not there'll be a  
9 kind of digital virtual format or not.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any Council  
11 members on the phone that want to potentially provide  
12 discussion items to Ms. Grediagin regarding the  
13 ungulate conference.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Casipit.

18

19 MR. CASIPIT: Well, I haven't had a  
20 whole lot of time to think about this yet but as far as  
21 moose goes, one of the issues that I would like some  
22 more information on and hear some discussion on at this  
23 wider scale is, you know, the Department of Fish and  
24 Game has really moved towards these spike-fork 50 3-  
25 brow-tine, 4-brow-tine, 2-brow-tine, whatever type  
26 antler restrictions to basically maintain, quote,  
27 reasonable opportunity, while still allowing, you know,  
28 a lot of people to go out and hunt and try to harvest  
29 and all. You know, in my mind the spike fork 50 3-  
30 brow-tine-whatever, it's kind of like a slot limit for  
31 us fish biologists and I, you know, I just would like  
32 to see or hear some more information about do those  
33 strategies really accomplish those kind of things. I  
34 know it makes Fish and Game's life easier to manage  
35 that way, but does it result in outcomes for  
36 subsistence users that help them meet their needs.  
37 Just that's kind of where I'm at. I mean, are the  
38 assumptions that they make about these spike fork type  
39 of restrictions, do they actually accomplish, you know,  
40 what we need as subsistence users, you know, does it  
41 improve harvest for us, does it result in more hunting  
42 time, you know, that sort of thing. Or is it just an  
43 easy way to manage and you don't need to know a whole  
44 lot about the population when you do it that way.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Mr.  
47 Johnson and then Mr. Smith.

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks. I'm just

50

0257

1 shooting from the hip a little to it, too. I've never  
2 heard about young growth management linked to moose  
3 populations, maybe it's just because I'm not in a  
4 moose-based region but certainly Kake and lots of other  
5 regions have a lot of young growth that's in need of  
6 management linked to moose and, you know, it's  
7 different objectives, I think than deer, and I haven't  
8 really heard anyone talked about that. And, again,  
9 maybe it's just not in the eco -- like the type of  
10 system that I'm in. But just putting it out there as a  
11 potential topic.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr.  
14 Smith.

15

16 MR. SMITH: Yeah, just to share a  
17 perspective. Understanding the moose and the social  
18 structure, there's definitely a reason they keep the  
19 bigger bulls away from us harvesting is because those  
20 are the mating bulls and the females, they don't seem  
21 to let the younger ones get involved, so they even have  
22 a cry that kind of -- so I don't know if they're using  
23 that as a -- an understanding to that, I don't know.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are  
26 there other suggestions for Ms. Grediagin at this time.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay.

31

32 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay, I'll continue on,  
33 and, again, if you guys think of anything else at a  
34 later time please feel free to just email myself and  
35 DeAnna and we'll take those into consideration when  
36 crafting the agenda for the symposium.

37

38 So then next, a critical component of  
39 this conference is making sure that local knowledge  
40 holders are able to attend and participate. Office of  
41 Subsistence Management is able to provide financial  
42 support to send one member of each Subsistence Regional  
43 Advisory Council to attend the conference. We are  
44 asking that as a Council you nominate a member to  
45 attend and participate. Again, the conference will be  
46 held May 8th to 12th next year in Anchorage and OSM  
47 will cover all expenses, such as travel and conference  
48 registration. One expectation of the nominated Council  
49 member is that they will be an active participant in  
50

0258

1 the State and Federal Ungulate Management Symposium for  
2 which you just provided input.

3

4

5 So now I'll turn the discussion back  
6 over to the Chair and Council to ask that you nominate  
7 a member of your Council to attend who you feel will  
8 represent local knowledge and the concerns of your  
9 region related to ungulates. And I would also  
10 encourage you to nominate an alternate as well. So,  
11 thank you.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. This  
14 is why it's an action item.

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

(Laughter)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Do we have any  
nominations -- or, I agree, we should probably do the  
-- nominate both a person to do it and an alternate in  
case that person can't make it because May is a long  
time away from now and you never know what might come  
up. Anybody have any ideas of who we'd like to send to  
this conference.

(Laughter)

MR. CASIPIT: I see the train 'a  
coming.

(Laughter)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Somebody  
knowledgeable who's provided a lot of input into the  
workshop already maybe.

(Laughter)

MS. PHILLIPS: What about our  
Coordinator.

(Laughter)

MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
Albert.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: I'd like to nominate Cal  
Casipit since he seems to be in an area where moose

0259

1 hunting is involved.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. It's  
6 like you were reading my body language through the  
7 phone.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Casipit, is  
12 that something that is potentially doable for you.

13

14 MR. CASIPIT: (Nods affirmatively)

15

16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Do we need a  
17 vote?

18

19 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, officially, yeah,  
20 it can't hurt to have a vote and then, yeah, just an  
21 alternate. And then after that that's it for this  
22 agenda item so thank you very much.

23

24 REPORTER: You'll need a second first.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Do we want to  
27 select a.....

28

29 MS. PERRY: I don't think we had a  
30 second.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: What's that?

33

34 MS. PERRY: We didn't have a second,  
35 did we, on the motion.

36

37 REPORTER: Not yet.

38

39 MR. WRIGHT: I will.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Frank seconds.

42

43 All right, any discussion regarding  
44 having Cal be our first person to potentially -- to  
45 attend this conference on our behalf.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: You guys ready

50

0260

1 to vote.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Question.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. All  
6 in favor say aye.

7

8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed,  
11 nay.

12

13 (No opposing votes)

14

15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
16 thanks, Mr. Casipit. Do we have an alternate, does  
17 anybody want to nominate an alternate.

18

19 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is  
20 Albert.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard.

23

24 MR. HOWARD: You probably don't want to  
25 hear this one, Madame Chair, I'd like to nominate Cathy  
26 Needham to be an alternate.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Can I actually  
31 run this election. Is there a second.

32

33 MS. PHILLIPS: Second.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: For ease of  
36 business, is there any discussion regarding Cathy  
37 Needham as the alternate.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are you guys  
42 ready to vote.

43

44 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes. Question.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. All  
47 in favor say aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

0261

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed say  
2    nay.

3  
4                   MR. SLATER: Aye.

5  
6                   (No opposing votes)

7  
8                   (Laughter)

9  
10                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
11    motion carries. Thanks, Ms. Grediagin.

12  
13                  MS. GREDIAGIN: Yep, thank you.

14  
15                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Our  
16    next item on the agenda is we are going to be moving  
17    into our fisheries proposal. I wanted to make one  
18    suggestion to the Council before we did so. On our  
19    agenda for new business we have Board of Game proposals  
20    and whether or not our Council wants to make comments  
21    on any of those proposals. It's an agenda item that  
22    actually could take a lot of time, however, if we  
23    wanted to consider doing a work group to streamline  
24    that process, where the work group would meet to at  
25    least select which ones we want to make comment on to  
26    provide for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. As  
27    you know, that meeting will happen prior to the next  
28    time that we meet so if we're going to provide comments  
29    on any Board of Game proposals, that letter would need  
30    to be generated out of this work session so I just  
31    wanted to see if folks wanted to have a working group  
32    potentially meet between now and tomorrow morning to  
33    help us expedite our agenda tomorrow. And if we decide  
34    that we want to have a working group I need some  
35    volunteers.

36  
37                  All right, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Hernandez,  
38    Mr. Smith.

39  
40                  MR. HERNANDEZ: I think the working  
41    group is a good idea and I'd volunteer.

42  
43                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
44    Hernandez.

45  
46                  MS. PHILLIPS: How many do you want?

47  
48                  MS. PERRY: Four.

49  
50



0262

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Four. That  
2 means you make four, I think Patty asked how many you  
3 have.....

4  
5                   MS. PHILLIPS: No, I asked how many she  
6 wanted.

7  
8                   MS. PERRY: Oh, okay.

9  
10                  MS. PHILLIPS: My apologies, I'm sorry.

11  
12                  (No microphones - re how many  
13 volunteers)

14  
15                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So the answer,  
16 Ms. Phillips is I need less than seven. I want less  
17 than seven. All right, so we have Mr. Johnson, Mr.  
18 Hernandez, Mr. Smith, and myself. Any others.

19  
20                  (No comments)

21  
22                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.

23  
24                  MS. PERRY: Could we have a motion to  
25 that effect.

26  
27                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: We're going to  
28 need a motion to form the work group.

29  
30                  MR. CASIPIT: I move that we form a  
31 work group to flesh out the comments for the Council  
32 for the Board of Game meeting coming up in January and  
33 the membership as we had just discussed.

34  
35                  MR. WRIGHT: Second the motion.

36  
37                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Second, Mr.  
38 Wright. Any discussion.

39  
40                  (No comments)

41  
42                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All in favor  
43 signify by saying aye.

44  
45                  IN UNISON: Aye.

46  
47                  ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed,  
48 nay.

49  
50

0263

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No opposing votes)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, motion carried. Thank you. All right, before we get into our fisheries proposal I'd like to call on our Council Coordinator, Ms. Perry, to go over some procedural reminders of running the new proposals for the fisheries cycle.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair. Members of the Council. For the record, my name is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. This is the first regulatory meeting for some of our Council members so I wanted to give a quick outline of the procedure for proposal presentation. As we go through each proposal and closure you can refer to Page 41 in your books to follow the process.

The Chair will announce each step which provides an opportunity for the various agencies, Councils, Committees, Commissions and public to participate. And then when you get to step No. 7 a member of the Council will need to make a motion to support or adopt the proposal just to bring the issue on the table for discussion. And for our new members, all motions need to be made in the positive so even if you plan to vote against the proposal, your motion would need to be a motion to support or a motion to adopt. If you are making a motion before the Council there will be five questions that are on the back of your nameplates and they're also listed on your presentation proposal that can help guide your discussion and deliberation. Each of these proposals are action items so we would be looking at closing each proposal procedure with a vote to support, adopt, support with modification, oppose or take no action.

And I see Brent has come up for the first proposal but usually this Council does like to get a fisheries update, like a status update before we get into that, so if we could play musical chairs and -- no.....

(Laughter)

MR. VICKERS: I forgot about that one.

MS. PERRY: We want to make sure Jake

0264

1 Musslewhite is able to provide his presentation. He  
2 does have a PowerPoint presentation so those of us on  
3 this row might need to wiggle around a little bit to  
4 see that. Thank you, Madame Chair.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
7 Perry.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 (Pause)

12

13 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: All right, thank you  
14 folks. For the record my name is Jake Musslewhite, I'm  
15 a Fishery Biologist for the Tongass National Forest.  
16 And we finally get to talk about fish.

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: All right, so I think  
21 we're in presentation mode there it looks like, or in  
22 speaker's mode or whatever.

23

24 (Pause)

25

26 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: But what I'm going to  
27 do is I'm going to take you a quick tour through this  
28 past season's fisheries. Most of the stuff is very  
29 preliminary, you know, so we don't have harvest data or  
30 anything yet, you know, we have escapement data from a  
31 kind of handful of key systems. So basically just kind  
32 of give you a snapshot of, you know, what the season  
33 was like.

34

35 So hopefully this thing will work for  
36 me.

37

38 (Pause)

39

40 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Maybe not.

41

42 (Pause)

43

44 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: All right. So we'll  
45 start with Unuk eulachon monitoring, near and dear to  
46 our hearts here in Ketchikan. So, you know, as you  
47 probably know for the past few years folks have been  
48 trying to keep an eye on what's going on with the Unuk  
49 eulachon, which is a pretty slippery creature to pin

50

1 down. So a lot of it has been what we'd call a  
2 qualitative rather than, you know, a quantitative so  
3 we're not really counting fish, it's more of a boots on  
4 the ground, eyes on the water type of effort just so we  
5 keep our finger on the pulse of what's going on there  
6 and, you know, talking to local land owners and things  
7 like that. So that's been a really adaptive effort,  
8 you know, with a lot of players everything going on  
9 there. You know they were there this spring, which has  
10 always been a rough time to kind of work in the field,  
11 and we did have some harvest open, you know, we're  
12 trying to keep some opportunity on that system. So,  
13 you know, there were a handful of permits with a limit  
14 of a five gallon bucket per household.

15  
16 So not a great year, again, on that  
17 qualitative scale this past year, it's weak, on a scale  
18 of weak, moderate, good, abundant. And then the bottom  
19 graph there, just to kind of give you some historical  
20 perspective, you know, it's too small to really see the  
21 scale but a lot of those blue bars on that bottom graph  
22 are, you know, the commercial harvest through the '70s  
23 and '80s that I think averaged around 12,000 pounds a  
24 year with some getting up to 30,000 pounds. And then I  
25 had to use a little magnifying glass to show you where  
26 we are now here with the past couple years.

27  
28 But at least we're keeping an eye on  
29 things and we're still hoping for those to come back to  
30 their former glory for sure.

31  
32 We'll start at the north kind of up at  
33 the Situk up in Yakutat, where it was a pretty decent  
34 year for sockeye and good enough for chinook. So the  
35 top graph there is sockeye with the black line with,  
36 you know, kind of the last few years is the other  
37 colors just so you can see and put it in perspective  
38 so, you know, exceeded the escapement goal of 30 to  
39 70,000 fish with the count of 90,000 through the weir  
40 there. Then for chinook, the count was 888, which is  
41 getting at least into the escapement goal. You know  
42 for the past few years we've been closing the chinook  
43 subsistence season or all fisheries really on the Situk  
44 until we see adequate escapements into those systems,  
45 so they're closed at the beginning at the season and I  
46 think they then reopened July 26th or something like  
47 that, in late July anyway. So relatively good news --  
48 pretty good news on the Situk this year.

49  
50

0266

1                   And then in sort of the Haines area,  
2 northern Lynn Canal, Chilkoot Lake and Chilkat Lake are  
3 the two major places where there's stock assessment  
4 projects run by ADF&G and for both of those, you know,  
5 they were pretty much square in the middle of where the  
6 escapement goals are. So things, at least, doing okay  
7 up there.

8  
9                   And then so Hoonah area, this is, of  
10 course, is something we'll be revisiting, there's an  
11 FRMP project at Neva Lake where things were on a long  
12 decline and now seem to be doing quite a bit better and  
13 stabilizing. We were down to something like 1,800 fish  
14 in 2015. Everyone put the brakes on, you know, with  
15 the fisheries and such and I'm looking -- I'm still  
16 counting fish, or you know the video, but I think we're  
17 going to be about 4,600 or something this year, there's  
18 still a bit of video to review. And of course we have  
19 a closure review so we'll be revisiting Neva here later  
20 in the meeting.

21  
22                   In the Angoon area, another FRMP  
23 project at Sitkho Lake. I happen to run that project  
24 and it's been a rough year on Sitkho Lake for me.  
25 Beavers have eaten everything I've thrown in the water,  
26 camera cables, light cables.....

27  
28                   (Laughter)

29  
30                   MR. MUSSLEWHITE: .....let's just say  
31 when the next wildlife cycle comes around I got a  
32 beaver proposal in mind.

33  
34                   (Laughter)

35  
36                   MR. MUSSLEWHITE: So I'm going to have  
37 a hard time coming up with, you know, a meaningful  
38 escapement estimate but things are actually looking  
39 really good. I spent a lot of time there, there's lots  
40 of fish on the beaches. I did get -- you know, 2,000 a  
41 fish in a day coming through the weir before the  
42 beavers ate the dam thing, so no real worries, you  
43 know, I think at Sitkho Lake for this year. In fact I  
44 would -- probably the northern Chatham Strait stocks  
45 that we've seen in general seem to be a pretty good  
46 year for sockeye, you know, not only the places that  
47 I've seen first hand, but also we had good test fishery  
48 catches and like Hawk Inlet test fisheries. It was a  
49 bad year for pinks in northern Chatham which means the  
50

0267

1 seine fisheries didn't open much which is a good thing  
2 for sockeye in northern Chatham. So, yeah, the one  
3 black hole of information of course would be Kanalku,  
4 you know, I haven't really got a lot of first hand  
5 accounts and we have no stock assessment program there  
6 anymore so that's one thing I'd really like to get a  
7 better handle of what's going on there.

8  
9                   And then maybe not a stock assessment  
10 project here, but just kind of one of the highlights of  
11 my season was I worked with the folks who run Angoon  
12 Youth Stewards there in Angoon. And I had a beach  
13 seine laying around and a boat and so we took all the  
14 kids and did a bunch of beach seining across the way at  
15 Basket Bay and caught a bunch of fish, processed them  
16 all, ate sockeye on the beach for dinner that night and  
17 then, you know, we went through the whole permit  
18 system, we taught them all about that and everything  
19 and then we took a bunch back to Angoon, put a notice  
20 up on FaceBook and handed fish out to the community so  
21 that was kind of the highlight of my season I think  
22 this year. It was super fun and the kids had a great  
23 time. And so we're going to try and expand that next  
24 year and try to hit a few more systems, get some more  
25 fish, kind of expand the program, add some data  
26 collection. You know I've always had a hard time  
27 getting scale samples and stuff so we can, you know, so  
28 we're going to try to use that as a way to get scale  
29 samples and additional information and such as well as  
30 just fish back to the community of Angoon.

31  
32                   As far as another FRMP project in the  
33 Sitka area, Klag Bay, that project run by Sitka Tribe.  
34 And maybe a little grimmer news there with the lowest  
35 escapement since monitoring began, you know, almost  
36 2,300 fish. And they do on-site harvest surveys, which  
37 is probably the best way to get the most accurate  
38 harvest information. So, you know, 1,600 fish  
39 harvested with 2,200 into the lake there. So, yeah,  
40 anyway, that's definitely something to keep an eye on.  
41 It's been kind of a long-term declining trend there.

42  
43                   But for some good news, a ton of fish  
44 at Redoubt. I think it's the second highest since  
45 monitoring began way back in the '80s, 90,000 plus into  
46 the lake, you know, so several multiples of the  
47 escapement goal of seven to 25,000 fish. And so that  
48 has a pretty established management plan so they pulled  
49 out all the stops and liberalized everything right down  
50

0268

1 to a commercial seine opening there. Yeah, so we'll  
2 see what kind of return we get out of 90,000 fish  
3 because, you know, you're kind of starting to get into  
4 maybe more than is good for it, but we'll see, I'm  
5 hoping more is more in this case.

6  
7 On the Stikine, you know, we had 101  
8 permits issued, a little over a thousand fish harvested  
9 in that fishery and as I think we mentioned before  
10 there was a lot of high water there which may have kept  
11 people off that stronger Tahltan stock and, you know,  
12 and then stuck fishing the kind of weaker, late run  
13 component there.

14  
15 And then closer to here, Prince of  
16 Wales, Hetta Lake, which had been seeing some  
17 extraordinarily low escapements the past couple of  
18 years seemed to bounce back a bit with escapement of  
19 over 9,000 through the weir there, which is way better  
20 than 558 that they had last year.

21  
22 And that's most of the highlights. I'd  
23 be happy to, you know, answer any questions or anything  
24 like that if anyone has anything, or observations.

25  
26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
27 Musslewhite. Very informative, good information, and  
28 getting us into the mood for fisheries. Appreciate  
29 that. Are there questions from the Council members  
30 regarding the presentation materials.

31  
32 Mr. Johnson and then Mr. Smith.

33  
34 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, Mr. Musslewhite.  
35 I was wondering on the Yakutat returns this year, I'm  
36 not sure on the kind of age return for sockeye on that  
37 system but I'm wondering, are we starting to see a  
38 bounce back from the 2018, is it a four year -- you  
39 know, this year's number is a four year since the 2018,  
40 kind of low, on sockeye, so what's happening there?

41  
42 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah. I don't know  
43 what the typical age structure of Situk sockeye is but,  
44 you know, they're typically like what we call 1:2's  
45 which of course is, you know, four years, so I mean I  
46 can go back and -- I don't know -- I can't remember if  
47 that slide had -- how far back that went so, yeah, so  
48 2018 like you had mentioned is that kind of low year,  
49 they just barely made escapement. So yeah depending on  
50

0269

1 what the age structure is, which I don't know, we'd be  
2 getting close to seeing the returns from that 2018  
3 brood year, if that's what you're asking, yeah.

4

5 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, thanks. I just --  
6 you know, I remember that year, pretty devastating for  
7 Yakutat and, you know, always curious to know what it  
8 means when that generation comes back to the river so I  
9 guess we're seeing that now.

10

11 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, sometimes those  
12 can be pretty surprising. Like we had a really bad  
13 return in, I think, 2018 to Sitkho Lake, there was a  
14 beaver dam -- beavers.....

15

16 (Laughter)

17

18 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: .....that blocked the  
19 passage to the lake for the bulk of the season and so  
20 we had, you know, a very small return, and yet they  
21 seemed to have come back like gangbusters this year so,  
22 yeah, there's no telling what they'll do.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr.  
25 Smith, you have a question for Mr. Musslewhite.

26

27 MR. SMITH: Yeah, it's really good to  
28 see the Angoon, the AYS Team Darren Snyder and myself  
29 and thinking of Josh and Gabe and Chris.....

30

31 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Eric.

32

33 MR. SMITH: .....Eric, yeah, yeah,  
34 yeah. Great team. And what community it's building  
35 between the tribe and the school district, yourself and  
36 the community, it's just awesome. Good to see that.

37

38 My question about the eulachon, seen  
39 the report about in this area, but what about Haines  
40 and Klukwan, and what's your thoughts about what's  
41 happening. Because I know I've been there -- I go  
42 there every year and I know one year we went there and  
43 they were pile-driving and they scared everything over  
44 into Skagway and so there was no return there and I  
45 actually think we put an amendment up there to stop any  
46 sound going on when they come in. But realizing the  
47 change in the river and also the last couple times  
48 where they were all the way on the other side of the  
49 river, so just maybe that's why what's going on is

50



0270

1 they're moving, but is there any other reasons, the  
2 return?

3

4 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the  
5 Chair. Member Smith. Yeah, there is actually an FRMP  
6 project up there that I didn't have a lot of  
7 information on so I didn't include it in this, it is  
8 studying the eulachon in a number of basins throughout  
9 the northern Lynn Canal area, it's a pretty ambitious  
10 project so they're doing kind of a lot of components  
11 and looking at using quantitative eDNA as a tool to  
12 perhaps, you know, assess some of these eulachon  
13 populations a little better, yeah. But I didn't  
14 include it because I didn't have a whole lot of  
15 information of what's going on. It's not a Forest  
16 Service, you know, it's a bunch of different partners  
17 up there.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Is there a group over there  
20 that's actually helping with data?

21

22 REPORTER: John, your mic.

23

24 MR. SMITH: Sorry. I was just curious,  
25 isn't there a group that's supporting some of the data  
26 support there with the eulachon, or the tribal folks  
27 there, no, yes?

28

29 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the  
30 Chair. Member Smith. Yeah, there's a bunch of  
31 partners in that project, you know, including, folks, I  
32 think from Haines, Skagway, there, yeah, and academic  
33 institutions and such, yeah, correct.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
36 you. Any other questions for Mr. Musslewhite. Ms.  
37 Phillips.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. On the  
40 eulachon video, or slide, is it possible that the  
41 eulachon might be going somewhere else and you're not  
42 seeing them in the Unuk?

43

44 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
45 Member Phillips. Eulachon are tough to figure out.  
46 They don't behave, you know, with nice site fidelity  
47 like salmon do, they're unpredictable sort of in their  
48 timing and everything so I think there's a lot of  
49 unknowns there. I doubt that that is a full

50

0271

1 explanation for the, you know, decline in that  
2 population. I don't think it's -- because we're not  
3 seeing them somewhere else so, you know, I think it's  
4 really a true decline that probably reflects a regional  
5 type effect. So, yeah.

6  
7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Smith.

8  
9 MR. SMITH: Yeah, it's interesting,  
10 just to share, there's a cultural story that comes from  
11 there that the eulachon didn't return and they used the  
12 (In Tlingit), their (In Tlingit), their spirit man who  
13 went out to go find them and he couldn't find them but  
14 later on he did and the interaction that they had  
15 because of the spirit that they had, they're bouncy,  
16 they're bright, they're exciting, so that the whole  
17 community -- but they did come back. So just  
18 understanding that a lot of our stories talk about and,  
19 you know, this story goes back many generations so this  
20 has happened before. So just to share, thank you.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there  
23 Council members on the phone that have any questions  
24 for Mr. Musslewhite.

25  
26 (No comments)

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I  
29 just wanted to check in on you guys.

30  
31 Ms. Phillips.

32  
33 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. On the Klag  
34 Bay, like -- so it's like way down, the returns, so I  
35 think CommFish has an indicator stream in like FortArm  
36 or something like that, are they seeing reduced numbers  
37 too, I mean so why -- I mean we do harvest there, on-  
38 site harvest survey of 1,600 fish but it shows -- what  
39 is this -- is this -- escapement is.....

40  
41 MR. JOHNSON: Well, the dash line is  
42 harvest, the grey line is escapement -- or grey bars.

43  
44 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, and they're on  
45 two separate scales. So the harvest scale's on the  
46 right, and escapement's on the left.

47  
48 MS. PHILLIPS: So escapement's pretty  
49 low is what you're showing.

50

0272

1 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Correct. Yeah, and  
2 has been on sort of a long-term, since, you know, since  
3 the early 2000s.

4  
5 MS. PHILLIPS: Who sets the harvest?  
6

7 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: The harvest limits  
8 there are set by the State. I believe they're 50 fish  
9 there but I believe that's what it is.

10  
11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wagner.  
12

13 MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
14 On the eulachons, were you there when they first came  
15 in, or were they already in the river?  
16

17 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: I did not do any of  
18 that work, that was done by Staff here in the Ketchikan  
19 office, John Hyde, I know is leading that effort but I  
20 probably would have tried to dodge it if I had been in  
21 the area, honestly but, yeah, so I'm not super  
22 familiar.  
23

24 (Laughter)

25  
26 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: I do have a report  
27 that, you know, I could refer you to that details it  
28 pretty well. I know they were there about early March,  
29 I think, mid-March, I think I have dates on there  
30 actually, kind of had the dates there.  
31

32 MR. WAGNER: Well, it happened right  
33 around when we had our spring meeting, March something.  
34 But I seen a rubber raft in there for a boat to get  
35 around, you folks have a good river boat to get around  
36 with.  
37

38 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
39 Yes, I think that -- I heard that that was a game  
40 changer for them, that it was an inflatable, that they  
41 were able to get into a plane and transport there and  
42 then have on-site for those surveys and what I heard  
43 was that it made it a lot more effective for them to be  
44 able to go from spot to spot. I think there might even  
45 be a jet boat there so I think that was a big deal for  
46 them.  
47

48 MR. WAGNER: Did they check anywhere  
49 else. It looks like they were up by the cabins up  
50

0273

1 there on the eulachon slough side?

2

3

4 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes. Like I said I  
5 have a fairly detailed report I could show you that has  
6 I think their daily activity log of all the places that  
7 they went and looked and, you know, what they saw in  
8 each spot.

8

9

10 MR. WAGNER: Yeah, and just share some  
11 information with you that they will go up on the  
12 Trickamin, go up Princess Bay, they'll go up the  
13 Blossom, down near Sweaton Bay and one year they went  
14 up Carroll Inlet and we went up and we got enough to  
15 make grease before it got closed on us but saved some  
16 eulachons, brought them over, and you people did a DNA  
17 on them, they were the eulachons from the Unuk and that  
18 was just coming back from the mining that occurred  
19 there. But it's very important to be there before they  
20 come in so you have a better idea. Because sometimes  
21 they'll go up one of the three streams there and  
22 they'll just plug that stream so you don't get much of  
23 a return when they all go up one side. When they  
24 spread out we have a good return.

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

When, my son and I, we went up after  
the meeting and it was just over and could see them on  
the meter the bay was just thick with them and the  
porpoises, I hadn't seen that many porpoises in I don't  
know how many years, they were feeding on them, usually  
they'll come and chase the boat, no, they stayed and  
they worked that whole bay. And what we could see on  
the meter was a lot. There is usually some herring up  
there but not like what that is on the eulachons. And  
about seven days after we seen them up there, my son  
and I, we were trolling in our bay, and we caught, I  
think like three different king salmon with eulachons  
in the stomach and they did that like the year before  
also. And this guy from Ketchikan, troller, Clyde, I  
can't remember his last name, he was trolling over in  
Moria Sound a few years ago before he passed away and  
he caught king salmon over there with the eulachons in  
the stomach and he was all excited. He let us know, he  
was a good friend to the people in Metlakatla, Clyde  
Cowin (ph). But, anyway, you have to be there to  
really know. You know if you go up late, it's usually  
the tail end.

But I have a question on the Chilkat. I  
used to fish the dog run up there in the fall, I didn't

0274

1 see anything on the dogs, have you folks done any study  
2 on the dog salmon, the chum?

3

4

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
5 No, those stock assessment projects are both run by the  
6 State and they're sockeye focused. I'm definitely  
7 aware of the big fall chum run on the Chilkat, I don't  
8 think they have like the fishwheels in or anything. I  
9 think they've pulled them by the time the fall chum are  
10 in, I could be wrong. But, yeah, usually at that  
11 point, like, you know, the District 15 gillnet  
12 fisheries are all closed down and that sort of thing.  
13 So I don't know what kind of stock assessment goes on  
14 for that part of the state.

15

16

MR. WAGNER: Yeah, it used to be really  
17 good fishing. The Haines Packing Company, the manager  
18 came down with his tendermen and looked at my boat to  
19 maybe buy and they told me the run was really depleted  
20 and it was in bad shape. So I was hoping maybe you had  
21 some good news on it coming back because that was  
22 really good fishing. We had fished the month of  
23 September and first part of October, and the snow  
24 landed on deck and we left and went home because the  
25 wind was with it.

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, anyway, thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
you, Mr. Musslewhite, for your report on the Southeast  
Federal Subsistence Fisheries Programs that we have.

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I think we're  
ready to move into our first proposal, which will be  
FP23-20 and we have Mr. Vickers from the Office of  
Subsistence Management coming up to present to us the  
analysis.

MR. VICKERS: Thank you. Hello. Madame  
Vice Chair. Members of the Council. My name is Brent  
Vickers and I am the Anthropology Division Supervisor  
at the Office of Subsistence Management. The analysis  
of Proposal FP23-20 begins on Page 42 of your Council  
meeting books.

This proposal was submitted by the  
Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

1 and requests the Federal Subsistence Board to recognize  
2 the customary and traditional uses of shellfish in the  
3 Southeast Alaska by rural residents of Southeast  
4 Alaska. The proponent states that during the Federal  
5 Subsistence Management Program's review of the  
6 customary and traditional use determination process in  
7 2016 the Southeast Alaska Council said it intended to  
8 submit regulatory proposals to the Board requesting to  
9 broaden the complex web of customary and traditional  
10 use determinations that existed in Southeast Alaska.  
11 The Board responded that the Council's recommendation  
12 regarding customary and traditional use determinations  
13 aligned well with the current process followed  
14 statewide in the Federal Subsistence Management  
15 Program. Since then, the Council has requested and the  
16 Board has adopted customary and traditional use  
17 determinations for fish, deer, moose, brown bear, and  
18 black bear that include all or most -- or most rural  
19 residents of Southeast Alaska. This has greatly  
20 simplified these determinations that were originally  
21 adopted from State regulations at the formation of the  
22 Federal Subsistence Management Program in 1992.

23  
24                   The Board makes customary and  
25 traditional use determinations based on a holistic  
26 application of the eight factors in regulation. The  
27 purpose of a customary and traditional use  
28 determination is to identify the eligible users of a  
29 resource. Residents of rural Southeast -- Southeast  
30 Alaska lump intertidal plants and animals together as  
31 beach food. Beach food is a good portion of the diet  
32 especially in winter and early spring when the  
33 availability of other fresh food is limited.

34  
35                   The Staff analysis reveals that  
36 shellfish have been seasonally harvested and used by  
37 Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian people of the Southeast  
38 Alaska region since well before historical contact and  
39 continue to be an important resource as documented in  
40 numerous ethnographies and studies of subsistence uses  
41 in the Southeast Alaska region. Harvest of shellfish  
42 for home use continues throughout the region in rural  
43 communities and constitutes a consistent pattern of  
44 use. Annual harvest estimates between the years 1983  
45 and 2015 were determined based on household surveys  
46 conducted by Alaska Department of Fish and Game,  
47 Division of Subsistence in collaboration with rural  
48 communities in the Southeast Alaska region. Based on  
49 these surveys, shrimp, crabs and clams are harvested in  
50

0276

1 the highest levels compared to other shellfish. In  
2 some communities, cockles, chitons, scallops, and  
3 octopi are also harvested at high levels compared to  
4 other shellfish. Smaller numbers of gooey ducks,  
5 mussels, scallops, sea cucumbers, abalone, and sea  
6 urchins are harvested. People sharing their harvest of  
7 wild resources and reliant upon a wide diversity of  
8 fish and wildlife are predominate features of  
9 subsistence economies in Alaska.

10

11 Wild resources were and continue to be  
12 distributed through kin and community networks.

13

14 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game,  
15 Division of Subsistence household surveys conducted  
16 between 1983 and 2015 demonstrate that high levels of  
17 sharing occurs in Southeast Alaskan communities.

18

19 Most rural communities in Southeast  
20 Alaska rely on a wide variety of wild resources. These  
21 resources comprise of a substantial portion of dietary  
22 intake. Overall annual harvest rates above 200 pounds  
23 per person are common. In general, rural Southeast  
24 Alaska communities harvest fish at the highest rate and  
25 land mammals, such as deer and moose, and shellfish are  
26 also harvested at high rates. Marine mammals, birds and  
27 plants and berries compose smaller portions of annual  
28 harvest but are important components of the diet.

29

30 Based on the analysis of shellfish use  
31 with the framework of the eight factors in regulatory  
32 -- in regulation that exemplify customary and  
33 traditional uses of resources, OSM prelimin -- the OSM  
34 preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal FP23-20.

35

36 The harvest and use of shellfish by  
37 rural residents of Southeast Alaska exemplify customary  
38 and traditional uses even though few marine waters are  
39 currently under Federal jurisdiction. Marine waters  
40 currently under Federal jurisdiction are primarily in  
41 Makhnati Island near Sitka. The Southeast Alaska  
42 Council's stated intent is to request the Board to  
43 recognize customary and traditional uses of all fish  
44 and wildlife in Southeast Alaska that have been taken  
45 for food or other purposes including handicrafts,  
46 ceremonies and customary trade. The Council said it --  
47 it's recommendations to the Board are intended to  
48 include residents of all rural Southeast communities  
49 and areas. This will greatly simplify the patchwork of  
50

0277

1 determinations.

2

3 Thank you, Madame Vice Chair. Members  
4 of the Council. This is the end of my presentation and  
5 I will try to answer any questions you have even though  
6 I wasn't the lead author on this, but I'll try.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
11 Vickers. Are there questions on the draft analysis  
12 from Council members.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Council members  
17 on the phone, are there any questions regarding the  
18 draft analysis presented by Mr. Vickers.

19

20 MR. SLATER: Not at this time, thank  
21 you.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
24 you. Mr. Kitka.

25

26 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
27 had no questions, just a comment. I'm glad to see this  
28 come around.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
31 you, Mr. Vickers. Is there a report on Board  
32 consultations, Mr. Lind.

33

34 MR. LIND: Good afternoon, Madame  
35 Chair. Council members. It's all really good to see  
36 you all. We had consultations on August 23rd for  
37 Regions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and during the consultations  
38 for your regions we did not have any questions or  
39 comments. Madame Chair, thank you.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
42 Lind. It's really good to see you too. All right.  
43 Agency comments, do we have any presentation from  
44 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. It looks like Ms.  
45 Sill.

46

47 MS. SILL: Thank you, Madame Chair. My  
48 name is Lauren Sill. I'm the Subsistence Resource  
49 Specialist for Southeast Alaska with the Alaska

50



0278

1 Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence.  
2 And I just have kind of a summary of our draft comments  
3 that were submitted to the Council.

4  
5                   So ADF&G is neutral on eligibility  
6 requirements for participation in the Federal  
7 Subsistence Program provided under ANILCA. We  
8 recommend the Federal Subsistence Board thoroughly and  
9 carefully review the data relevant to the eight  
10 criteria for the communities that currently lack a C&T  
11 finding.

12  
13                   As Mr. Vickers was mentioning,  
14 shellfish were and still are harvested year-round in a  
15 variety of locations utilizing multiple methods. They  
16 continue to be part of a wide range of resources relied  
17 upon by Southeast residents. Most shellfish harvested  
18 are harvested in marine waters and the majority of  
19 marine waters in Southeast are under State  
20 jurisdiction, therefore, contemporary shellfish harvest  
21 take place mostly under State subsistence regulations.  
22 Permits are generally not required to harvest shellfish  
23 under State subsistence with the exception of shrimp  
24 but shellfish are also harvested under personal use,  
25 sport and commercial fisheries.

26  
27                   The Federal C&T use determinations were  
28 adopted from a portion of the State's shellfish C&T  
29 findings in place at the time of the Federal  
30 Subsistence Management Program began. Those State C&T  
31 findings were crafted when the State subsistence law  
32 recognized a rural priority and so took into account a  
33 community's traditional use areas. State C&T findings  
34 have been modified and expanded since that time.

35  
36                   In terms of conservation issues, I  
37 guess there are some conservation concerns that exist  
38 in Southeast Alaska, Yakutat area for some shellfish  
39 stocks in various locations including abalone, king  
40 crab, tanners and dungeness, and in terms of  
41 enforcement issues, it does seem there could possibly  
42 be some enforcement issues if the Board adopts Federal  
43 subsistence regulations for the harvest of shellfish in  
44 marine waters that don't align with the State's  
45 subsistence regulations. And also as the proposal is  
46 written and under current regulations, there's not a  
47 map or anything to provide clarity for Federally-  
48 qualified users to know if where they're harvesting is  
49 one of the Federal marine waters areas.

50

0279

1                   That's all I have, thank you.

2

3                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are  
4 there questions for Ms. Sill. Mr. Smith.

5

6                   MR. SMITH: Yeah, just questioning the  
7 -- you said permitting, so you're talking about  
8 harvesting cockles or clams or even seaweed, don't you  
9 need to have a fishing license to harvest? I know that  
10 here pretty soon, you know, people are making money off  
11 the bullkelp or the seaweed that's attached to the --  
12 so understanding that anything that's broke from that  
13 and comes up on the beaches, you know, sustainable to  
14 grab without permit but, you know, harvesting off the  
15 land, don't you need to have even just a fishing permit  
16 or not? Because I have families that were asking some  
17 of these questions.

18

19                   MS. SILL: Sure. Through the Chair.  
20 Member Smith. So Federal subsistence goes on where it  
21 is that you're participating in activities, so around  
22 Juneau or around Ketchikan, it's a non-subsistence  
23 area, so to participate in fisheries there, they're  
24 personal use or sport and you do need a fisheries  
25 license or a permit of some sort, but if you're outside  
26 of those areas then generally, no, you do not. Shrimp  
27 is one exception to that where there is a permit now in  
28 place for subsistence, sport, everything, for shrimp.

29

30                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other  
31 questions for Ms. Sill.

32

33                   (No comments)

34

35                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Council members  
36 on the phone, are there any questions regarding ADF&G's  
37 comments on the proposal.

38

39                   (No comments)

40

41                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
42 you. Are there any other Federal agency comments  
43 regarding the wildlife proposal -- sorry, Fisheries  
44 Proposal 23-20.

45

46                   (No comments)

47

48                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
49 tribal comments. Mr. Gallegos.

50

1                               MR. GALLEGOS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
2 Council. My name is Tony Gallegos. I am the Cultural  
3 Resource Director with the Ketchikan Indian Community  
4 here in Ketchikan. And I just wanted to make a few  
5 comments on this particular proposal. It mirrors a  
6 proposal that the tribe, meaning Ketchikan Indian  
7 Community, submitted to the Board of Fish during this  
8 last cycle. It basically was to do a C&T finding for  
9 beach foods, was basically how it was written. During  
10 the discussion of that proposal, there was some  
11 modifications made because plants are not part of the  
12 jurisdictional authority that Fish and Game can have  
13 jurisdiction over. So we -- there were some changes  
14 made at that time but we do really see the value in  
15 doing a customary and traditional use finding for all  
16 of these beach-related foods that are used throughout  
17 the area in all locations as opposed to the piecemeal  
18 inconsistent way that it's structured right now which  
19 is difficult for any users, or for enforcement, and  
20 just doesn't show the fact that tribes have, throughout  
21 their history, utilized these foods in various amounts  
22 and in various locations but they were all utilized.

23  
24                               One of the concerns that was brought up  
25 during the discussion, and the Board -- by the way this  
26 was Proposal 170 of the Board of Fish, if anybody  
27 wanted to look up the details and see the comments on  
28 that, but they took no action on that particular  
29 proposal. They let us know that they wanted to engage  
30 in further discussions, they found it quite  
31 interesting. Their -- some of their concerns were over  
32 the commercial, some of these species, whether it's  
33 crab, shrimp, abalone, are commercial harvested species  
34 as well, so concerns there and how they would address  
35 those led them to the point that they kind of delayed  
36 any action on that. But we do see the value of --  
37 whether these are commercial species or not, and  
38 whether they're plants or not, these foods should be  
39 broadly considered traditional and customary use  
40 throughout all of Southeast Alaska.

41  
42                               The other concern that our tribe has  
43 when we prepared this, is the fact that there is a  
44 large push for mariculture. Really there's a very much  
45 significant push since the development of the  
46 Mariculture Taskforce, a lot of money is going into  
47 really promoting those activities and we think if we  
48 don't have a recognition, that a lot of these beach  
49 foods are traditional and customary use, they may be  
50

0281

1 utilized commercial to the detriment of the population  
2 and to the access of those by our other tribal users in  
3 the area.

4  
5 One of the things to note which relates  
6 to this, and relates to a proposal you'll be hearing  
7 tomorrow about our rural status for Ketchikan is the  
8 fact as Ms. Sill mentioned, we're in a non-subsistence  
9 area, so a lot of these things don't apply and that  
10 becomes another catch for us as far as being a non-  
11 subsistence area. We hope that the alignment of the  
12 State and Federal rules can come into alignment. Who  
13 steps first, whether it's the Fish and Game or whether  
14 it's the Feds is always kind of like, you know, is up  
15 in the air. But I would really ask this Council here  
16 to move this proposal forward and take that step to  
17 recognize traditional beach foods as customary and  
18 traditional use broadly and that hopefully Fish and  
19 Game can follow suit with the steps that you guys take,  
20 that we can go ahead and align these for simplification  
21 and for the recognition of these very important foods.

22  
23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
24 you. Are there questions for Mr. Gallegos. Mr.  
25 Johnson.

26  
27 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Gallegos.  
28 Could you -- I'm curious about that link between the  
29 cultural and traditional desig -- the C&T versus the  
30 mariculture development, do you know more details there  
31 about like what a C&T designation would mean for the  
32 use of -- you kind of alluded that they would be off  
33 limits to commercial use at that point, but could you  
34 talk a little bit more about that, what you do know?

35  
36 MR. GALLEGOS: And I don't know any  
37 specifics on that, but I know that potentially there  
38 may be some value to protect the resources, what that  
39 protection is, is it something that's regulatory or  
40 not, I don't know. I do think that just the  
41 recognition that this is a food source and traditional  
42 foods will allow for a more open discussion before  
43 these foods and some of the locations where they're  
44 looking at putting mariculture practices in are more  
45 seriously considered in the permitting process.

46  
47 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks.

48  
49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other  
50

0282

1 questions for Mr. Gallegos.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
6 you for that. Are there any other comments on the  
7 proposal by tribal entities.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Do  
12 we have any comments from other Regional Advisory  
13 Councils.

14

15 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. No other  
16 Regional Advisory Councils commented on this proposal.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are  
19 there any comments from Fish and Game Advisory  
20 Committees.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
25 comments from Subsistence Resource Commissions.

26

27 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. I just wanted  
28 to hold a moment to see if Barbara Cellarius,  
29 Coordinator for the Subsistence Resource Commission was  
30 on but I believe she's not. She did advise that there  
31 were no comments on any of the Southeast proposals this  
32 time around. Thank you.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Ms.  
35 Perry, can you give us a summary of written public  
36 comments.

37

38 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, thank you.  
39 Mr. Vickers is coming up to share that. Thank you.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. Mr.  
42 Vickers.

43

44 MR. VICKERS: There was one written  
45 public comment received regarding this proposal. The  
46 Tongass Womens Earth and Climate Action Network opposed  
47 the proposal. They said that expanding the number of  
48 Federally-qualified subsistence users during times of  
49 shortages is contradictory to the original intent of

50

0283

1 the law, including ANILCA, protecting Alaska Native  
2 cultural existence. Additionally, expanding customary  
3 and traditional use determinations to all Colonial-  
4 based settlements is not justifiable.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Vickers. All right, we're now moving into public  
10 comment on the proposal. I have two blue cards and I'll  
11 take them in order as they were handed to me. So Mr.  
12 Larry Bemis are you with us in the room.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm not seeing  
17 you. Amy Dougherty.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, is  
22 there any other public comment on the telephone  
23 regarding Fisheries Proposal 23-20.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Last call for  
28 public comment on the proposal.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.  
33 Fellow Council members we are now at the point in this  
34 proposal where we need to provide our recommendation  
35 and at this time I'd entertain a motion.

36

37 Ms. Phillips.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
40 Move to support Proposal FP23-20.

41

42 MR. CASIPIT: Second.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Seconded by Cal.  
45 Now we're in deliberations for Fisheries Proposal 23-20  
46 regarding customary and traditional use determination  
47 for Southeast Alaska and Yakutat area shellfish. Are  
48 there Council comments, we are going to need to provide  
49 some justification.

50

0284

1 Mr. Casipit.

2

3 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.

4 Yeah, I just have a few comments and I'll have some  
5 items for justification as well.

6

7 I heard through the testimony --  
8 through some of the testimony and the Staff  
9 presentation that its -- you know, only Makhnati Island  
10 is involved in this right now and that might be true  
11 right now, but I remember that we got -- over the  
12 summer we got the maps of all the submerged areas that  
13 are currently -- I guess there's a proposed rule out  
14 now for including those in the Federal Program, those  
15 might come to the Federal Program so there's more --  
16 potentially more marine waters that could come to the  
17 Program, and I -- I don't want to sit here and decide  
18 what communities might have harvesters there or who  
19 might harvest there, I just want to make sure that if  
20 people want to harvest there, they can and I think this  
21 is the first step in doing that. So that's why I'm in  
22 support of this.

23

24 You know, like we heard about, you  
25 know, maybe localized conservation issues with  
26 shellfish throughout Southeast, but I'm not sure those  
27 can be attributed to any subsistence users, I think  
28 most of those issues deal with commercial fisheries so  
29 I'm not sure that that's even a concern for us, we're  
30 talking about customary and traditional uses here,  
31 we're not talking about conservation issues.

32

33 I think there's more than substantial  
34 evidence here. There's a great amount of evidence here  
35 that beach foods, if you will, were used by virtually  
36 ever village in Southeast so, you know, I think there's  
37 more than substantial evidence to support that.

38

39 I think it will be beneficial to  
40 subsistence users, again, because we're going to  
41 hopefully -- if people want to harvest there, that  
42 we'll have some regulations in place to allow that at  
43 some point in time but the first step here is the  
44 customary and traditional use determination, and I  
45 really don't think this recommendation for C&T use is  
46 really going to restrict any other users at this point.

47

48 So I'm all in favor of it. I think  
49 it's well supported and, yeah, thanks.

50

0285

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
2 Cal Casipit, for giving us good justification for  
3 support for this proposal. Mr. Wagner.

4  
5                   MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
6 This proposal was put forward by the Alaska Department  
7 of Fish and Game -- no, I see the RAC Board did it.

8  
9                   MS. PHILLIPS: Us.

10  
11                   MR. WAGNER: Okay. One of the big  
12 concerns I have is, is someone going to come in and  
13 tell us how much we can take because we just take what  
14 we need and sometimes we have to get it for families,  
15 especially like seaweed, and the greens and everything,  
16 we know where to go, I mean we've been doing it forever  
17 since it's been on the island. But that's a concern I  
18 have. It seems like our people will get regulated  
19 immediately on everything and say, oh, you can only  
20 bring one little bag of seaweed, we all eat more than  
21 that. And, you know, the greens, there's a lot of  
22 places for the greens, you have to know where to go and  
23 there's not a whole lot but, again, we take what we  
24 need so other families go out and they get some. So  
25 that's just a concern I have, if there's an answer for  
26 that. It seems like we get limited all the time and  
27 cut back, you know, and this is not easy work, it's  
28 hard work to go harvest and it takes a lot of gas to go  
29 around to different spots so and with gas pushing \$7 a  
30 gallon. Can you answer that, thank you.

31  
32                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wagner. I  
33 see Mr. Vickers came up to the front of the room, he  
34 might be wanting to provide some clarity. I will add  
35 that -- before he comes up, if we want that -- that  
36 this is a C&T determination proposal, so it doesn't --  
37 it's not actually about regulations, it's for down the  
38 line when regulations are developed that a customary  
39 and traditional use determination for those resources  
40 have been already put in place and then would, thus,  
41 allow for a meaningful subsistence priority for  
42 communities that have a positive C&T determination  
43 associated with it in times of conservation. And so  
44 right now the C&T determinations for shellfish are not  
45 inclusive of all species and they're very specialized  
46 around specific areas and the effects of this proposal  
47 would be to provide a broader C&T determination for all  
48 communities in Southeast Alaska in these areas.

49  
50



0286

1 Does that help, or would you like more  
2 clarification from Mr. Vickers?

3  
4 MR. WAGNER: No, that helps. It's just  
5 my concern, because we've always had it. We've had it  
6 forever, we never had to have it in black and white  
7 from anyone. But, yeah, thank you for that. I'll go  
8 along with it, whatever the Council does here. But it  
9 just concerns me because like I say, it's been there,  
10 we harvest it, we only miss it if the weather's too  
11 bad. A lot of it's on the outside.

12  
13 Thank you.

14  
15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Right. Right.  
16 It's good to have clarity in what we're doing. All  
17 right, other Council members with deliberation comments  
18 regarding their support or opposition for the proposal.

19  
20 Mr. Smith.

21  
22 MR. SMITH: Yeah, just to connect with  
23 Cal and some information that kind of showcases a lot  
24 of the foods that our families eat. This USDA and the  
25 Forest Service put this book with a lot of our family  
26 and our elders sharing about all the foods we get off  
27 the beach so inside there you go to a certain page here  
28 and it actually showcases a whole chart, gives all the  
29 nutritional value and everything to it, it even has a  
30 CD. It's really cool to hear that. But I hear what  
31 you're saying because I'm from Juneau and I have to  
32 travel and that's why you see our skiffs in your -- in  
33 Angoon and other places because we can't do that kind  
34 of stuff in Juneau too much.

35  
36 Hurrah. Happy Day.

37  
38 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Would our  
39 Council members on the phone, either one like to chime  
40 in on the deliberations and discussion regarding this  
41 proposal.

42  
43 MR. SLATER: Yes, Madame Chair, this is  
44 Jim. I would -- more data, I believe is always  
45 helpful. So I support this in documenting the uses.

46  
47 Thank you.

48  
49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright.

50

0287

1 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
2 You know in the Tlingit culture, the saying is always  
3 when the tide is out the table is set, you know, so for  
4 us to continue on taking care of the way we live I  
5 agree.

6  
7 Gunalcheesh.

8  
9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
10 Wright.

11  
12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.

13  
14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: The question's  
15 been called. We are now voting on Proposal --  
16 Fisheries Proposal 23-20 to revise the customary and  
17 traditional use determination for Southeast, Yakutat  
18 area shellfish. All in favor say aye.

19  
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed, say  
23 nay.

24  
25 (No opposing votes)

26  
27 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carried.  
28 All right, we're moving along.

29  
30 (Laughter)

31  
32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Next up we have  
33 Fisheries Proposal 23-21, limit sockeye salmon harvest  
34 in Kah Sheets Lake and River to Federally-qualified  
35 subsistence users, and it sounds like Mr. Sander's  
36 going to come up and give us the draft Staff analysis.

37  
38 MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
39 For the record my name is Andrew Sanders and I'm a  
40 Biologist for the Forest Service on the Tongass  
41 National Forest. Next to me I have Robert Cross, the  
42 Subsistence Coordinator for the Tongass National  
43 Forest.

44  
45 Federal Fisheries Proposal 23-21 can be  
46 found on Page 73 of your meeting book and requests  
47 closing the Federal waters of Kah Sheets Creek and Kah  
48 Sheets Lake to non-Federally-qualified subsistence  
49 users. The proponent states that subsistence harvest  
50

1 of sockeye salmon at Kah Sheets Creek has been  
2 decreasing since 2012 due to conflict between  
3 Federally-qualified subsistence users and non-  
4 Federally-qualified users. The proponent attributes  
5 this conflict to the limited time and space suitable  
6 for fishing stating that the Kah Sheets River has a  
7 very large tidal flat restricting access to large tides  
8 during daylight hours, limiting the number of harvest  
9 days. The proponent also noted that harvest in Kah  
10 Sheets Creek is generally concentrated to a small pool  
11 below a set of waterfalls and is limited to very few  
12 harvesters at any one time. Further, the proponent  
13 states that public cabins located above and below the  
14 harvest area add to the overall competition with  
15 Federally-qualified harvesters.

16  
17 Overall, the proponent writes that the  
18 low return of sockeye salmon to Kah Sheets Lake,  
19 limited harvest days, concentration of harvesters in  
20 one pool and sportfishing by unguided lodge guests has  
21 restricted Federally-qualified harvesters ability to  
22 harvest meaningful amounts of sockeye salmon.

23  
24 This system does not have an active  
25 monitoring project or any estimates of sockeye  
26 escapement but sockeye salmon harvest reported by  
27 Federally-qualified users at Kah Sheets has steadily  
28 decreased over the past decade.

29  
30 The preliminary OSM conclusion is to  
31 support Proposal FP23-21 with modification to close Kah  
32 Sheets Creek to non-Federally-qualified users from July  
33 1st to July 31st while leaving Kah Sheets Lake open to  
34 all users. Eliminating competition by non-subsistence  
35 users at this location while keeping Kah Sheets Lake  
36 open to all users will give a Federal preference to  
37 rural residents and reduce user conflicts over sockeye  
38 salmon while being less restrictive than a full  
39 closure.

40  
41 Thank you, Madame Chair. I can take  
42 questions from the Council at this time.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
45 Sanders. Are there any questions for Mr. Sanders from  
46 Council members regarding the draft analysis.

47  
48 Mr. Casipit.

0289

1 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
2 Mr. Sanders. Correct me if I'm wrong but under the  
3 State system, there are no subsistence permits  
4 available there, is that true?

5  
6 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair.  
7 Council Member Casipit. There is a personal use  
8 fishery there.

9  
10 MR. CASIPIT: But not a State  
11 subsistence fishery?

12  
13 MR. SANDERS: Not that I know of, no.

14  
15 MR. CASIPIT: So the fishing that  
16 occurs there is under Federal permits?

17  
18 MR. SANDERS: Correct.

19  
20 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Can I ask a  
23 followup to that question, Ms. Phillips, before I  
24 recognize you?

25  
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I have a  
29 followup to what Cal just asked. There's a personal  
30 use fishery there so this proposal would not affect the  
31 personal use fishery because it's a State personal use  
32 fishery at Kah Sheets?

33  
34 MR. CROSS: For the record, my name is  
35 Rob Cross with the Forest Service. Madame Chair, so to  
36 clarify, there really isn't a personal use fishery  
37 there just because of the terrain, it's a huge tidal  
38 flat. I'm unsure as to the State regulations as to  
39 whether people can participate in a personal use  
40 fishery but the fishing that's in question here, or  
41 that would be restricted is sportfishing. So really  
42 it's a matter of competition for space for harvesting  
43 on this system. So there's very limited amount of room  
44 for people to subsistence harvest and the conflict  
45 happens when sportfishermen are there participating in  
46 the sportfishery. So this -- to your question, this  
47 would not affect any sort of personal use fishery out  
48 in the salt water, this is only -- with the  
49 modification, this is only proposing to restrict  
50

0290

1 sportfishing in freshwater.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Cross. Ms. Phillips, you had a question.

5

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
7 Mr. Sanders, is there an escapement goal for that Kah  
8 Sheets sockeye stock?

9

10 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
11 answer your question Council Member Phillips. No,  
12 there's not an escapement goal for Kah Sheets Creek.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Other questions  
15 from Council members regarding the Staff analysis.

16

17 Ms. Phillips.

18

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
20 Is there fishing for sockeye above the waterfall?

21

22 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
23 Council Member Phillips. No, the entirety of the  
24 fishing there happens at the hole below the falls.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Other questions  
27 on the Staff analysis.

28

29 MR. SLATER: Yeah, Madame Chair, this  
30 is Jim on the phone.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater.

33

34 MR. SLATER: Yeah, I guess -- I've been  
35 to Kah Sheets Lake, stayed at the cabin there and been  
36 up and down to see the falls in the lower cabin and  
37 then been there on another visit or two just coming in  
38 my boat. And I do remember fishing for sockeye up  
39 above as well, and then later fishing for coho up in  
40 the lake. And, anyway, one thing that did note to me,  
41 this was in the '90s and it was the start of the self-  
42 guided lodges in Petersburg there and we did see people  
43 from that lodge coming to the falls and fishing for  
44 coho. I'm just wondering, that was 20-some years ago  
45 and I know that the self-guided businesses increased  
46 quite a bit, has -- are there several self-guided or  
47 Bare Boat Charter Lodge in the Petersburg area now, has  
48 that presence increased or has that stayed the same; do  
49 you know?

50

0291

1 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair. It's  
2 hard to say how that has changed or increased. There's  
3 not very good data on the sport use there.

4  
5 MR. SLATER: Okay. From my experience,  
6 going there and just watching the coho go up the falls,  
7 all of a sudden I think about eight people from the  
8 lodge showed up and crowded around there and so I can  
9 understand the comments from the writer of this  
10 proposal, being that they were overwhelmed by non-  
11 Federally-qualified sportsfishermen. So, thank you, I  
12 just wanted to understand what the trend was as far as  
13 the pressure from non-Federally-qualified users was in  
14 that area.

15  
16 Thanks.

17  
18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are  
19 there other Council questions regarding the Staff  
20 analysis.

21  
22 Ms. Phillips.

23  
24 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So there's a  
25 conclusion to support with a modification, July 1 to  
26 July 31st, are there sockeye in that system before and  
27 after those dates?

28  
29 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair. There  
30 was a weir on Kah Sheets in the mid-1960s and at that  
31 time they did observe sockeye there after the 31st of  
32 July but the majority, if not the entirety of reported  
33 subsistence harvest in that system happens during the  
34 month of July.

35  
36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.

37  
38 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
39 just wondered, the sportfishing that you speak of, are  
40 they snagging or are the fish biting?

41  
42 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
43 Council Member Kitka. It is my understanding that the  
44 predominant form of sportfishing there is what's known  
45 as flossing, which.....

46  
47 (Laughter)

48  
49 MR. SANDERS: .....I will refrain from  
50

0292

1 describing.

2

3

(Laughter)

4

5

6

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Other questions regarding the Staff analysis.

7

8

(No comments)

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

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, I have a question, it might be two parts depending on how it's answered, I think. Is there a conservation concern on this run of sockeye at Kah Sheets and then given that the data collection seems to have been concentrated on the 1960s, do you have any updated information regarding the population of sockeye in Kah Sheets and the run timing? This kind of gets at Ms. Phillips' question, too, I think. Because, you know, we have seen run timing changes in small creeks in Southeast Alaska over time. And given that the last data collection efforts may have been in the 1960s and we're now in 2022, do you expect that there could have been run timing or more -- what do we know about the sockeye salmon and potential conservation concerns.

MR. SANDERS: Madame Chair. It's difficult to draw conclusions about the state of the population in Kah Sheets, it's a small system that is fairly difficult to get to and study. There is a lack of data. While I do think that it is possible that there have been changes in run timing, I don't think that they have been severe enough that the people going there to subsistence harvest would be missing the run. I don't think that it's changing a month earlier, a month later, but no -- the data that we have regarding a potential conservation concern is related to decreasing success by subsistence harvesters.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any other questions on the Staff analysis. Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, just curious that is there any other rivers that you've actually -- that has the same numbers of -- negative numbers that you've actually shut down completely from anybody fishing? I mean is this a river that you -- I mean I know you're suggesting that you leave it open for the locals but I'm thinking, is it at a point to where you need to shut it down completely and give it a year like I seen

0293

1 they've done that in other rivers, where they've  
2 actually stopped and then have it come back without  
3 any.

4  
5 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
6 Council Member Smith. To answer your question, I would  
7 like to say that I think the issue here is -- I think  
8 there is a potential conservation concern and people  
9 are struggling to get the fish that they got in the  
10 past, but the primary concern is the lack of space and  
11 so when there are sportfishers present, they tend to  
12 fish for a long time in that spot, and when subsistence  
13 harvesters are present they tend to get their fish and  
14 leave. Often if people arrive at Kah Sheets to harvest  
15 and they see that sportfishermen are present they will  
16 not attempt to fish, they will just leave and go home  
17 and so it's more about ensuring that the very limited  
18 amount of space is available more than a limited amount  
19 of fish.

20  
21 MR. SMITH: What's their count a day  
22 fishing there?

23  
24 MR. SANDERS: The average subsistence  
25 user at Kah Sheets fishes for one to two days a season  
26 and they will generally harvest four to eight fish per  
27 day.

28  
29 MR. SMITH: So there's no limit, they  
30 could keep -- or is there a limit? That's what.

31  
32 (Pause)

33  
34 MR. SANDERS: I believe the limit is 10  
35 fish.

36  
37 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

38  
39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka -- or,  
40 wait, Mr. Douville, were you signaling out a question,  
41 you looked at me and smiled first.

42  
43 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
44 A couple questions. I assume that they're fishing with  
45 a State permit at this time to subsistence fish in that  
46 river system?

47  
48 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
49 Council Member Douville. It's a -- this is Federal  
50



0294

1 subsistence fishing and so a State fishing license is  
2 not required to fish under a Federal permit.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Followup.

5

6 MR. DOUVILLE: So who's issuing the  
7 initial permits, is it the State that they're fishing  
8 in this system, a State issued permit?

9

10 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
11 Council Member Douville. The subsistence harvesters  
12 that I'm referring to here are harvesting under a  
13 Federal subsistence permit.

14

15 MR. DOUVILLE: One more question.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr.  
18 Douville.

19

20 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. Maybe it's in  
21 here but I haven't looked that close. I just wondered  
22 what the description of legal gear under the Federal  
23 permit is for this system. Thank you.

24

25 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair. I'm  
26 sorry, Council Member Douville, but I did not quite  
27 understand your question.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Under the  
30 Federal permit, what is the legal gear allowable for  
31 fishing?

32

33 MR. SANDERS: Oh, the legal gear  
34 allowable -- I would have to have the permit in front  
35 of me, but it's a pretty broad different classes of  
36 gear that are allowed there from rod and reel to  
37 various types of nets but the preferred method is  
38 dipnetting.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka, and  
41 then Mr. Casipit.

42

43 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
44 wanted to know on State sportfish, or State personal  
45 use, is there an annual limit that they're allowed,  
46 realizing that they got a daily take limit, but is it  
47 different than the Federal, how much is the annual  
48 limit on the Federal subsistence take?

49

50

0295

1 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
2 Council Member Kitka. I'm sorry but I am not sure what  
3 the State limits might be for that system.

4  
5 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Casipit.

6  
7 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
8 I do -- I can answer your question Harvey. First of  
9 all, the Federal limit there is 10 daily, 20 annually,  
10 so a household can harvest 20 fish annually there.  
11 They'd have to do it over two days because the daily  
12 limit is 10. As far as I know the State limit there is  
13 the State sportfishing limit for that species, which is  
14 six a day, 12 in possession and no annual limit per  
15 individual. And, you know, this is kind of bleeding  
16 into what we'll be talking about at the closure review  
17 next time.

18  
19 But, you know, 10 fish a day, that's  
20 hardly worth it. Hardly worth it making the trip.  
21 Now, a sportfisherman from one of these roll your own  
22 lodges or whatever, you know, they probably don't care  
23 that the gasoline cost \$6.30 a gallon, your average  
24 subsistence user probably does have a concern about  
25 \$6.30 per gallon gas. And irrespective of what's  
26 happened with the personal use fishery out in  
27 saltwater, what the limits there or whatever are, you  
28 know, that's a personal use fishery, it has no priority  
29 under the State system. So, anyway, those are more  
30 observations than a question, but I felt like I had to  
31 step in there to answer a question. I apologize to  
32 Staff.

33  
34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for  
35 that clarification. It is something that we've -- I  
36 mean we've addressed this system in the past through  
37 the Board of Fish process and haven't made much headway  
38 using that tactic and so I think we're still trying to  
39 make sure that we understand what the effects of this  
40 proposal are and so I appreciate Cal's clarification on  
41 that. And I saw Mr. Smith and then Mr. Hernandez.

42  
43 MR. SMITH: Yeah, that's 'why I was  
44 kind of asking about the limits and thank you, Cal, it  
45 kind of makes a big difference to hear that, that, you  
46 know, we have an issue there and the low numbers but  
47 we're going to cut off the guests that come here to  
48 harvest fish. I truly -- just my feelings, and to  
49 where we possibly need to -- the local families, to  
50

0296

1 drop the number down just to make it equal. Just a  
2 thought, and maybe a conversation we can have, because  
3 our objective mainly is to protect the fish.

4

5 And I'm just sharing a feeling is all.  
6 Thank you.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

9

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, just something  
11 else to consider. You know virtually all the people  
12 other than the non-resident sportsfishermen who would  
13 be inclined to fish this area would be Federally-  
14 qualified, you know, Wrangell, Petersburg, basically  
15 would be the main people and they're -- you know  
16 they're eligible for Federal permits, they could get a  
17 State permit as well. So really you're talking about  
18 bag and possession limits for personal use and  
19 subsistence, it's the same people that would be  
20 eligible under Federal subsistence fishing permits as  
21 well. So the issue really is the non-resident, you  
22 know, fisheries, which are only eligible to go  
23 sportfishing there, they can't participate in any other  
24 fishery so.

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are  
27 there any other questions regarding the draft Staff  
28 analysis on this proposal.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
33 you Mr. Sanders and Mr. Cross.

34

35 MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Do we have a  
38 report on Board consultation, Mr. Lind.

39

40 MR. LIND: Afternoon Madame Chair.  
41 Council members. During our consultation session held  
42 on August 23rd we did not have any questions or  
43 comments on Fisheries Proposal 23-21. Thank you,  
44 Madame Chair.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
47 you. Agency comments, Alaska Department of Fish and  
48 Game.

49

50

0297

1 (No comments)

2

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there anyone  
5 online from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game that  
6 wishes to bring forward comments on Fisheries Proposal  
7 23-21.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
11 comments from other Federal agencies.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Comments from  
16 tribal entities.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
21 moving into Advisory Group comments, are there any  
22 comments from any other Regional Advisory Councils.

23

24 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. No other  
25 Regional Advisory Councils commented on this proposal.  
26 Thank you.

27

28 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
29 comments from any Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
34 comments from Subsistence Resource Commissions.

35

36 MS. PERRY: Wrangell-St. Elias SRC  
37 chose not to comment. Thank you.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, does  
40 Staff have a summary of any written public comments on  
41 the proposal, or were there an

42

43 MR. SANDERS: For the record this is  
44 Andrew Sanders. Madame Chair, there were two public  
45 comments both in support. They can be found on Page 90  
46 in your books. Both were in support of the proposal.  
47 They stated support for the proposal to protect  
48 continued subsistence use of this stock through a  
49 closure to non-Federally-qualified users.

50

0298

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
2 you. Now, we'll move into public testimony. Is there  
3 any public testimony on Fisheries Proposal 23-21.

4  
5                   (No comments)

6  
7                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there anyone  
8 on the phone that wishes to provide public comment on  
9 the proposal.

10  
11                   (No comments)

12  
13                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. We  
14 are now at the point where we will consider the  
15 Regional Council recommendation and I will entertain a  
16 motion. Ms. Phillips.

17  
18                   MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
19 Move to approve FP23-21.

20  
21                   MR. CASIPIT: Second.

22  
23                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it's  
24 been moved and seconded to support, or adopt Fisheries  
25 Proposal 23-21, what is the Council's wish regarding  
26 this proposal.

27  
28                   Mr. Hernandez.

29  
30                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame  
31 Chair. I guess I just have a question is whether or  
32 not this Council wants to adopt this as modified which  
33 would require an amendment to the motion. If that  
34 would be the case. Or we could possibly withdraw this  
35 and maybe make a motion to adopt it as modified. I  
36 guess those are two options. But if we want to go the  
37 modified version we need to take an additional action  
38 here.

39  
40                   MR. CASIPIT: Madame Chair, I seconded  
41 because it was as originally proposed.

42  
43                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

44  
45                   MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair, same here.

46  
47                   (Laughter)

48  
49                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for  
50

0299

1 that clarification, though, Mr. Hernandez. It's good  
2 to get on the record exactly what we're working on. So  
3 does anyone want to provide support, opposition,  
4 justification for this proposal.

5

6 Mr. Casipit.

7

8 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
9 I'll take a shot at justification. You know the first  
10 question we're supposed to consider is whether there's  
11 a conservation concern or not. I guess I'm really not  
12 sure, not without stock assessment data, but the fact  
13 that there are people there fishing and apparently it  
14 attracts a fairly good contingent of non-resident  
15 sportfishermen, I suppose, that there's a fair amount  
16 of sockeye there or fishermen wouldn't be showing up.  
17 Fish attract fishermen. So I think, you know, I don't  
18 know if there's a conservation concern, but I suspect  
19 not if there's lots of people showing up to fish.

20

21 Is the recommendation supported by  
22 substantial evidence. Yes. Again, I think there's  
23 more than substantial evidence here to show that people  
24 are harvesting under Federal regulations with a Federal  
25 permit. As far as I'm concerned it's a Federal fishery  
26 occurring in our jurisdiction, we have to provide that  
27 meaningful priority and if folks can't fish in those  
28 locations because of competition from sportfish -- non-  
29 resident sportfishermen, we need to act and we need to  
30 act decisively.

31

32 Will the recommendation benefit  
33 subsistence users. Yes, it will. Subsistence users  
34 have asked for this, I think we should provide it. And  
35 I don't think we're unnecessarily restricting other  
36 users. You know what, those -- you know there -- I  
37 really wish some of these non-Federally-qualified non-  
38 resident fishermen would realize that sockeye are  
39 important to the people that live here and, you know,  
40 they're really here to catch fish that bite, not to  
41 have to floss them or snag them or whatever you're  
42 calling them, as far as I'm concerned flossing is  
43 snagging in any book.

44

45 (Laughter)

46

47 MR. CASIPIT: So, yeah, I fully support  
48 this proposal. This is something that's concerned me  
49 for a really long time, even before I was on this

50

0300

1 Council, when I was Staff sitting over there, how  
2 things were going in Kah Sheets really bugged me, so  
3 I'm supporting this as written. You know I realize  
4 that most people prefer to fish at the falls but maybe  
5 some day they'll figure out, you know, another way to  
6 catch them. I know, you know, the folks in Hoonah, one  
7 of the users in Hoonah from a long time ago, he didn't  
8 use dipnet, he used a, as best as I can tell, is a  
9 gaff, with a really long handle. So -- and you could  
10 use something like that in a river, I mean you wouldn't  
11 have to be at a falls to use gear like that. So I  
12 would really like to keep it open -- or closed as much  
13 as -- close that whole river and lake as the proponent  
14 requested because, you know, in the future somebody may  
15 develop the skills and have the ability to harvest with  
16 other gear in different parts and I want to make sure  
17 they're not getting flooded out by non-resident  
18 sportfishermen as well.

19

20 So that's all I have, thank you, Ms.  
21 Chair.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
24 Casipit. Ms. Phillips.

25

26 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
27 The person who submitted the proposal is a Federally-  
28 qualified user and I'm very heartened that we have a  
29 Federal-qualified user sharing their local knowledge  
30 and presenting us with a proposal. The discussion  
31 states that the proponent states that the public cabins  
32 located above and below the harvest area add to the  
33 overall competition with Federally-qualified  
34 subsistence users and that's why I support the proposal  
35 as written.

36

37 Thank you, Madame Chair.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
40 Phillips. I kind of want to go back to this  
41 modification, if we can. I do have a little bit of  
42 question about it and reading the justification of why  
43 OSM proposed a modification to it. And I was a little  
44 bit confused. I thought their modification really only  
45 addressed like the where. But I think the difference  
46 is that right now we're thinking about this proposal in  
47 terms of like your justification that you guys have put  
48 on is about competition and without the modification  
49 that only closes out the competition for fishing for  
50

50

0301

1 sockeye, with the modification it closes out non-  
2 Federally-qualified users from actually going to that  
3 location to fish for any species and so that  
4 competition would still remain, meaning non-Federally-  
5 qualified users could still go in there and sort of  
6 take up space fishing for coho if the run timing of  
7 sockeye and coho are at the same time in July, or any  
8 other fish, I guess, that they're fishing. And so I  
9 think that's a little bit about the why OSM was  
10 suggesting that modification and I just wanted to bring  
11 that back up and maybe we need to ask Staff if I have  
12 that interpretation correct as we think about it, if  
13 you guys feel it's important.

14

15 I was -- yeah, the modification piece  
16 of it, I was a little bit confused by why they modified  
17 the original proposal.

18

19 Are you guys okay with that?

20

21 (Council nods affirmatively)

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I see one, yeah,  
24 all right. Can you guys explain what the effect of the  
25 modification would have been if we consider the  
26 modification to this proposal.

27

28 MR. CROSS: Yes, Madame Chair. For the  
29 record my name is Robert Cross. Yeah, so the original  
30 proposal as written was to close the river and the  
31 lake, Kah Sheets River and Kah Sheets Lake to the  
32 harvest of sockeye, and as Madame Chair mentioned, the  
33 intent of the proposal was to eliminate or reduce the  
34 competition for physical space, not necessarily for  
35 that one species. And so, as written, sportfishermen  
36 could still sit on that one rock that subsistence users  
37 use to fish and cast for cutthroat or whatever species  
38 they want, and it wouldn't be breaking the rules. And  
39 so the modification eliminated the closure of the lake  
40 because there is a cabin up there that people fly into  
41 and fish for cutthroat and Dollys and things like that  
42 and don't necessarily interfere with the main  
43 subsistence fishery, and so it drops the lake in the  
44 closure but then it closes the entire river during the  
45 main sockeye season, subsistence season to all fishing  
46 harvest by non-Federally-qualified users. And so that  
47 completely would -- is our thought that that would  
48 completely eliminate the competition for space and  
49 would be a better modification.

50



0302

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for  
2 that clarification. Ms. Phillips.

3  
4                   MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
5 So it would close it to all species of fish then, is  
6 that what I'm understanding?

7  
8                   MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member  
9 Phillips. Yes, as written the modification is to close  
10 Kah Sheets to non-Federally-qualified harvest.

11  
12                   MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

13  
14                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
15 you for that. Are there further questions regarding  
16 that piece of it before we go back to the main motion  
17 on the table.

18  
19                   MR. SLATER: Madame Chair.

20  
21                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.

22  
23                   MR. SLATER: Can you hear me?

24  
25                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater.

26  
27                   MR. SLATER: Yes, I just wanted to note  
28 that when I was there before there was a significant  
29 coho run and there were some local Petersburg people  
30 there and I witnessed some of the tension between the  
31 local fishermen and the lodge, the Bare Boats Lodge, or  
32 Bare Boat Charter Lodge and it was near there. So I  
33 don't know if we're trying to eliminate competition  
34 between Federally-qualified and non-Federally-  
35 qualified, does -- and I know we probably can't change  
36 the proposal to expand it, but I believe there is also  
37 competition in the month of August and probably early  
38 September for the coho run that's there as well, that  
39 I've seen with my own two eyes.

40  
41                   Thank you.

42  
43                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Cross.

44  
45                   MR. SANDERS: Okay, if that was a  
46 question, I think I understand it. So through the  
47 Chair.

48  
49                   MR. SLATER: It's not a question, it  
50

0303

1 was.....

2

3

MR. SMITH: It's a comment.

4

5

MR. CROSS: Oh, sorry, I was getting a  
6 nod from Madame Chair.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MR. SLATER: Yeah, go ahead, you can  
comment on the coho run if you want, I was just  
basically making a comment that there was a coho run  
and there has been some competition. I don't know if  
there is any Federally-qualified harvesting going on  
with coho there but maybe if you have any information  
on that you could comment, please.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. I don't  
know if I can comment on the Federal subsistence of  
coho since it wasn't really something that we looked  
into. I would say it's my belief that that would be  
outside of the scope of this analysis, or of this  
proposal because we were just looking at sockeye, the  
subsistence harvest of sockeye because of the intent  
stated by the proponent, which was sockeye harvest.

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: Okay, well, thank you.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are  
there other questions -- or we could go back to the  
deliberations. Thank you guys.

Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, maybe just one  
more observation. Kah Sheets also has a small  
steelhead run, which gets used, you know, I know some  
locals go down there and try and catch steelhead mainly  
as a sportfish but, you know, you can keep it if you  
want to go get a Federal permit, I believe for that  
system, and I suspect that there's probably non-  
resident sportfishermen who probably, from the lodges,  
might like to go there for steelhead as well. So you  
know if you do go for the modification it would be open  
in the month of May and June when there's, you know,  
steelhead present, so that could possibly be another  
conflict as well. And I can certainly see where, you  
know, on a small sockeye system like that, you know, if  
people are looking for subsistence fish there, you  
know, quite often switching over to catching cohos now,  
you know, if you can't get enough sockeyes. So I guess

0304

1 I could see conflicts as well there if you leave it  
2 open into August, so, yeah.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Johnson, Ms.  
5 Phillips, then Mr. Smith.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you, Madame  
8 Chair. Yeah, I guess I didn't -- you know I'm  
9 realizing now the modification included the spacial  
10 piece, the removal of the lake and the timing window.  
11 The removal of the timing window in the proposed action  
12 makes a lot of sense to me in just having a full  
13 closure, I think, that, that I understand, it makes  
14 sense. But the current motion to have -- to not, which  
15 includes closure of the lake and the river, I'm less  
16 certain about closure of the lake because, you know,  
17 it's more of a space use and it doesn't seem like the  
18 subsistence activities occur in the lake.

19

20 So putting that out there, it does seem  
21 like I would -- I guess I might be more in favor of  
22 having the lake continue to be open for non-Federally-  
23 qualified but maintain the full closure of the river.

24

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair, thank you.  
26 If I were to write that and I didn't understand what  
27 the full ramifications would be, I really appreciate  
28 that Staff has taken the time to flesh out what the  
29 intent is of the proponent, and, thank you, Madame  
30 Chair, also for pointing that out because I didn't  
31 fully understand what the implication is. And so I  
32 would support a modification. I don't know if I would  
33 support specific dates, I mean like this modification  
34 has, but I would support a modification to close Kah  
35 Sheets Creek to non-Federally-qualified users and  
36 possibly while leaving Kah Sheets Lake open to all  
37 users. I think what the proponent states about the  
38 public cabins adding to overall competition is that by  
39 non-Federally-qualified staying at the cabin then they  
40 can go down and use the falls or whatever, but by  
41 keeping the lake open and the falls closed, then they  
42 are not allowed into the falls, they wouldn't compete,  
43 is what I'm understanding now.

44

45 So I would support a modification, I  
46 don't know about the dates, though.

47

48 So, thank you, Madame Chair.

49

50

0305

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
2 Phillips. Mr. Smith.

3  
4                   MR. SMITH: (In Tlingit) my intentions  
5 aren't to hurt anybody. But I feel that the river and  
6 the pond, they're both, they're the same, so I feel  
7 that if you're going to put a stipulation on it that  
8 you hold strong on the whole thing together, but also  
9 looking at if we're going to cut off the, you know, the  
10 non-resident family from harvesting, we should cut down  
11 -- at least cut down the number, maybe a quarter of the  
12 number on how many they get there because the objective  
13 is to bring the numbers up also. Or, you know, take  
14 the flossing out.

15  
16                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr.  
17 Kitka.

18  
19                   MR. KITKA: Thank you, Madame Chair. I  
20 had a -- maybe this is kind of second hand information.  
21 I was sitting at the airport and listening to these  
22 guys that came in from the lodges and talking to a  
23 friend who -- on the phone, and he was talking quite  
24 loud and he was sitting right behind me, and he said  
25 you need to go to this lodge, he said he's got 28 cases  
26 of sockeye. Now this is sportfish. This is something  
27 that's been going on for a long time and it's  
28 unregulated lodges and unguided sports that take an  
29 excess amount of stuff where the subsistence user is  
30 limited to 20 fish, these guys are taking so much fish  
31 out, it's just unbelievable.

32  
33                   That's all I had to say.

34  
35                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
36 Kitka. In thinking about Ms. Phillips' question and  
37 keeping the dates, I think my question back would then  
38 be if we took the dates out would that not then just  
39 make it a full closure to non-Federally-qualified  
40 subsistence users in Federal waters, and then does that  
41 become an unnecessary restriction to non-Federally-  
42 qualified subsistence users, like does it meet that  
43 next threshold, whereas leaving the dates in basically  
44 reduces non-Federally-qualified subsistence users  
45 opportunity while providing a meaningful opportunity  
46 for subsistence users during those dates, might that --  
47 would that be an argument for keeping the dates in and  
48 then going with supporting the modification.

49  
50

0306

1 Does that make sense?

2

3 Mr. Hernandez.

4

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: I guess kind of maybe  
6 simplify what you were saying, I think the only  
7 modification necessary would be -- and it would read,  
8 you know, Federal public waters of Kah Sheets Creek are  
9 closed from July 1st to July 31st, which does cut off  
10 all fishing in the creek system, and then if we added  
11 wording, and I don't know it might require some  
12 boundary marker or something, but if you left the lake  
13 system open that provides some non-resident  
14 sportfishing opportunity, which would probably not  
15 impact subsistence users to any great degree. So I  
16 guess any modification I would support would leave the  
17 dates but open the lake, would probably be simple  
18 enough.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

21

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
23 Well, again, I appreciate the proponent bringing this  
24 to our attention and us realizing that we probably need  
25 to do more but we can't do it through this proposal so  
26 I would support a modification, and if that requires  
27 withdrawing my motion then I'll do that.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

30

31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame  
32 Chair. I think we could accomplish what we need to do  
33 under our original motion with just an amendment. I  
34 think that would be effective.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Would you like  
37 to make a motion to amend.

38

39 MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure. I would amend the  
40 -- let's see, should I read the existing -- go back to  
41 the existing proposal. Yeah, this page only has the  
42 modification, go back to the original, do you have the  
43 page number.

44

45 MR. JOHNSON: Page 74.

46

47 MR. HERNANDEZ: 74. Okay. Okay, what  
48 we have for a proposal which was put in the form of a  
49 motion was: Federal public waters of Kah Sheets Lake

50

0307

1 and Kah Sheets Creek are closed to sockeye salmon  
2 fishing except by Federally-qualified users. So I  
3 would amend that proposal to read, Federal waters --  
4 Federal public waters of Kah Sheets Lake -- or excuse  
5 me -- Federal public waters of Kah Sheets Creek are  
6 closed to sockeye salmon fishing except by Federally-  
7 qualified subsistence users, Federal public waters of  
8 Kah Sheets Lake would have no closure -- I guess I'm  
9 not really sure of good wording there but -- I guess,  
10 you know, as long as it's clear that there's a  
11 difference between the lake and the creek, and then the  
12 original proposal does specify lake and creek, so --  
13 yeah, so what I'm looking at is the original proposal  
14 has no dates of closure, it's just closed, so that  
15 would be closed for the entire season so I don't think  
16 the modification needs to address the timing if you  
17 just close Federal public waters of Kah Sheets Creek,  
18 that would be closed for the entire season. So then we  
19 have to make an exception for Federal public waters for  
20 Kah Sheets Lake would remain open to non-subsistence  
21 users. That's my best attempt. Separating out the lake  
22 and the creek but not addressing anything about the  
23 dates. The lake would remain open for the entire  
24 season and the creek would remain closed for the entire  
25 season.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Do you have a  
28 motion, Ms. Phillips?

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, I'm confused,  
31 because isn't this a sockeye proposal or is it  
32 anything, any kind of fish proposal?

33

34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: It's a sockeye  
35 -- well, it's to provide subsistence opportunity for  
36 subsistence users on sockeye by closing Kah Sheets  
37 Creek to non-Federally-qualified users through --  
38 potentially with dates, but we haven't got that far.  
39 So if you close it to Federally-qualified subsistence  
40 users it keeps -- to non-Federally, it keeps them from  
41 coming in and competing with Federally-qualified  
42 subsistence users that are harvesting sockeye salmon.

43

44 Mr. Hernandez.

45

46 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. But then our  
47 discussions went beyond that to start to talk about  
48 subsistence users that may also want to harvest coho  
49 salmon in August. And I thought kind of the discussion  
50

0308

1 amongst the Council was that, well, maybe that would be  
2 an impact to subsistence users as well, there could be,  
3 you know, user conflicts on the coho run as well as a  
4 subsistence species so maybe we should just not talk  
5 about just closing it for the month of July, but  
6 closing it for the entire season but leave the lake  
7 open as that opportunity for non-subsistence users. I  
8 mean if the intent of the modification is to soften the  
9 impacts of the closure by offering some opportunity to  
10 non-subsistence users, I think the discussion kind of  
11 came around to, well, maybe the best way to do that is  
12 to leave the lake open because that is less of an  
13 impact on subsistence users, still open -- leaves  
14 opportunity. And -- but closing the stream system for  
15 the entire season so we don't get user conflicts on  
16 steelhead fishing or coho fishing which happens in ,  
17 you know, May, June and August.

18

19 So it just -- the only challenge I have  
20 is trying to come up with a wording that clearly, you  
21 know, delineates the geographic difference between the  
22 creek and the lake so.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
25 Hernandez. I do want to reiterate that I don't think I  
26 would be in support of a full closure for non-  
27 Federally-qualified subsistence users without like an  
28 analysis of the need for that -- it's unclear if  
29 there's a conservation concern. There's no -- we know  
30 nothing about the sockeye run but that would be an  
31 unnecessary restriction to non-Federally-qualified  
32 subsistence users for all of the species and we don't  
33 have any other species information presented to us. So  
34 I don't think that I could support a complete closure  
35 so I kind of feel the dates are important to leave in  
36 personally.

37

38 Do we need to take, like maybe a five  
39 minute break to gather the wording of what we need to  
40 do to get a good motion on the table to handle the  
41 amendment and maybe Staff can help us with like what  
42 we're trying to -- hopefully you understand what we're  
43 trying to do and we can present a clearer amendment to  
44 the motion so that we can move through this.

45

46 (Council nods affirmatively)

47

48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So I'm seeing a  
49 lot of head nods so let's take a five minute break,

50

0309

1 this is just to get our ducks in a row, this is not a  
2 15 minute break, it's five minutes, max.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (On record)

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, let's  
9 see, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, all right  
10 we have a quorum back at the table. Do we have our  
11 Council members online?

12

13 MR. SLATER: Jim is here, Madame Chair.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
16 Slater.

17

18 MR. HOWARD: Albert's here, Madame  
19 Chair.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
22 Howard. All right. I think we have a plan of action,  
23 who would like to implement it.

24

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

28

29 MS. PHILLIPS: I would like to withdraw  
30 my motion.

31

32 MR. CASIPIT: Second concurs.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
35 you. We've withdrawn the main motion and is there  
36 anyone who wants to make a new motion regarding  
37 Fisheries Proposal 23-23 -- or wherever we are, 23-21.

38

39 (Laughter)

40

41 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.

42

43 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: I move to support FP23-  
46 02 [sic] with modifications to close Kah Sheets Creek  
47 to non-Federally-qualified users from July 1 to July  
48 31st, while leaving Kah Sheets Lake open to all users.

49

50



0310

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Is  
2 there a second.

3  
4                   MR. CASIPIT: Second. It is FP23-21,  
5 correct.

6  
7                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Correct.

8  
9                   MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, that's the wrong  
10 one, there's a mistake in our book.

11  
12                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: There's a typo  
13 in our book, yeah.

14  
15                   (Laughter)

16  
17                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Do  
18 we need to provide justification for supporting this  
19 proposal as modified, did some of our discussion from  
20 the previous motion carry over into it.

21  
22                   Mr. Casipit.

23  
24                   MR. CASIPIT: Madame Chair. My  
25 rationale for supporting this hasn't changed. It's  
26 virtually the -- my justification is the same for the  
27 last one so.

28  
29                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any further  
30 comment. Mr. Johnson.

31  
32                   MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
33 Yeah, I think the modification reads well. It does  
34 make it a little less liberal than the requester was  
35 looking for, however, I think making it not just a  
36 sockeye proposal, but limiting all sport usership does  
37 grant them probably a little more -- you know, reduces  
38 that competition factor completely which is probably  
39 what they really want to address so I'm hoping that  
40 redaction of just having it be a sockeye proposal is  
41 actually a better fit for what they're looking for  
42 here.

43  
44                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. Thank  
45 you, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Hernandez.

46  
47                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame  
48 Chair. And I also would support the proposal as  
49 modified. I think we've addressed the point about will  
50

0311

1 the recommendation unnecessarily restrict other uses  
2 and I think we've kind of satisfied that a little bit,  
3 I don't think this is an unnecessary restriction anymore  
4 on non-subsistence users. And I also just kind of want  
5 to make the observation that, you know, after talking  
6 with the Staff and the intent of the person who  
7 proposed this, our discussions on coho salmon and  
8 steelhead fishing, I think that does go beyond the  
9 realm of what the Staff analyzed and so even those may  
10 be issues that come up I don't think we should get into  
11 that now because we didn't really have a Staff analysis  
12 that dealt with those species.

13

14 So I'll support the modification as  
15 proposed.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Hernandez. Any other Council deliberations on the  
19 proposal.

20

21 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater, and  
24 then Ms. Phillips.

25

26 MR. SLATER: Yeah, I just wanted to  
27 comment that the geometry of the lake and the stream  
28 lend themselves well to the lake being more geared  
29 towards sportfishing and the stream being more geared  
30 towards subsistence fishing, the geometry of the stream  
31 for the fish to be in, as you would guess, in small  
32 locations for dipnetting and anything else, whereas the  
33 lake is more open and traditional sportfishing where  
34 there isn't any snagging or flossing, it's basically  
35 just regular fishing.

36

37 That's my main comment, thank you.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I did recognize  
40 Ms. Phillips.

41

42 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
43 I support the OSM preliminary conclusion,  
44 justification. Increasing competition with non-  
45 Federally-qualified users has led to user conflicts and  
46 has led to decreased harvest success for subsistence  
47 users. Eliminating competition by non-subsistence  
48 users at this location while keeping Kah Sheets Lake  
49 open to all other users will give Federal -- to all  
50

0312

1 users will give Federal preference to rural residents  
2 and reduce user conflicts over sockeye salmon and be  
3 less restrictive than a full closure.

4

5 Thank you, Madame Chair.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
8 Phillips.

9

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.

11

12 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Question's been  
13 called. We are now voting on support for Wildlife  
14 [sic] Proposal FP23-21 with modification to close  
15 Kah Sheets Creek to non-Federally-qualified users from  
16 July 1st to July 31st while leaving Kah Sheets Lake  
17 open to all users. All in favor signify by saying aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed,  
22 please signify by saying nay.

23

24 (No opposing votes)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carried.  
27 To our fellow Council members on the telephone, we took  
28 a quick pulse of the Council who is willing to stay  
29 late to try to get through the two Federal fisheries  
30 closure reviews, so that would be FCR23-22 [sic] and  
31 FCR23-4 [sic]. So we are going to try to continue that  
32 business tonight before we adjourn until morning where  
33 we will take up our final fisheries proposal, or our  
34 final proposal which is the non-rural determination  
35 proposal, 25-01 for non-rural determination for  
36 Ketchikan.

37

38 With that said, I'm ready for the draft  
39 Staff analysis for FCR23-23, review closure to  
40 subsistence harvest of salmon in the Taku River, and we  
41 have Mr. Sanders and Mr. Cross.

42

43 MR. SANDERS: Thank you, again, Madame  
44 Chair. And, again, for the record my name is Andrew  
45 Sanders and I'm a Biologist with the Forest Service on  
46 the Tongass National Forest. Next to me I have Robert  
47 Cross, the Subsistence Coordinator for the Tongass  
48 National Forest. Federal Fisheries Closure Review 23-  
49 23 can be found on Page 92 of your meeting book and is  
50

0313

1 a routine of the Federal subsistence salmon fishery  
2 closure on the Taku River.

3

4

5 The Taku River has been closed to  
6 subsistence salmon fishing since 2008, however, there  
7 is currently a State personal use sockeye salmon  
8 fishery on the Taku River. Chinook salmon stocks in  
9 the Taku are depressed and have not met the minimum  
10 escapement goal since 2015. Sockeye salmon stocks,  
11 though, have remained steadily above the escapement  
12 goal range.

12

13

14 The preliminary OSM conclusion is to  
15 rescind the closure to subsistence harvest on the Taku  
16 River. Title VIII of ANILCA mandates that Federal  
17 subsistence be given priority over other consumptive  
18 uses of fish and wildlife resources. Given that there  
19 is an in-river personal use fishery for sockeye salmon  
20 on the Taku River, the Federal subsistence closure  
21 should thus be rescinded. Opening Federal subsistence  
22 harvest on the Taku River is not likely to have a  
23 significant impact on the Taku River sockeye salmon  
24 stocks and special actions by Federal managers could  
25 allow for a subsistence sockeye salmon harvest and  
26 prevent direct harvest of chinook salmon.

26

27

28 Thank you, Madame Chair. And I'm happy

29 to take questions from the Council.

29

30

31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

50

50

50

50

50

50

50

50

50

50

0314

1 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair to  
2 Council Member Casipit. The provisions listed in the  
3 Pacific Salmon Treaty for the United States take an  
4 allocation of salmon apply only to the District 111  
5 drift gillnet fishery and, therefore, do not apply to  
6 the State personal use fishery nor a Federal  
7 subsistence fishery.

8  
9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

10  
11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Madame  
12 Chair. I don't know it's just kind of a ridiculous  
13 situation. I mean it kind of sounds to me just because  
14 there was no subsistence fishery there at the time, it  
15 was never mentioned in the Treaty so therefore it  
16 wasn't allowed, it just seems kind of convoluted, but I  
17 think that's the situation. It was never specifically  
18 included to have a subsistence fishery on that river,  
19 so they didn't address it so there is no approval, and  
20 it's just -- I mean it's crazy. So I think it's just a  
21 simple matter of just rescinding this closure and not  
22 worrying about the Pacific Salmon Commission  
23 personally. Yeah, I think we can, actually, I don't  
24 know.

25  
26 But from our perspective, it kind of  
27 seems like a no-brainer. Maybe there'll be blow back,  
28 you know, from the Canadians but, you know, with a  
29 personal use fishery there that includes the people  
30 from Juneau who, you know, obviously have a lot of  
31 opportunity to fish there and opening it up to a  
32 subsistence fishery where, you know, the nearest  
33 residents live 50, 60 miles away would be qualified I  
34 mean it just seems kind of crazy. So, yeah, I would  
35 just say let's vote to rescind the closure and not  
36 worry about the repercussions, we'll deal with that  
37 later. I don't think there will be any personally.

38  
39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there other  
40 questions on the draft analysis.

41  
42 (No comments)

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. I have a  
45 question with regards to chinook salmon. This Council  
46 proposed to the Board of Fish to take out of regulation  
47 the language that prevented a chinook fishery, a  
48 chinook subsistence fishery where it said, you know, no  
49 subsistence permit for chinook would take place and at  
50

0315

1 that Board of Fish meeting there was a lot of  
2 discussion with the -- you know, the allocation for  
3 chinook and so I guess my question to you is, the Board  
4 of Fish actually passed that proposal so there's no  
5 longer that stumbling block and would this allow --  
6 would this prevent -- would this current proposal  
7 before us, on the Federal side, allow -- if we rescind  
8 it, would it then allow for us to go to the table and  
9 negotiate a subsistence chinook fishery for the Taku  
10 River?

11

12 MR. SANDERS: Rob, correct me if I'm  
13 wrong here, but my understanding is that with this  
14 closure review, that at this time seasons can't be  
15 created as part of this, it would simply completely  
16 rescind the closure on all salmon fishery and that in  
17 the future, seasons for chinook or sockeye or what have  
18 you would need to be created through new actions.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Right. So then,  
21 yes, it's like the last sort of stumbling block for  
22 potentially creating subsistence chinook harvest for  
23 Taku River by rescinding the closure.

24

25 MR. CROSS: Yes. For the record, my  
26 name is Robert Cross with the Forest Service. Madame  
27 Chair, that's correct. And I would also add that at  
28 this point the Taku chinook are not reaching escapement  
29 so it would kind of be a -- it's my understanding that  
30 it would be a situation similar to the Stikine River  
31 where there may be a chinook season but it's closed  
32 through in-season management unless that escapement  
33 goal is reached.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. Any  
36 other questions regarding the draft analysis from  
37 Council members.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
42 you, gentlemen. Do we have a report on Board  
43 consultation.

44

45 MR. LIND: Madame Chair, I'll be really  
46 quick. There were no questions or comments on this  
47 proposal, 23-23. Thank you, Madame Chair.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

50

0316

1 Lind. Agency comments from the Alaska Department of  
2 Fish and Game.

3  
4 (No comments)

5  
6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any agency  
7 comments from other Federal agencies.

8  
9 (No comments)

10  
11 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any agency  
12 comments from tribal entities.

13  
14 (No comments)

15  
16 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other  
17 Regional Advisory Council comments.

18  
19 MS. PERRY: No comments, Madame Chair.

20  
21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
22 comments from Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

23  
24 (No comments)

25  
26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any comments  
27 from Subsistence Resource Commissions.

28  
29 MS. PERRY: No comment from the  
30 Wrangell-St. Elias SRC. Thank you.

31  
32 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. It  
33 does not look like we have a summary of written  
34 comments but I'll just confirm with Staff, no written  
35 comments.

36  
37 (No comments)

38  
39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.  
40 We've reached the time where we can take public  
41 testimony on Fisheries Proposal FCR23-23, are there any  
42 public comments, anybody on the phone wishing to make  
43 public comments regarding this proposal.

44  
45 (No comments)

46  
47 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: And we don't  
48 have blue cards, is there anyone in the room that would  
49 wish to make public comments on this proposal.

50

0317

1 (No comments)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.

4 We've reached the time for Council deliberations and

5 I'd entertain a motion.

6

7 Ms. Phillips.

8

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

10 I move to rescind the Federal subsistence salmon

11 fishery closure on the Taku River.

12

13 MR. JOHNSON: (Hand raised)

14

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Johnson had

18 his hand up first to second.

19

20 (Laughter)

21

22 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,

23 Council deliberations. You want to provide a

24 justification for support Ms. Phillips.

25

26 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

27 The justification in our analysis states the provisions

28 listed in the Pacific Salmon Treaty for U.S. take and

29 allocation of salmon apply only to District 111 drift

30 gillnet fishery and, therefore, do not apply to the

31 State personal use fishery, nor a Federal subsistence

32 fishery. Title VIII of ANILCA mandates that Federal

33 subsistence be given priority over other consumptive

34 uses of fish and wildlife resources. Given that there

35 is an in-river personal use fishery for sockeye salmon

36 on the Taku River, there's no justification for

37 maintaining the status quo. If there is an open State

38 fishery then the Federal subsistence closure should be

39 rescinded.

40

41 Thank you, Madame Chair.

42

43 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.

44 Phillips. Is there any further comment. Mr. Johnson.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.

47 I guess in regards to the conservation concern. This

48 doesn't actually create any actual type of new

49 regulation so there is no conservation concern

50



0318

1 associated with this. But then it does look like from  
2 a substantial -- biological evidence, that sockeye  
3 escapement is high so the potential for new regulations  
4 is warranted and certainly, you know, beneficial  
5 opportunities for subsistence users given the volume of  
6 the Taku River and it's location as a central hub for  
7 folks to access.

8

9 And, again, last, and this doesn't  
10 unnecessarily restrict anyone because there's no actual  
11 regulation being created.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for  
14 that.

15

16 Mr. Casipit.

17

18 MR. CASIPIT: Just in light of my  
19 comment before, I just wanted to point out that in the  
20 justification apparently the -- let me get this right  
21 -- the TransBoundary River -- the TransBoundary  
22 Technical Committee 2022 Salmon Management Enhancement  
23 Plans for the Stikine, Taku and Alsek Rivers from the  
24 Pacific Salmon Commission TransBoundary Technical  
25 Committee report says that the U.S. take and allocation  
26 of salmon apply only to the District 111 drift gillnet  
27 fishery and, therefore, do not apply to the State  
28 personal use fishery nor a Federal subsistence fishery.  
29 And that's cited, you know, the Pacific Salmon  
30 Commission 2022, that's the TransBoundary Technical  
31 Committee report. And I would like to say I'm pretty  
32 pleased that the TransBoundary Technical Committee  
33 finally realized that Federal subsistence fisheries do  
34 have a place in that Treaty and that hopefully we won't  
35 have to go through all the hoops and jumps and years  
36 that it took to get the Stikine stuff recognized. So  
37 thanks.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other  
40 comments from Council members on the proposal.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MR. HERNANDEZ: Call for the question.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Question's been  
47 called. We are now voting on Wildlife [sic] Proposal  
48 20-23 [sic], I don't have the language.....

49

50

0319

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: It's 23-23.

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. HERNANDEZ: It's 23-23.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: We're now -- oh, sorry about that. We're now voting on supporting Fisheries Closure Review 23-23, to rescind the closure on the Taku River. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Motion carries. Moving along. We now have Fisheries Closure Review 23-24 to review the closure of non-Federally-qualified subsistence users for sockeye salmon in Neva Lake, Neva Creek and South Creek. We'll have the Staff come up to present the draft Staff analysis.

MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Thank you, Madame Chair. For the record my name is Jake Musslewhite, I'm a Fisheries Biologist for the Forest Service on the Tongass National Forest. Next to me is Rob Cross, the Subsistence Coordinator for the Tongass. Federal Fisheries Closure Review 23-24 could be found on Page 103 of your meeting book and is a review of the closure of Neva Lake, Neva Creek and South Creek to the harvest of sockeye salmon by non-Federally-qualified users. This is the first review of the closure since it began in 2019.

The closure was initiated in response to decreasing escapements, reduced harvest limits and conflict between user groups. The preliminary OSM conclusion is to rescind the closure.

Since the closure was initiated, escapements of Neva sockeye salmon have improved while the reported subsistence harvest has fallen to nearly zero. The State harvest limits at Neva are the most restrictive in the region which appears to have discouraged subsistence use more than competition between user groups. The increased abundance of Neva sockeye salmon along with the uncertain effectiveness of the closure in reducing user conflict indicate that the closure is no longer necessary to continue subsistence uses of Neva Lake sockeye salmon.

0320

1 Thank you, I can take questions.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Musslewhite. Are there any questions for Staff  
5 regarding the draft analysis.

6

7 Mr. Casipit.

8

9 MR. CASIPIT: I apologize in advance to  
10 Staff but I just have a few questions.

11

12 Figure 1, Page 106, the blue line,  
13 which is the, according to the description, the thick  
14 blue line shows the waters of South Creek, Neva Creek,  
15 and Neva Lake covered under the closure. And I know  
16 that the scale of this map is, you know, difficult and  
17 all, but I see that thick blue line extending below  
18 that bridge that crosses South Creek right about  
19 saltwater, that blue line extends down into an area  
20 where, you know, there is a bit of sportfishing that  
21 occurs there on that blue line below that -- below that  
22 bridge. Now, I've always assumed that the bridge was  
23 the line of demarkation between Federal jurisdiction  
24 and State waters. If that blue line is extending below  
25 that bridge, that is taking in some area where there is  
26 a significant amount of sportfishing by these non-  
27 guided users. I've seen them lined up, eight, 10  
28 people there, all -- I don't know what you'd call it, I  
29 guess maybe they're flossing, I'm not sure but that's  
30 what goes on there, it goes on below that bridge. And  
31 I can see from my boat at saltwater looking up the  
32 creek exactly where they are, and they're right there,  
33 right where this blue line kind of ends. So apparently  
34 there is a lot more sportfishing there than I even  
35 thought because when I originally submitted this  
36 proposal, I submitted thinking that the line of  
37 demarkation was that bridge. So now I'm even more  
38 concerned about sportfishing use there, unguided  
39 sportfishing use there.

40

41 Care to -- I mean is that why -- am I  
42 right, am I wrong, am I -- is that line about right, or  
43 what?

44

45 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
46 Member Casipit. Yeah, so the Federal public waters  
47 would extend down to the, you know, the tideline  
48 essentially which is a little ways below the bridge.  
49 So obviously you're familiar with that area, it kind of  
50

0321

1 goes out on to that big flats. So the exact, you know,  
2 high water mark, or whatever, I think would be the  
3 extent of the Federal jurisdiction there. So the clos  
4 -- and you're absolutely correct in that, at least to  
5 my observations, the bulk of sportfishing and, you  
6 know, almost all sockeye harvest that I've seen at  
7 least is there right at the mouth of the stream in  
8 essentially State waters below the high tideline.

9  
10 MR. CASIPIT: Or just above. I mean I  
11 see a lot of people fishing right at that grass line  
12 right at high tide. That's one of their favorite spots  
13 right there, I don't know, I think it's just the way  
14 the river is running right there next close to the  
15 bank.

16

17 Okay.

18

19 Then I wanted to talk a little bit  
20 about the use there. The use by Federally-qualified  
21 subsistence users and that use going down over time,  
22 you know, a lot of that has to do with the 10 fish  
23 limit, it's just, you know, not worth it at \$6.30 a  
24 gallon to run over there. I do it anyway because I feel  
25 like I have to, I have to show my use there. The seven  
26 fish in 2021, one permit, that's me.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 MR. CASIPIT: I -- it's unfortunate  
31 because under the State system you don't see what I  
32 reported under the State in 2021, it was three. It was  
33 the other 10 -- it was the three of the other -- you  
34 know, 10 fish, it was the other three. I fished it so  
35 that if I was fishing in State waters, I reported on a  
36 State permit, fishing in Federal waters, I report on a  
37 Federal permit. So you got this declining use because  
38 of the low limits, yet in the justification you say  
39 that because there's not a whole lot of subsistence  
40 fishing there we don't need to have a closure anymore,  
41 and that's the whole reason nobody's fishing there is  
42 because the bag limits are low, because they were put  
43 that way because people were concerned about the run.

44

45 I don't -- how are we supposed to show  
46 the importan -- as a subsistence user, how am I  
47 supposed to show the importance of this location to  
48 people with small boats in Icy Straits who can't go out  
49 to Hoktaheen, I mean what does -- what does a guy like  
50

0322

1 me to who doesn't have a big boat to get out to  
2 Hoktaheen, I'm stuck with Neva. And, you know, I only  
3 got three fish there this year because the water was so  
4 high, it was hard to fish where I like to fish because  
5 the water was so high and you could see the fish but it  
6 was threatening my personal safety to get out in the  
7 water to get them for the couple times I went out. So  
8 I'm just -- I don't know what to say, because the whole  
9 reason there's less use is because there's a low bag  
10 limit, and you're saying that because there's no  
11 subsistence -- lower subsistence use there there's no  
12 need for the closure, and it just -- it's -- I don't  
13 know, it just doesn't seem right to me when we're  
14 trying to provide that meaningful priority.

15  
16                   You know, I'd also say, yeah, my boat  
17 could probably make it out to Hoktaheen but its  
18 operator can't. And, you know, quite frankly I'm too  
19 old to get my kidneys beat up going out to Hoktaheen.

20  
21                   Anyway, that's kind of where I'm coming  
22 from on that, I just think that we need to maintain  
23 that closure until something happens with the bag limit  
24 so that there is truly a meaningful priority for  
25 Federally-qualified users. And it's more than just  
26 people in Gustavus, there's people in -- I know there's  
27 people in Hoonah that go there because I ran into them  
28 this year and they were talking about the same thing, I  
29 mean I'm battling these people from that lodge there, I  
30 don't want to mention the name. You know, it seems  
31 like every time you go there there's one of those  
32 stabicrafts there.

33  
34                   So, anyway, that's all I have.

35  
36                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I can turn that  
37 into a question I think.

38  
39                   (Laughter)

40  
41                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for  
42 that. Rescinding a closure, does that preclude  
43 increasing a bag limit, like if there's a closure to  
44 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users and if we  
45 maintain that in place would we be able to subsequently  
46 in the next fisheries cycle submit a proposal that  
47 increases the bag limit when that closure is in place?

48  
49                   MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Madame Chair. Yes.  
50

0323

1 Thank you for bringing that up because I don't know if  
2 you remember from our last meeting but I have been in  
3 discussions with the State management biologist there  
4 to increase the limit at Neva because I've always  
5 perceived that, as we've discussed, as the main  
6 obstacle to subsistence use there, and it's an  
7 excellent opportunity for that because, you know, we  
8 monitor that system because we've demonstrated that the  
9 use has gone essentially to zero reported on, you know,  
10 the State permits, so, yes, I think with an email I  
11 could probably increase the limit to -- or ask them to  
12 increase the limit to 20. They indicated they'd have  
13 to go through a public comment process and everything,  
14 but I've laid all the ground work for that and so that  
15 is very doable.

16

17 So, yes.

18

19 And, I guess, also just to address some  
20 of the things that Member Casipit said, I absolutely  
21 100 percent understand your like difficulty to the  
22 situation, I also went to Neva this year and for many  
23 of the same reasons, I guess that you did, I got a  
24 proxy from my folks to kind of make it worth while and  
25 I said, hey, can I borrow your big boat, too, and went  
26 out there with my family and got a bunch of sockeye,  
27 stayed on my side of the line, as a Juneau resident and  
28 got a bunch, just so I could report them on State  
29 permits just to get a non-zero number there. So I  
30 definitely feel that and I understand the difficulty  
31 with trying to -- with opening that closure, but I feel  
32 that it's -- in my mind, it feels like a good  
33 opportunity to work -- for the State and the Federal  
34 systems to work together where we can ask them and work  
35 with them to address what I feel is this main issue,  
36 with the restrictive bag limit, while also allowing,  
37 you know, other users into the area at the same time, a  
38 little, you know, quid pro quo, if that's the right  
39 word. However -- and when I was considering this, and  
40 I've spent a lot of time on the ground at Neva, it's  
41 hard, you know, with the fact that there's the, you  
42 know, fairly healthy escapements and everything like  
43 that, it feels very hard to justify, to me, continuing  
44 to close that to the -- that that meets the, you know,  
45 a threshold, that that is absolutely necessary because  
46 the documented use in Federal public waters by non-  
47 Federally-qualified users is fairly low. There is  
48 some, and, yes, there is like folks from the lodges you  
49 see and sportfishers from out of town at the mouth of  
50

0324

1 the stream so, you know, it's not zero but it doesn't  
2 -- from my observations there it doesn't feel like, you  
3 know, at a level where it's affecting subsistence use  
4 that much.

5  
6 I feel there is some other issues there  
7 as well that, you know, I think need addressing such  
8 as, you know, enforceability of this, you know, as we  
9 discussed I've been posting signs there, you know, for  
10 the past few years just because that, you know, closure  
11 doesn't show up in the State reg book, you know, unless  
12 you read -- unless you were a Federal subsistence user  
13 and looking at the reg book you would never even know  
14 it exists without us putting some signs there. And  
15 I've been talking to everybody I can talk to there in  
16 the community, and, which apparently those signs  
17 stirred up a little bit of a local controversy and I  
18 had, you know, at least one person report that a group  
19 of Juneau users had said, well, we're fishing under  
20 State regs anyway so that doesn't apply to us and that  
21 sort of thing. So I think there's some enforcement  
22 issues and that sort of thing. I don't think a State  
23 Wildlife Trooper would enforce this Federal closure,  
24 obviously, and the Federal LEO presence there is, you  
25 know, not very much. So, yeah, there's a lot of things  
26 coming together here, I would say, that make it a  
27 difficult decision to make, I can certainly understand.

28  
29 Thank you.

30  
31 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr.  
32 Smith, did you have a question regarding the analysis.

33  
34 MR. SMITH: (Shakes head negatively)

35  
36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Mr.  
37 Johnson.

38  
39 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
40 So the closure reviews are a little bit different than  
41 the proposals, in that, there's not like alternatives,  
42 I guess, you know, suggested, but it does seem to me  
43 that one of the alternatives could be to change the bag  
44 limit for -- or sorry, the limit for subsistence users  
45 and look at the affect on the system for a few years  
46 before considering like a full change in -- so were any  
47 like alternatives -- I mean it's not part of the  
48 process maybe, but like were alternatives considered  
49 aside from just rescinding the closure, or something  
50

0325

1 like that, a little more adaptive sort of management,  
2 maintaining the subsistence priority and looking at the  
3 system's ability to, you know, sustain that before  
4 thinking about other user groups?

5

6 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah. Through the  
7 Chair. Member Johnson. Yeah, the option's available  
8 to us for these closure reviews, if you look at Page  
9 117, our only options are to retain the status quo,  
10 rescind, modify or defer on the closure or take no  
11 action. So that's sort of our menu right there, you  
12 know.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: So to answer Mr.  
15 Johnson's questions, did you look at the -- did you  
16 consider the other options or your recommen -- you just  
17 come forward with your recommendation and a  
18 justification for that, like you don't look at the  
19 recommendation to retain status quo?

20

21 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, Madame Chair,  
22 no, I definitely did consider each of those options for  
23 sure. Yeah.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great. Thanks  
26 for that clarification. Any other questions regarding  
27 the Staff analysis.

28

29 Ms. Phillips.

30

31 MS. PHILLIPS: So in order to increase  
32 the bag limit for Federally-qualified users, would that  
33 be a modification of the closure?

34

35 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
36 Member Phillips. The -- unless otherwise provided in  
37 Federal regulation, the Federal harvest limits are what  
38 are laid out in the State harvest limits. And that's  
39 kind of, in a way, the beauty of this situation is that  
40 by working with the State to modify their harvest  
41 limits, we do the same thing for the Federal harvest  
42 limits.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

45

46 MS. PHILLIPS: So would we rescind the  
47 closure to do that, or would we maintain the status quo  
48 to do that?

49

50



0326

1 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
2 The bag limits and the closure are two separate issues,  
3 so with this action we're only talking about the  
4 closure, however, I am -- you know as I described  
5 earlier I am also talking with the State to try to get  
6 them to increase the bag limit there. So it's  
7 definitely a factor to consider.

8  
9 For example, it had definitely occurred  
10 to me that increasing the bag limit to 20 may make that  
11 system more attractive to non-Federally-qualified users  
12 and, you know, whose effort also dropped along with  
13 everybody else in that system, so from one perspective,  
14 you might consider that it's more important to keep the  
15 closure. I sat there and teeter-tottered with this  
16 myself before finally deciding the evidence shows so  
17 little use right there that it's not doing much, under  
18 current conditions, to -- you know to affect  
19 subsistence use: if that makes sense.

20  
21 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there other  
22 questions.

23  
24 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.

25  
26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Ms.  
27 Phillips.

28  
29 MS. PHILLIPS: I understand that there  
30 are two different issues but I don't feel like he  
31 answered my question. If we retain the status quo, can  
32 -- but the bag limit can still be increased -- I mean  
33 that's a separate issue -- if we retain the status quo  
34 and the bag limit's a separate issue and it can be  
35 increased we can still have a closure with an increased  
36 bag limit, knowing that the bag limit's a separate  
37 issue, correct or not?

38  
39 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Through the Chair.  
40 Correct.

41  
42 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other  
45 questions regarding the Staff analysis.

46  
47 (No comments)

48  
49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, we'll  
50

0327

1 move through our process. I see Mr. Vickers made a  
2 move -- he's fine, okay.

3

4 (Laughter)

5

6 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, we  
7 have a report on Board consultations regarding FCR23-  
8 24.

9

10 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. Council  
11 members. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During  
12 the consultation sessions we did not have any questions  
13 or comments on Closure Review 23-24.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you very  
16 much Mr. Lind.

17

18 MR. LIND: Thank you, Madame Chair.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Agency comments.  
21 Any agency comments from the Alaska Department of Fish  
22 and Game.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any agency  
27 comments from Mr. Kitka -- Mr. Kitka.

28

29 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair. I had pretty  
30 much a question that -- I know Orville has said there's  
31 been no comments from the -- no written comments or  
32 nothing from the tribe. It seems to me like I've heard  
33 this for a few of the proposals that came up.  
34 Basically it just means that the tribes aren't making  
35 it to their comment period, to their discussions when  
36 they come, consultation. It would be really worth our  
37 while to make sure that they get the notices to the  
38 tribes. I feel that the tribes are not really getting  
39 the notices to the affected -- what it bothers -- what  
40 it means to the tribes. I know that when I was on the  
41 Sitka Tribe I went to OSM, to one of their meetings for  
42 a consultation, and I was the only tribal member there  
43 and it's really sad that -- to have the consultation  
44 practices that we're supposed to have and they're  
45 supposed to have isn't happening because for whatever  
46 reason the tribes can't make it there.

47

48 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank  
49 you, Mr. Kitka. Mr. Lind, do you have a response to

50

0328

1 maybe that part of the process?

2

3

4 MR. LIND: Madame Chair. Council  
5 members. Yes. And thank you, Member Kitka, for  
6 bringing that up. We did have a talk earlier and there  
7 are several factors that play into the of why tribes  
8 aren't calling in or coming to the meetings. One is  
9 the reasons is that there's a lot of -- actually  
10 there's a lot of -- this year we had some contact  
11 issues where the names were changed, email addresses  
12 were changed, we had new people on tribal councils and  
13 corporations and so those people I had contacts to had  
14 changed and wasn't aware that they were changed so they  
15 never got the information. In other cases, some tribal  
16 offices just don't share the information once it gets  
17 to them.

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 my pitch this new year, since this is a new start again and we're meeting in person, I encourage every one of the Council members to relate this information to your tribes. Again, my policy, or our policy is that a tribal member can call me any time, on any issue and request a consultation; that's our policy. And, again, I encourage folks to, you know, share your messages, share the news releases, whatever, so we can have more engagement from tribes and corporations.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair. That would be a good idea to, you know, see I'm the -- I'm going to take off this hat.

(Laughter)

MR. WRIGHT: As the President of the tribe I've never even heard of any consultation with you so I think that issues like this, that need to go past administrator and come to the President of a tribe, or the leader of the tribe, because sometimes the administrator is so busy that doesn't know the importance of this issue, you know, so it might be good to just ask the tribal administrator or the administrator of the tribes, who's the President, or who's the leader of the tribe, or who are the

0329

1 Councilmen.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

6

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Smith, do you have a question regarding the tribal consultation piece.

7

8

9

MR. SMITH: It's kind of a comment.

10

11

12

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, if you can keep it brief so we can get through the process that'd be great.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I'd just like to echo that myself too. That even through the -- me, just being on the Board, I connected with our tribal members and made communication that we're on the Board and even shared other cultural connections that were there even to where I've invited them here but it didn't seem important. So I'm just sharing my feelings and echoing what you're saying. And not even in the -- the meeting that we had before, that's even documented here, we talked about partnerships, all of us here, and we had the tribe on the table which echoed that too so it would be good to see their faces here. Hurrah.

28

29

30

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you Mr. Lind for coming back up and sharing that regarding the Board consultations.

31

32

33

34

35

I'm going to go back through the list, we're on agency comments, I want to make sure we didn't skip over Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.

36

37

38

39

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Other Federal agency comments.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Agency comments from any tribal entities.

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Advisory group comments, were there any other Regional

0330

1 Advisory Council comments regarding the proposal.

2

3 MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair -- or, Madame  
4 Chair. Gosh, it's late.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
9 comments from Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any  
14 comments from Subsistence Resource Commissions.

15

16 MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Were there any  
19 written public comments.

20

21 MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
24 public testimony. Is there anyone on the phone that  
25 wishes to provide public testimony for Fishery Closure  
26 Review 23-24.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there anyone  
31 in the room that would like to provide public testimony  
32 on the Fisheries Closure Review 23-24.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. We  
37 are now at the Regional Council recommendation for the  
38 proposal, is there a motion.

39

40 Ms. Phillips.

41

42 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
43 Move to retain the status quo.

44

45 Madame Chair, I don't know if within  
46 the motion I can request an increase, that ADF&G be  
47 asked to increase the sockeye salmon limit for  
48 subsistence or should I keep that out?

49

50

0331

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd keep it out.

2

3                   MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. The motion is to  
4 retain the status quo.

5

6                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.  
7 Phillips.

8

9                   MR. CASIPIT: Second.

10

11                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. It's  
12 been moved and seconded to maintain the status quo, so  
13 retain the closure on the Neva system. Would anybody  
14 like to provide a justification and get us led off on  
15 Council comments.

16

17                   Mr. Casipit.

18

19                   MR. CASIPIT: I'll take a shot at that.  
20 I'm not going to really go through this list that's  
21 here in front of me about conservation and substantial  
22 evidence and that kind of stuff.

23

24                   I believe there is substantial evidence  
25 enough to show that this unguided sportfishing is  
26 negatively affecting subsistence users ability to  
27 harvest the sockeye they need, especially with the blue  
28 line I was talking about earlier. It extends further  
29 than I thought, to take in some areas where I know  
30 there is a lot of unguided sportfishing going on. Also  
31 I don't think it's very fair to use, as a reason to  
32 rescind the closure, the decreasing use by Federally-  
33 qualified subsistence users because the bag limit is so  
34 low. And on the subject of the bag limit, I'm not  
35 really into giving a quid when I haven't got the quo  
36 yet.

37

38                   (Laughter)

39

40                   MR. CASIPIT: You know, and I know you  
41 were talking with folks -- you talked to folks before  
42 our last meeting, which was before the fishing season  
43 and if Fish and Game was really concerned about  
44 providing us opportunity that we should have, they  
45 already should have made the change to that bag limit  
46 for this year on the permit. So I'm not willing to  
47 give -- like I said, I'm not willing to give up the  
48 quid before I get the quo.

49

50

0332

1                               So that's kind of where I'm at on that.  
2   And I do think there's enough information to show that  
3   -- well, that's the other thing. This unguided  
4   sportfishing, you know, we put in a proposal to the  
5   Board of Fish to keep track of this stuff, we didn't  
6   get it, the problem continues, it's going to get worse,  
7   I guarantee you it's going to get worse as far as  
8   unguided sportfishers, they're not picked up in the  
9   mailout survey because the mailout survey goes  
10  statewide and everybody recognizes that those statewide  
11  sportfish surveys do not pick up the level of detail  
12  that we need to manage Federal subsistence fisheries,  
13  it just doesn't. And it's unfortunate that we can't  
14  point to some Fish and Game technical bulletin or  
15  something that says the sportfishing at this location  
16  is X. They can't do that. They can't. Unless it's a  
17  huge sportfishery like, you know, the Kenai or  
18  something like that, but for something small like Neva  
19  Creek it just doesn't -- there's not enough reports for  
20  them to catch that in their statewide survey. So, you  
21  know, how can we develop this information. It's  
22  traditional knowledge and it's observations from people  
23  who fish there like me, and the folks from Hoonah that  
24  I ran into this year. And that perspective gets  
25  discounted because the data isn't being collected to  
26  the detail that we need to do our management, and  
27  that's really unfortunate, and it gets us in these  
28  places like this.

29  
30                               So, yeah, I'm in complete support of  
31  keeping that closure in place until something changes  
32  that helps Federally-qualified users get what they need  
33  there. You know I don't want to see people being  
34  forced to go to unsafe places or to fish in unsafe  
35  conditions just to get their sockeye. There's got to  
36  be something we can do.

37  
38                               Thank you.

39  
40                               ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.  
41  Casipit. Any further Council deliberation.

42  
43                               (No comments)

44  
45                               ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any comments  
46  from the Council members that are on the phone.

47  
48                               (No comments)

49  
50

0333

1                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

2

3                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Madame  
4 Chair. I think I heard enough justification from Cal,  
5 I'm ready to call for the question.

6

7                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
8 question's been called and we will now vote on Federal  
9 Closure Review 23-24 to maintain the status quo --  
10 maintain the status quo, that's all I'm going to say, I  
11 think you guys know what that means. All in favor  
12 signify by saying aye.

13

14                   IN UNISON: Aye.

15

16                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any opposed  
17 signify by saying nay.

18

19                   (No opposing votes)

20

21                   ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,  
22 motion carried to maintain the status quo.

23

24                   Well, I'd like to extend my sincere  
25 thank you to the Council for staying late and help move  
26 us further along the agenda. We still have a lot of  
27 work to do under new business, including non-rural  
28 determination which is likely the agenda item that  
29 we'll take up first in the morning. And I also want to  
30 thank Staff and all of the members of those attending  
31 the meeting for sticking with us as we continue through  
32 this important business and -- it seems like Mr.  
33 Douville might have something to say for the good of  
34 the order before we recess until tomorrow morning.

35

36                   MR. DOUVILLE: I don't have nice things  
37 to say, I have a question.....

38

39                   (Laughter)

40

41                   MR. DOUVILLE: .....for Cal. The next  
42 piece of action would be to raise the bag limit for  
43 subsistence users in that system, right, so that  
44 process needs to start.

45

46                   MR. CASIPIT: Correct. And I  
47 believe.....

48

49                   REPORTER: Cal.

50



0334

1 MR. CASIPIT: Correct. And I believe  
2 that Jake was going to get with the area management  
3 biologist to try to make that happen for next year. I  
4 would have hoped he would have done something this year  
5 but.....

6  
7 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Well, if you remember  
8 though.....

9  
10 REPORTER: No, Jake, come on up.

11  
12 (Laughter)

13  
14 REPORTER: Sorry, it's the way it is.

15  
16 (Laughter)

17  
18 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, for the record  
19 this is Jake Musslewhite again. Through the Chair to  
20 Member Casipit. I don't know if you remember but at  
21 our last meeting the issue came up and I ended up  
22 having a side conversation during the meeting with the  
23 AMB about the possibility of doing that. He actually  
24 said, oh, we can't do that except through the Board of  
25 Fish process and I showed him the memo saying yes you  
26 can, and so we sort of negotiated that through email  
27 really quick. At that time it was too late in the year  
28 -- in fact, we're actually pretty much right at the  
29 threshold for their process to be able to get it into  
30 effect for next year. So I feel like I have the  
31 blessing of the Council here to continue to pursue  
32 that, you know, I've laid all the groundwork for it so  
33 I will get back to him as soon as I get back to work  
34 and, you know, they indicated they'd be comfortable  
35 with raising the limit to 20. I think that's 20 daily  
36 and 20 poss -- or 20 for the season, so I'll talk to  
37 them about that. But I think that's what, you know,  
38 we're aiming for.

39  
40 MR. JOHNSON: One thing.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Johnson.

43  
44 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, this is really  
45 quick. You know, the FRMP there is managed as a  
46 cooperative agreement amongst the tribe and Forest  
47 Service and so I'd be happy to help facilitate  
48 something -- that process through the tribe or, you  
49 know, also it's a good co-management opportunity to,  
50

0335

1 you know, look at the escapement and do that. So if  
2 there's something in there, just offering that up,  
3 thanks.

4

5 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Thank you.

6

7 MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Phillips.

10

11 MS. PHILLIPS: I had requested should  
12 we include an increase limit for sockeye in the motion  
13 and you had said it wasn't necessary but would it help  
14 facilitate the request to increase the limit to 20  
15 sockeye.

16

17 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yeah, through the  
18 Chair. Member Phillips. That would have had to have  
19 been its own separate proposal, you know, because  
20 during the closure review, it can only address that  
21 closure.

22

23 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

24

25 MR. MUSSLEWHITE: But had we had a  
26 separate proposal, you know, to change the bag limit  
27 for -- under the Federal rules we could have addressed  
28 that in this meeting. The very, very nice thing,  
29 though, is that you're all well aware of the lengthy  
30 process for changing this, however, I can work with the  
31 State to do it under their process, which has the  
32 effect of also changing the Federal regulations,  
33 because we just adopt those. So it's a two for one  
34 deal that I can do with a handful of emails to the  
35 biologist there. Thank you.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Where are you  
38 guys going, I haven't called for the recess yet.

39

40 (Laughter)

41

42 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.

43

44 MR. KITKA: I've always been curious as  
45 to why they put such a low limit and how many times you  
46 have to go to get the annual limit. If they gave us  
47 the annual limit we'd make one trip and that'd be it.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank

50

0336

1 you for that comment. I don't have an answer to the  
2 question. But the workgroup members for the Board of  
3 Game proposals, if you could meet me up here  
4 immediately after we recess so we could set a time to  
5 meet that would be great, and with that we'll recess  
6 until 9:00 a.m., tomorrow morning.

7

8 MR. SLATER: Thank you.

9

10 (Off record)

11

12 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

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

