

0001

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

SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

HARRIGAN CENTENNIAL HALL
Sitka, Alaska
March 19, 2025

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Donald Hernandez, Chair
Frank G. Wright, Jr.
Calvin H. Casipit
Michael A. Douville
Theodore F. Sandhofer
Patricia A. Phillips
Harvey Kitka
John Smith III
Lewis M. Hiatt

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

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

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Sitka, Alaska - 3/19/25)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Good morning, everybody. I think we've got the technical issues resolved. So, we'll get started with the meeting here this morning. And DeAnna, I think I'm going to ask you to do a roll call. Frank had to step away for a minute. He's got a family issue to work on here this morning, but he'll be rejoining us shortly. But for the roll call. If you could do that, please.

MS. PERRY: I'd be happy too, Mr. Chair. Calvin Casipit.

(No audible response)

Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Here.

MS. PERRY: Ted Sandhofer.

MR. SANDHOFER: Here.

MS. PERRY: Patricia Phillips.

MS. PHILLIPS: Here.

MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Here.

MS. PERRY: John Smith III.

MR. SMITH: Here.

MS. PERRY: Lewis Hiatt

MR. HIATT: Here.

MS. PERRY: And we have four members with excused absences. Those are Larry Bemis, Jim Slater, Louie Wagner, and Mr. Wright will be with us in just a moment. And, Mr -- yes. Albert Howard is also an excused

1 absence. Don Hernandez is here. You have a quorum, Mr.
2 Chair.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
5 DeAnna. So, we will start off the meeting this morning
6 with an opportunity for public testimony. And this is
7 on any issue related to subsistence uses in the region.
8 I'll ask if there's anybody in the room who would like
9 to testify first, and then we'll go to the phone lines
10 and see if there's anybody on the phone who wants to
11 testify. So, is there anybody in the in the room who
12 would like to say anything about subsistence this
13 morning? Bring to the attention of the Council? Yes.
14 Come forward. If you would come forward and, we need to
15 use the microphones at the table there so everything can
16 be recorded. So, yes, just turn on the microphone, a
17 little silver button, and state your name again,
18 and.....

19
20 MR. NIELSON: Yes, my name is James --
21 John Neilson, Jr. I'm a born and raised Alaskan. Across
22 the bridge matter of fact. And I've seen the herring
23 fisheries kind of decimate the -- (indiscernible) it's
24 just getting smaller and smaller, you know, over the
25 years I've grown up here. It's just, now it's down to
26 just spots bombing here and there. This whole coast used
27 to be spawn. Yeah. And we didn't have to hunt or put our
28 branches in the water, you know, and then they get stolen
29 and stuff like that, you know. So, that's what we're
30 dealing with nowadays. And then, you know, the, you know,
31 the weather's a factor. Also, small boats, most of us,
32 yeah. We don't have 50-foot sailers so. Yeah. So, you
33 know, we do what we can and, you know, price of fuel and
34 everything else. And I just think it should be reduced
35 or whatever, you know? Yeah. In the East Coast, they
36 tried it, you know, moratorium on the herring and it --
37 recovery was minimal over years. So, that that didn't
38 work out there that that was in the news. So, you know,
39 it's one thing, you know, it's -- it's a time thing, you
40 know, and it's going downhill right now, in my eyes. So,
41 it's -- like I say, thank you, and I'm happy to be here
42 and partake in a year of harvesting eggs. Okay. Thank
43 you.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you for
46 bringing that to our attention. Appreciate it. Anybody
47 else in the room like to testify about anything this
48 morning? Okay. Come forward.

49
50 (No response)

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

Okay. Guess not. Anybody else? Okay. Is there anybody on the telephone standing by this morning who would like to talk to the Council?

MS. PERRY: And Mr. Chair, just as a reminder for those joining us on the phone, if you'll press star five that will indicate for us that you'd like to speak. And if you're joining us on Teams and would like to speak, please use the raise hand feature. Again, if you're on the phone, star five, or on teams the raise hand feature. We'll give that just a moment, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, DeAnna. Stand by here, see if anybody raises their hand. Okay. We're not seeing anybody or hearing anybody, so we'll move on with the Council's business for this morning before we get into the wildlife proposal process. So, I did have a request from Lisa Grediagin from OSM to maybe clarify some things from yesterday. So, Lisa, go ahead.

MS. GREDIAGIN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Lisa Grediagin, for the record. And just to follow up briefly on the rabbit hole we went down about closing the federal season for a Unit 2 deer, while leaving the federal public lands open to hunting under state regulations. From, you know, a statewide perspective, you know, this happens to some extent. You know, the Federal In-Season Managers have authority to close the federal season and if they close the season, then the lands are still open if there's a state hunt occurring. However, in this specific situation of Unit 2 deer closure of the federal season, while leaving the state, the lands open to state hunters would be restricting federal users without restricting state hunters, which is completely against ANILCA. And so, whether, you know, the In-Season Manager could do it, I mean, I guess technically maybe, but should they do it? Absolutely not. That's a violation of ANILCA and would it hold up in court? No, I don't think so at all. So, just to clarify that on the record, clear my conscience. So, maybe thinking, you know, on the fly and providing maybe some confusing information. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Lisa. Are there any questions from the Council? I think you made that pretty clear. So, thank you, Lisa. We did have somebody come on to the phone line here, and that would

0005

1 be Ian Johnson. Are you there Ian?

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Hey. Good morning. Yes, I
4 am, thank you.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Oh, good. Good
7 morning, Ian. Go ahead.

8

9 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning, everyone. I'm
10 Ian Johnson from Hoonah. I work for Hoonah Indian
11 Association. I run the environmental program there. I
12 know there was some discussion yesterday about some of
13 the deer work in Chichagof, so I just wanted to provide
14 the Council a quick update on what we've been working
15 on, forward on there with a lot of partners. A lot of
16 folks are in this meeting, too. So, we're currently
17 drafting a survey, but not just a survey, an interview
18 format to help provide new data to the effects of the
19 closure. So, I guess that survey has two goals. One is
20 evaluate the closure, and then the second goal is just
21 collect recent data on harvest. Just try to get, you
22 know, aside from harvest reporting, just get a snapshot
23 on how people's seasons were and if their subsistence
24 needs were met. So, we are just starting that now, worked
25 very collaboratively with a pretty large group of people
26 from OSM and the state, and other partners as well, to
27 design that survey, and thank you to all of them for
28 their help there. And so, by this autumn we'll have, you
29 know, some results from that. The goal is to collect the
30 data, code it, and then provide it to OSM...

31

32 MS. PERRY: Hello. Ian?

33

34 (Simultaneous speech)

35

36 Ian? I'm sorry to interrupt you. We have
37 lost internet here in the building. I am on my MiFi, so
38 I do still have internet to be able to talk to you. They
39 are trying to troubleshoot that right now. But I wanted
40 to let you know that we can't hear you in the room, and
41 hopefully you can stand by and be able to give your
42 report in just a little bit?

43

44 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, sure. Yep. I'll just
45 mute myself until you tell me I'm ready again.

46

47 MS. PERRY: Yep. And I can't hear you.
48 Okay. If there's someone else on the line, could you
49 speak so I can see if I can hear you through my computer?

50

1 AMBER COHEN: Good morning, DeAnna.

2

3 MR. RISDAHL: Hey, DeAnna. This is Greg.

4

5 MS. PERRY: Great. Thank you. I heard
6 both Amber and Greg. So, I do -- I have my government
7 Wi-Fi that I am on, but the entire recording system is
8 through what we have here in the office. We do have a
9 plan B and a plan C, but we're just going to need to
10 transition to that. So, if folks could just be patient
11 with us, we will be back shortly. Thank you.

12

13 (Pause)

14

15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. For the
16 folks on the on the line, we do have to take a break to
17 resolve these technical problems. I think we'll come
18 back at 9:30. We'll try coming back at 9:30 and see if
19 things are working. Thank you. Now we're gonna [sic],
20 we're gonna.....

21

22 (Off record)

23

24 (On record)

25

26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think we
27 can resume here. Thank everybody for their patience, and
28 we'll pick up where we left off. We have one person,
29 hopefully, still standing by on the telephone. And then
30 while we were waiting, we also had somebody show up in
31 the room who would like to testify. So, let's go back
32 to Ian Johnson. Ian, are you with us?

33

34 MR. JOHNSON: I am, thank you.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And we didn't --
37 we basically didn't hear anything you had to say. So,
38 you have to start over. So, go ahead.

39

40 MR. JOHNSON: All right. Well, it's like
41 kicking a field goal twice. You usually make it the
42 second time, so that's good. My name is Ian Johnson. I
43 work for Hoonah Indian Association, and we've been
44 working on the -- a lot of the deer related stuff in
45 North Chichagof, and I have provided some updates to the
46 Council in the past, so I wanted to just make folks
47 aware of what we are working on currently, sort of
48 related to the discussion that you had yesterday as well.
49 Unfortunately, I wasn't able to listen in to that. So,
50 I -- but I'm -- yeah. So, what we're working on is some

1 survey work to help evaluate the closure and gather new
2 data on hunting success, just to sort of supplement the
3 harvest reporting that goes into the state. Also trying
4 to evaluate if folks' subsistence needs were met. So,
5 over the last six weeks or so now, we've been
6 collaboratively making a survey tool with quite a few
7 folks who are on this call, and also probably present
8 in the room. So, collaborating with federal and state
9 and private entities to design a tool. So, the way this
10 tool is structured is it's two parts. The first set of
11 questions are pretty straightforward about just whether
12 or not folks hunted this year, the type of success they
13 had, and then also if they were aware of the closure,
14 and then based on those answers, basically if they say
15 yes, I was aware of the closure and, yes, I hunted deer.
16 Then we're going to request a longer interview with them
17 which will be recorded, and we'll be coding and -- coding
18 all that data that we get from that interview process,
19 and providing that back to OSM, and the state, for
20 analysis as part of the way to evaluate these closures
21 and just look at its effect on hunting trends around
22 Hoonah.

23
24 So, yeah, thanks to all the folks that
25 are on this call that have been a part of this survey
26 design process. It has been a lot of back and forth and
27 very collaborative. So, appreciate that. Yeah, and we're
28 starting, I think, this week now, finally, we'll be
29 starting to interview hunters, so we'll be generating
30 data over the next couple of months. And, you know,
31 certainly by the next RAC cycle we'll be able to, you
32 know, I -- you know, I think we'll be able to, you know,
33 provide data to OSM and the state by say mid-June or
34 July, or whatever [sic] it ends up being there by the
35 time we're done with these surveys. I will say right now
36 the survey is definitely written with Hoonah people in
37 mind, like thinking about road system usage. We do want
38 to do it in the other communities that we've worked in
39 in the past, Pelican and Gustavus and Angoon. We just
40 need to think about how the questions are written and
41 how it applies to their own closure areas. So, yeah, I
42 just want to flag that right now. It's definitely a
43 Hoonah kind of oriented survey. And then the other --
44 on a separate thing that we've been working on is to
45 deploy deer cameras for population monitoring and trend
46 monitoring in Hoonah. So, as of last year, we've deployed
47 32 trail cameras throughout the road system in Hoonah.
48 We're working with the state on their mark recapture
49 model for that. So, we're using the same model that
50 they're transitioning to. Definitely -- I -- you know,

1 I'm excited to have that data to provide and just like
2 look at year trends -- patterns and trends. We had a
3 little bit of a steep learning curve last year after
4 pulling the first year of images. We, you know, there
5 was about maybe like ten of the 32 cameras that generated
6 data that can be used. We need to go back this year and
7 modify some of the sets to be -- some of them are on too
8 steep a slope. It's just like -- some logistics like
9 that. But hopefully after this year, we'll have 32 camera
10 trapping sites that are collecting the data that we're
11 seeking to get with that. And then the last thing, I
12 guess, I'd provide is that we're -- I've been pretty
13 actively coordinating with what we're calling the North
14 Chichagof Deer Working Group. So, bringing together
15 communities and agencies and other stakeholders to just
16 talk about deer issues, stay current on what's happening
17 in regards to research, etc. So, you know, yeah, that
18 that's just a good forum to kind of continue to work
19 through some of the issues on Chichagof -- North
20 Chichagof. And then, yeah, all of that work that I've
21 just mentioned is funded under the U.S. Forest Service
22 Southeast Alaska Sustainability Initiative, SASI, if you
23 all have heard of that acronym, strategies. So, we have
24 funding for that through 2027 right now, and are going
25 to continue to do the social work and biological work
26 associated with deer on North Chichagof. I think that's
27 what I got. Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Hey. Thank you,
30 Ian. Are there any questions for Ian from the Council?
31 Yeah. Mike, go ahead.

32
33 MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville here. I was
34 wondering if you -- it's great. I think it's -- first
35 of all, I think it's a great thing you're doing. The
36 information is going to be most helpful down the road
37 when I get -- when we have to do a reassessment. And it
38 sounds like you have funding for it, and I was wondering
39 how much you can share or give a template to the other
40 areas, Pelican and Angoon, to help them along and doing
41 a similar thing and all, you know, and all of this takes
42 a little bit of funding, but is there a way to -- you
43 did mention them, but is there a way to include them as
44 well?

45
46 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. Yep. Yeah. Thank you
47 for the question. Yeah. So, we need to this year again.
48 So, the way -- we did these social type surveys two
49 years ago trying to -- it wasn't the same questions, but
50 we hired people in Gustavus and Pelican to conduct the

1 surveys. And this time around, I'm not sure if we're
2 going to do that kind of model again or if we'll just
3 try to have the interviewer that we have in Hoonah travel
4 to communities or work, you know, work remotely with
5 people. But, yeah, the funding we have can be applied
6 basically to the communities and - and all around North
7 Chichagof, we can use it to collect data there too. And
8 so just need to decide how we're going to collect that
9 data. If it's with a local interviewer like that, or if
10 we try to bring someone into the community. But, yeah,
11 I would like to get that data as a part like this season.
12 Like start with Hoonah and meet our collection needs,
13 but then look at moving into other communities, you know,
14 early summer, late spring or whatever that is.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you.
17 Anybody else? Patti, go ahead.

18
19 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
20 Hernandez. Ian, I was wondering, you mentioned deer
21 patterns and trends. Is it too early to see any of those
22 in the Hoonah area?

23
24 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, we don't have any of
25 the analysis for that yet. So, we're working with the
26 state on that. And, yeah, they haven't done the work
27 with our cameras yet. So, it is -- it is too early. I'm
28 excited to see, you know, again, like the sets that --
29 the setups that worked are, you know, there was like ten
30 of them. So, we'll be able to get something from that.
31 I'll be curious to see what it does. Like what the
32 results of that look like when we do have it, and then,
33 hopefully, we'll have a much better sample size by next
34 year, once we correct those other camera sets that --
35 this summer.

36
37 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any other
40 Council members with a question for Ian?

41
42 (No response)

43
44 Doesn't appear so. Thank you for meeting
45 with us this morning, Ian, and bringing us that
46 information. Appreciate it.

47
48 MR. JOHNSON: All right. Thanks,
49 everyone.

50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. And then we
2 also have in the room, looks like Mr. Olsen; if you want
3 to come forward. So, yeah, let's turn on the microphone,
4 and give us your full name for the record and, go ahead.

5
6 MR. OLSEN: (In Native) In the Haida
7 Language, my name means place of one's own. I was born
8 in Ketchikan, Alaska, and my given name is Frederick
9 Olsen, Jr. I live here in Sitka, and I am here as myself,
10 an individual speaking. A resident of this area. And I
11 do not mean to offend anyone. Yeah, I didn't wake up
12 this morning and here's my chance to really get some
13 people I don't know. And I, you know, and I'm not here
14 to have you advocate naming the Gulf of Alaska, the
15 Haida Gulf, or anything like that. And -- but I know,
16 you know, it's funny. When you explain things these days,
17 you can start to seem like you're facetious or talking
18 down to people, and I don't mean that. And I'm not trying
19 to be sarcastic or anything. And so, I hope I've not
20 over explained that, I hope not to offend anyone. But,
21 you know, I do have to wonder who is listening to us.
22 And I hope when you advocate further, you know, who --
23 is anyone actually listening? You know, I hesitated to
24 even come here because I've been to a lot of these
25 meetings now in the last decade, and a lot of times you
26 seem, and you probably felt this, you seem like you're
27 having the same meeting, the same conversation, the same
28 issues. And it can be really frustrating, especially,
29 you know, as an individual citizen. And we're told to,
30 to use science and we try to, you know we -- and we use
31 what we know from growing up in this world, and it's
32 really hard to take and, hopefully, you can do something,
33 you know, when the so-called Board of Fish, these folks
34 who are actually sitting in the Chairs, they didn't know
35 how herring eggs got onto kelp and how they got onto
36 branches that were put in the water. You know, that
37 would be amazing. Like, you know, if Stephen A. Smith
38 didn't know, how come football games a lot of times end
39 in multiples of seven? You know, they do know this. But
40 if someone, if a sports announcer didn't know that, you
41 might not listen to the -- what they thought of the
42 game. Well, what are we supposed to think of the Board
43 of Fish when they don't know what we know? And here's
44 something we all know. You know what's happening, the
45 eagles are coming back, and a lot of animals are coming.
46 How come? Because the herring are coming, and what are
47 herring?

48
49 Herring are a forage fish and that's why
50 everyone's coming. The eagles are coming. The whales are

1 coming. The sea lions are coming. The seiners are coming.
2 But because herring is a forage fish, and I did this the
3 other day with a friend, because I was surprised when I
4 found out that the Board of fish, the state of Alaska
5 doesn't -- they say the herring is not a forage fish.
6 When everyone else does. Scientists, they know it, we
7 know it, everyone knows it, but they want to not know
8 it because of commercial reasons and these kinds of
9 things, but why is it important? It's a forage fish
10 because it's a basic building block of our world. And
11 it would -- you know, that reality must be recognized.
12 Herring is a forage fish. And I don't want to go on and
13 on. But it just -- you know, it might have been the same
14 room, same building. I don't know, a different building,
15 same town. But anyway, same issue. There was a proposal
16 to close a little bay over here that was described by
17 one tribal leader as our school. And when I say our --
18 I don't pretend to -- I'm not from here. But you know
19 what I mean. The person described this as our school,
20 you know, where folks are taught the knowledge of
21 harvesting herring eggs and so on, everything that goes
22 along with that. And, you know, you live long enough,
23 you're actually in the room when these kinds of things
24 are said. And one of the people on the Board, who was
25 actually for the closure, said they were for it, but
26 they were kind of wringing their hands because, gee,
27 maybe the herring protectors or the other groups will
28 want to close more areas. And I thought that was pretty
29 ironic. Like, yeah, colonizer. You know, that's kind of
30 ironic that, you know, that's what happened. The whole
31 bay got closed to, you know, our people, right. And now
32 we're the ones have to come hat in hand and ask if we
33 could have one of our little bays back. And in any way,
34 all of this comes -- the reason we're having these --
35 the same meeting over and over again is because this one
36 group, or the state, doesn't want to recognize what the
37 eagles recognize, what the whales recognize, the sea
38 lions recognize. Our people have always recognized,
39 herring is a forage fish. Gunalchéesh, thank you.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
42 Olsen. I don't know if anybody has any questions, but
43 we certainly -- yeah, I think somebody does want to ask
44 you a question, if you want to answer, but we certainly
45 do recognize your frustration. Yeah. So, John Smith,
46 then maybe Harvey. So, John...

47
48 MR. SMITH: (In native). I just want you
49 to know that I can -- we can hear you and we, like Don
50 was saying, your frustration is our frustration too. The

1 other day, some of the issues that were put on the table,
2 you can feel the passion and the pain Calvin was having,
3 and the team, of some of the things and how hard we're
4 working and putting the information up on the table and
5 the proposals to make good changes. So, you know, for
6 conservation for, you know, the community. So, I just
7 want you to recognize we understand you, you know, and
8 we hear you -- that you know that. And thank you for
9 coming up here. We appreciate it.

10

11 MR. OLSEN: Gunalchéesh.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
14 Harvey.

15

16 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank
17 you, Fred, for coming in and talking. Most of you don't
18 know that Fred is our heads-up our National Resource
19 Commission, and our committee for the Sitka Tribe. And
20 he's done a fair job, a fairly good job, over the last
21 -- I don't know how long ago I quit, and I quit that.
22 But I want you to know that this group is made up of
23 people that fish and hunt and take part in all the things
24 we know what is -- what you're talking about. We've been
25 up and talked to so many people that had no idea what
26 we were saying. We're hoping that somewhere along the
27 way, that they might have some sort of training for some
28 of these Board people to understand what we're talking
29 about. And instead of trying to explain to them as we
30 come along and tell them our things, we want this message
31 to get out there as often as we can. Thank you, Fred.

32

33 MR. OLSEN: Thanks.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
36 Harvey. Cal.

37

38 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Olsen, thank you for
39 coming and testifying to us, and I agree with you 100%.
40 They're forage fish, always have been. And I also say
41 this, as a fisheries biologist, I'm not aware of any
42 forage fishery that has -- any forage fish population
43 that has come out ahead on the other side of a industrial
44 fishing operation on them. I can't think of one. If
45 there's anybody in the audience who can give me an
46 example of one that did turn out all right for the forage
47 fish population, I'd surely like to hear it because I've
48 never seen an example of it. So, I agree with you. I
49 think there should, you know, there should be no
50 industrial fishing on forage fish. So, I agree with you

1 100% on that and, you know, we -- every time the Board
2 of Fish comes around for southeast or, you know, seems
3 like herring is always on the table. And I just wish
4 they would recognize the value of these things to other
5 than, than you know, the SAC Roe Fishery, or whatever.
6 I think they're worth more to the environment than they
7 are to a few permit holders. Anyway, that's all I have.
8 Thank you. But thanks for coming, and thanks for
9 everything you do.

10
11 MR. OLSEN: Well, thank you. I really
12 appreciate the challenge because, actually, there was
13 such a fishery, but actually, technically, maybe not
14 because they didn't actually take the herring, but
15 there's remnants of it now. You know, I've never been
16 asked by any friends or family, what are the seiners get
17 per ton? I've never been asked that. I've been asked a
18 lot of times, and it's going to be coming soon, Fred how
19 do I get some herring eggs? Can you get me some herring
20 eggs on branches or herring eggs on kelp? See, that's a
21 market. And back in the day there was this -- that's how
22 it was. People came here and they harvested the eggs,
23 and then they would go back to the communities and, you
24 know, that's why it's still going. They didn't have test
25 sets and didn't kill their -- you know, most of the
26 herring survived that fishery, and the people thrived
27 until, you know, some other folks came and did some
28 other things. But thank you for that. And that's what,
29 that's one thing I would like to see us go back to the
30 future, and have that as the fishery, you know, say run
31 by the tribe or tribal leader; the people that -- folks
32 like Harvey, people that actually know the area and know
33 about such things should be running that. And believe
34 me, there's a huge market. I'm going to be, you know,
35 bombarded, and now my cousin knows -- he's here, and
36 everybody wants herring eggs. But yeah. Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And Patti, go
39 ahead.

40
41 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
42 Hernandez. Thank you, Fred Olsen. You made a statement.
43 What are we supposed to think when they don't know what
44 we know? It's this traditional ecological knowledge that
45 that's missing at, at our what, partner agency? The Board
46 of Fish. I mean, if you look at this Council, you see a
47 long-term presence on this Council. If you look at the
48 Board of Fish membership, they're at the whim of the
49 Governor's choosing and, rarely do you have long-term
50 presence on their Board. But so, at every opportunity

1 to submit public comment on forage fish herring, I think
2 that it would be good to submit your traditional
3 ecological knowledge as a -- as a document. How far back
4 that goes, and I don't mean to offend you by saying I
5 know better, I think you should do this. I'm saying this
6 as we need those -- that group of people needs to know
7 what that traditional ecological knowledge is. And even
8 if you're submitting it every three years, because
9 that's when those proposals come forward, onto their --
10 into their recorded comments, because they don't know,
11 like you said, they don't know. So, and then it might
12 give other groups opportunity to comment as well. So,
13 thank you, Fred.

14

15 MR. OLSEN: Thanks.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti. Anybody
18 else questions or comments? Frank, go ahead.

19

20 MR. WRIGHT: Hi, Frank Wright from Hoonah.
21 Thank you for coming in. You know, I -- when I first
22 started black codding in Hoonah, I used to be able to
23 use a throw net to get my bait, get herring. Now you
24 don't even see them in Hoonah. And I know in Auke Bay
25 they used to have a herring fisheries there, and that's
26 gone. You know, and you think about this area, and you
27 wonder when is it going to stop here? Or are there going
28 to be herring here for our future? We don't know. The
29 way the fishery is going, it's going to decimate the
30 whole area, and then the Fish and Game will say, oh, we
31 should have listened to them. They'll never say that.
32 They'll never admit that they were wrong. So, you know,
33 for you to come in and talk to us about it, I'm glad.
34 You know, I'm glad that you're here. Because I always
35 say squeaky wheel gets the grease, and you're squeaking.
36 And you're going to get the grease, I hope. Anyway,
37 gunalchéesh for being here.

38

39 MR. OLSEN: Gunalchéesh. I'll take a jar
40 of grease. That'd be great. It goes great with the
41 herring eggs.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody else on
44 the -- anybody else on the Council with a question or
45 comment? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Olsen, once again;
46 appreciate it. Have we had anybody else join us online
47 or in the room that wants to testify anything to the
48 Council?

49

50 (No response)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Okay. I guess that concludes our public testimony session this morning, and now we can get back to the other Council business, and we left off with the call for Federal Wildlife Proposals, and the first step in the process. And that would be a report on the present status of wildlife in Southeast Alaska. So, we'll hear that first, and then we'll start developing some proposals.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

MS. BOLWERK: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Council members. Presentation's being passed around to you, but it's also going to be up on the screen here as well. So, I'm going to briefly go through some updates on wildlife harvest throughout Southeast Alaska. There we go. Okay. We're going to start off with deer. So, I'm going to just kind of give a synopsis of what's happening here, but this is a graph of deer harvest in Units 1 through 4. Roughly over the last ten years, although this data only goes through 2023. As you can see in Unit 4, in the yellow there the harvest has gone up and down quite a bit over the years, and has been fairly low the last couple of years, but coming back up a bit in 2023. Next going down, we have Unit 2. As you can see, there's a pretty big decline in deer harvest starting back in 2015. We also marked when the limit change to two bucks there on the graph for you all. And the decline in harvest has been stabilizing, but still is decreasing. And then the blue line there is Unit 1 and Unit 3 is in gray. Both have remained fairly steady with just slight increases over the last couple of years.

33
34
35

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Actually, just one clarification there that the two buck limit, that was only for non-subsistence hunters.

36
37

MS. BOLWERK: CORRECT.

38
39
40

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That that didn't go into effect for subsistence hunters?

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

MS. BOLWERK: Yes. Sorry about that. This graph is showing sort of the state reported harvest, which includes those federally qualified users in those places. Thank you for the clarification there. All right. My clicker is a little crazy. Then, we also wanted to look at effort here in numbers of hunters in Units 1 through 4. And this is actually permits that were issued, not folks who actually went hunting. So, again the trends are fairly similar in each of the Units to the harvest

1 that occurred. Unit 2, harvest and effort level declined
2 over the last ten years. But, again, appears to be
3 leveling out. Go ahead, Cal.

4
5 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you. Calvin Casipit.
6 Gustavus. This one, and this slide and the slide before.
7 I noticed, you know, that you got that little -- those
8 little bits of increases while on the previous one.
9 Little bit of increases in harvest in the past two years,
10 that due to milder winters, or do you -- don't know.
11 What to me -- the Unit 2, they didn't find the -- they
12 didn't get the same response as the other Units. That's
13 -- I'm curious about that.

14
15 MS. BOLWERK: To the Chair member Caspit.
16 I just have the data to report to you. But I don't live
17 in those places, and so, I think you all have the best
18 sense of why those trends might be what they are. So,
19 yeah, if you if you want to have a conversation about
20 that, that would be.....

21
22 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We'll probably
23 have a conversation that when we get into developing the
24 proposals. So, yeah.

25
26 MR. CASIPIT: I just wanted to point that
27 out. It's kind of curious to me.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Go ahead,
30 Ashley.

31
32 MS. BOLWERK: All right. We know there
33 had been conversations around the Unit 2 deer, and so
34 we wanted to provide some additional data for Unit 2,
35 this report out. So, we did look at the harvest of does
36 and bucks, and so on the left, that pie chart is from
37 2020 to 2023, and just shows the proportion of does
38 harvested over that time frame, which accounts to about
39 2% of the overall harvest that occurred in Unit 2. And
40 then on the right, is just doe harvest, but broken down
41 by month. And so, as you can see earlier in the season,
42 there's no doe harvest over the last four years. And
43 then most of the doe harvest tends to occur in November.
44 Moving on to mountain goats. The top table there shows
45 our federal permits that we have. So, the top one is
46 sort of what we often refer to as the extra goat permit.
47 There was -- this is showing 20 -- or sorry, 2004 to
48 2024. There's been no harvest with those, and then we
49 have the 5A and 5B ones where there's been some low
50 harvest. We do issue permits for those, but it's pretty

00017

1 low occurrence of issuing permits for those. And then
2 the bottom table is sort of the, again, Fish and Game
3 registration permit data over the last four years there.
4 And so, as you can see, there's some variability as far
5 as overall success rate as we go. Oh, and I apologize,
6 the Units got cut off on this one. So, the top row is
7 1A and we have 1B, 1C and 1D. And then on the bottom we
8 have Unit 4, and the last one is Unit 5A. So, I'm sorry
9 about that. Yeah. It seems like the goat hunting has
10 been pretty variable in many of these areas, but many
11 of them are showing increases in harvest with this last
12 2023 year.

13
14 All right. Some more information about
15 goat harvest and effort, this one broken down by
16 residency and community. This is just for 2023 now. So,
17 in Unit 1A, 74% of the goats that were harvested there
18 were by Alaska residents, the largest group being from
19 Ketchikan. In unit 1B, 71% of the goats harvested were
20 by Alaska residents, and 63% of those were folks from
21 Petersburg and Wrangell. Unit 1C, 62% of the goats
22 harvested by - were by folks who are residents of Alaska,
23 primarily Juneau. And then, in Unit 4, 81% of the harvest
24 was by residents of Alaska, with 72% of those being
25 Sitka residents. Moving on to moose, you can see in Unit
26 1A at the top there, we've had some increased harvest
27 success. But there's been low hunter effort this -- the
28 latest year we have data for. Units 1B and 1C have been
29 pretty steady throughout the four years we're looking
30 at here. The Unit 1D, we have a pretty big decline in
31 harvest in 2021, but then things seem to have gone back
32 to where they were. In Unit 3, it seems like in the last
33 year that we have data here for, there have been -- was
34 a pretty big increase in hunters and harvest. The -- I
35 want to call out in Unit 3 here for 2022, there's a
36 typo. It wasn't 8 goats that were harvested. That would
37 be a really drastic decline. But that's supposed to be
38 86 goats. So, it didn't drop quite that far, but still
39 going up from 86 in 2022 to 113 in 2023. Let's see. Unit
40 5A and 5B, those are both under quota. So, not a lot of
41 change in overall harvest, especially for 5A, and there
42 is some sort of low effort in the 5B. Okay. The Unit 1A
43 federal moose hunt is the bottom table there. Again, low
44 participation in that and low harvest as well. The elk
45 information we have for you today, again is over the
46 last four years. We continue to issue the federal elk
47 permit, which is that top row there, but no one has
48 harvested under that permit to date. The other hunts
49 that you see there, as you can tell, we don't have the
50 data yet for 2024. But there's pretty low harvest and

1 success for all of those permits.

2

3 All right, moving on to the Designated
4 Hunter Program. This is just permits issued in 2024. So,
5 this this past year, and separated out by community. And
6 so, you can see the lion's share of the Designated Hunter
7 Permits are issued in Petersburg, Wrangell and Sitka. I
8 did want to flag there was a question about Yakutat
9 moose yesterday. Here we're showing that we issued 12
10 Designated Hunter Permits in Yakutat. The assumption
11 being that most of those are for moose hunting, but I
12 don't have the specific data to say anything further
13 than that. Then we have a few permits issued in some
14 other communities as well; it's that smaller chunk of
15 the pie chart on the right. And when we look at this
16 over the last ten years, the trends are pretty similar.
17 I think the only thing of note here is that this past
18 year, we didn't issue permits in as many communities as
19 we have over the ten-year time frame, so. And the last
20 information I have for you is on this past year's unit
21 two wolf harvest. So, you guys saw this similar
22 presentation in 2022. Since then, in 2023, there were
23 71 wolves harvested, and then in 2024, there were 74
24 wolves harvested. This year's season ran from November
25 15th to December 15th. And with that, I can try to answer
26 any questions you might have.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
29 Ashley. Questions on the status of wildlife report?
30 Council members?

31

32 (No response)

33

34 Okay. Not seeing any questions, so thank
35 you, Ashley.

36

37 MS. BOLWERK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, I guess now
40 we've come to the point where it's time for the Council
41 to start discussing any -- this would be Federal Wildlife
42 Proposals we want to put forward. Maybe a little review
43 of the procedure here. I think it's only necessary for
44 a Council member to make a motion, and then we have a
45 discussion about the proposal, and then the Council has
46 to vote on whether or not to move that proposal forward
47 to the next step, which would be the analysis phase. And
48 then that proposal, if it's a -- would come back to the
49 Council for review and recommendations in the fall. So,
50 I guess we start off with a motion, or motions, or --

1 and then move to the discussion phase. And I'm going to
2 maybe make a suggestion here. I know we're going to have
3 a lot of discussion on Unit 2 deer proposals, but I'm
4 thinking, maybe I'll request if there's any Council
5 members who are thinking about putting forward a
6 proposal in any other areas for any other species that
7 we might want to address first. So, does anybody on the
8 Council have a proposal they want to put forward other
9 than Unit 2?

10
11 (No response)

12
13 Okay. I guess not. Looks like we're
14 going to be focusing on Unit 2 for this cycle. So, I
15 guess we need to begin any discussion with some kind of
16 a motion on the floor. And I know we have a lot of
17 avenues to discuss here. So, maybe I'll just open it up
18 to the Council initially here, and see what kind of
19 discussions we may want to have. Mike, you got something?

20
21 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 I don't have a proposal, but I do have a concern. And
23 that the deer population since 2014 has -- from all
24 indications, if you look at the data that I have, that
25 was supplied by the department, shows that we are 62%,
26 or somewhere in that neighborhood, down from 2014.
27 That's really significant, and to me it is a conservation
28 concern. I don't see things changing significantly
29 because we -- I've lived on the island all my life, so
30 I understand the dynamics of it. And until we can harvest
31 more wolf, which is the primary predator, we're not going
32 to be able to bring that population up. Restrictions
33 would help some, but until you get predation under
34 control to level things off, you know, that population
35 will not increase. But I'm not clear on exactly what
36 proposal to make. Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
39 Mike. Any other Council members have any thoughts they
40 want to get out on the table here? And just as far as
41 discussions concerning Unit 2, we might have to have
42 these discussions before we actually decide on a motion.
43 So, Cal, go ahead.

44
45 MR. CASIPIT: I'll just add on to what
46 Mike was saying. I agree, I think there's an issue there
47 on Prince of Wales, there the deer -- it's obvious the
48 deer population is not responding to -- looking at this,
49 there should have been a response in the deer population
50 with these two last mild -- the two last mild winters.

1 There should have been response in the population to
2 that. There wasn't. I think there's something major
3 going on there. You're probably right. The wolf issue
4 is probably contributing to that. But before we restrict
5 subsistence users, we have to close to non-federally
6 qualified users. You know, I know in the past we've
7 tried to address subsistence needs by slightly
8 restricting non-subsistence users. You know, we had some
9 areas closed. We had reduced bag limits. But I think
10 it's now the time to totally close federal public lands
11 to non-federally qualified users, especially with
12 potentially a huge new population of subsistence users
13 in Prince of Wales Island. So, I do support a closure
14 to federal public use -- federal closure of federal
15 public lands to non-federally qualified users in Unit
16 2. And I think it should be done, both as a regulatory
17 proposal, and as a special action request for the
18 upcoming season. And I've got more issues, but I want
19 to address the first thing we need to do before we start
20 restricting subsistence use, and that's closing federal
21 public lands.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
24 Cal. I think I see what I want to do here, you know, in
25 prelude to this. Let's get the -- let's get the issues
26 out on the table, like, you know, Mike and you were just
27 doing, and then at some point, we'll have to start
28 crafting some motions, but let's call this just -- let's
29 -- an exercise in getting the various issues out there
30 that we need to discuss before we go to a motion. So --
31 Okay, Ted, go ahead.

32
33 MR. SANDHOFER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and
34 I just wanted to expand on Cal's comments. You know,
35 it's not potential. You know, there's a conservation
36 concern now with the present rural owners on Prince of
37 Wales Island, and it's not a potential, there will be
38 more hunters whenever the Federal Register allows
39 Ketchikan residents to hunt there. We're not sure how
40 much impact, but there is going to be a greater impact.
41 So, I think it's essential. I'm not sure what to do, but
42 we do need to do something, and we need to do it in a
43 way -- we need to be proactive. We can't be reactive.
44 We got to make sure things are in line. So, when that -
45 - those hunters from Ketchikan are allowed to hunt on
46 Prince of Wales Island as rural residents, that we're
47 ready to put something in place to protect the deer on
48 the island, you know. Thanks.

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
2 Any other Council members want to get any other issues
3 out before us that need to be discussing this question?
4 Patti, go ahead.

5
6 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
7 Hernandez. The population estimates provided by ADF&G
8 in our analysis here for Unit 2, talks about like deer
9 pellet surveys, and being discontinued due to their
10 inaccuracy, and then alpine aerial surveys techniques
11 being discontinued due to the difficulty of determining
12 exactly how deer seen per hour in the alpine relates to
13 the overall deer population. And then further, it says
14 that the average total harvest fell to 1,833 deer a year
15 from 2018 to 2023. It's an average harvest, you know,
16 and they say that decreasing harvests and hunter effort
17 in Unit 2 could also be an indication of declining or
18 less accessible deer population, making it increasingly
19 difficult and time consuming for hunters to harvest
20 sufficient deer to justify their efforts and
21 expenditures. So, we also have the forest management of
22 Unit 2, where it should be land management that promotes
23 forage food for deer -- or I'm not sure if that's the
24 correct way to put it. And also, that if there's going
25 to be community use areas that that timber management
26 for deer productivity should be prioritized in those
27 areas -- what I'm also -- you know, those are two
28 different issues, but first and foremost is, we don't
29 even know what the population of that island is. But I
30 put greater stake in the traditional ecological
31 knowledge that's shared with us, that there's less deer
32 on that island due to stem -- what's stem -- forest --
33 stem exclusion of the forest, and to wolf predation. And
34 so, you know, the fact that the people on the island
35 aren't getting the deer that they need for their
36 subsistence use, needs to have a higher priority. So,
37 thank you, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
40 Patti. John. Go ahead.

41
42 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I'm just going to kind
43 of echo what I did the other day in just understanding
44 the conservation issue that, that we've being sharing.
45 And quite a few years now, we've been trying to protect
46 that, that location. And so, I really think a proposal
47 should be put on the table in a special action. It's
48 almost like what our testimony at the table where you
49 know, they're not hearing us about how the issue that's
50 on the table. So, I do think the 804, and the ANCSA,

1 should be addressed too, as is you know, the non-
2 qualified users and, you know, putting all three of them
3 on the table. It's just my thoughts.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
6 Anybody else? Okay. I want to weigh in here as well. I
7 guess I should identify as, you know, Chairman Hernandez
8 speaking. As far as the issues, I think what Patti
9 brought out is important. The numbers that we were
10 presented here in these tables -- those are not
11 population estimates. Those -- that's hunter data on
12 success rates and all that. You can, you know, maybe
13 interpret -- try and interpret populations from those.
14 But they are not actual population estimates. As you
15 pointed out, Patti, we don't have that from the
16 departments. Now I think it's a perfectly valid to look
17 at the local knowledge and, you know, listening to
18 people. And what we hear is we're definitely seeing
19 population declines. I think that is verifiable with
20 traditional ecological knowledge, people on the ground.
21 So, you know, if we're going to be crafting proposals,
22 you know, one of the issues that we're going to have to
23 consider is, do we have a conservation concern? That's
24 going to drive, you know, a lot of what we ask for and,
25 you know, if the Council agrees that, yes, the local
26 knowledge indicates that there is a conservation
27 concern, I think we should, you know, make that point.

28
29 I just want to go back. You know, the
30 hunter data, you know, it shows a decrease in the number
31 of bucks taken, which is pretty drastic, but it also
32 shows decrease in effort. And you have to, you know, try
33 and interpret well, what's causing that decrease in
34 effort. Is it just -- the way these surveys are conducted
35 with these mail-out surveys, you know, it's been noted
36 in the past that they only capture successful hunts. So,
37 is that effort actually less people hunting, or just
38 less people success. So, they don't even bother filling
39 out the cards, you know, are you getting an accurate
40 picture? We've always questioned the validity of using
41 those mail-out surveys for determining, you know, all
42 the things that we need to consider in our proposals.
43 So, I think we're going to rely on the local knowledge.
44 I think we should rely on the local knowledge, and if
45 that indicates a conservation concern, that opens up a
46 whole different area of what our proposals might look
47 like. Cal, you mentioned that you think we should have
48 a closure to non-federally qualified users. That would
49 only be valid if we have a conservation concern. So, you
50 know, that's how I'm tying this all together, you know,

1 what you were saying, what Patti was saying, what Mike
2 was saying; we may need a special action request to get
3 us through this season because we don't have the
4 opportunity to put proposals in effect for this season
5 that will deal with the situation where Ketchikan
6 residents are now able to hunt as subsistence qualified
7 hunters. So, we need to be talking about special actions.
8 And the special action requests, kind of are determined
9 by whether or not there's a conservation concern as well.
10 I think I heard that -- let me back up here.

11
12 I think the Council is probably going
13 to request an 804 determination, so that we'll have a
14 basis moving forward in our October meeting on how to
15 evaluate proposals that are likely to come in that will
16 treat Ketchikan subsistence hunters different than
17 Prince of Wales subsistence hunters. And if we request
18 an 804 determination, I think I was told that, that has
19 to -- the basis for that has to be a conservation
20 concern. So, I think a lot of what actions we might end
21 up taking here kind of depend on whether or not we're
22 facing a conservation concern. And another point that I
23 think has also been brought out, if the season were to
24 happen this coming fall, and no actions are taken, and
25 Ketchikan residents are hunting under subsistence
26 regulations, which would be five deer, you know, the
27 longer season, and be allowed to take does, that - and,
28 I think everybody's opinion, would create a conservation
29 concern. And even if we can't convince the Board that
30 there -- we're presently operating under a conservation
31 concern, we certainly would want to be proactive and try
32 and prevent a really serious, you know, decline in the
33 population. If we can avoid that. So, I think, you know,
34 even if we can't convince the Board that we're in a
35 present conservation concern, I think we'd make a pretty
36 strong argument that we're trying to avoid being forced
37 into one. I think Ted said you want to be proactive and
38 not reactive, if you're looking at that. So, I think
39 we're getting a pretty good understanding of the issues
40 here that we need to discuss. Any other Council members
41 want to add anything to that? Harvey.

42
43 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not
44 knowing the competition between the predators and the
45 hunter population, what I do know is that in our area,
46 when we have these mild winters like we had, the
47 population seems to explode. We seem to get more deer.
48 The young ones survive to the -- because they're
49 healthier. They don't have to forage as hard as some of
50 the other places in winter times. Just looking at that

1 point, it shows that something is happening in Prince
2 of Wales that shouldn't be happening. And if it's a
3 conservation concern, it's definitely -- the only thing
4 we have control of is the hunters.

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

8
9 MR. CASIPIT: On the issue of
10 conservation concern for Unit 2. You know, I take to
11 heart your issue about, you know, harvest does not equal
12 populations. However, the state kind of looks at it that
13 way and that's what they were saying in our Unit 4
14 closures that we talked about over the past couple of
15 years. But I'm looking at this chart and I see Unit 2
16 is the only Unit that doesn't seem to be benefiting from
17 milder winters. Unit 1, Unit 3, Unit 4, there are
18 increases in harvest, and I think it's due to milder
19 winters, bigger population, easier to find the deer.
20 Your harvest goes up. It's -- it seems natural to me.
21 Unit 2 is opposite. Even though they had the mild
22 winters, they're still getting the decline in harvest,
23 which to me indicates the population is still declining
24 even though they've got the two mild winters that the
25 other Units had. Could be wolves, could be something
26 else, could be habitat -- I don't know. Who knows?
27 Whatever it is. The issue is, they're declining. There
28 is a conservation concern. I think there's enough of a
29 conserve -- to me, that's enough of an indication of a
30 declining population that we can put in a closure. We
31 can request a closure and be justified for it. I mean,
32 it's not following the same trends as the other Units.
33 There's something else going on there. There is a
34 conservation concern.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
37 Anybody else? Patti.

38
39 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
40 Hernandez. Our book shows on page 93, its data from
41 2012, but, you know, Fish and Game is using old data
42 too. The most frequently cited reason, 55% for using
43 less large land mammals in Whale Pass, was that the
44 resource was less available in 2012. But they also had
45 increased effort for less animals, and increased need,
46 for subsistence needs were being met. And many Whale
47 Pass respondents noted the impacts of non-local hunters,
48 as well as hunting violations and inadequate enforcement
49 on what they perceive to be declining POW deer
50 populations, and similar with Hydaburg that in 2012, 29%

1 of Hydaburg households reported not getting enough
2 subsistence resources in 2012, and deer was the resource
3 that these households most frequently reported needing
4 more of; 35% of the households, say they need more deer
5 and that there -- they also -- Hydaburg also cited the
6 interrelated factors such as increasing competition with
7 non-local hunters, high population of predators like
8 wolves and bears, changing forest habitat, and reduction
9 in the number of deer on the landscape, or changes in
10 the location of deer on the landscape, and declining
11 road access. So, I mean, we see that these -- you know,
12 from two communities that they have -- their needs aren't
13 being met. There appears to be less of a deer population
14 to harvest, and that there is increasing competition
15 from non-federally qualified hunters. And then they cite
16 the land management and, you know, the stem exclusion
17 affecting the number of deer on the landscape. Thank
18 you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
21 Patti. Anybody else want to continue to frame the
22 discussion here with issues we need to be considering?
23 Maybe not. Mike, yes.

24
25 MR. DOUVILLE: I don't know how to draft
26 a proposal, but to address these issues, but we have
27 this conservation concern, which is why non-rural
28 hunters are limited to two, which is pointed out that
29 most of them don't take more than two. So, it didn't
30 really move the needle. And if you're wondering why there
31 is a decline, I've heard that said a couple of times
32 here that, how come? We have predation. We have wolf
33 predation, and we have bear predation in local areas.
34 The estimate was 87 wolves in 2012, or '13, or whatever
35 it was, when they started their hair board study. They
36 were all of a sudden, we had a concern for wolf, but we
37 had a stable, or a pretty high deer population at that
38 time. So, as a result, the trapping season was limited
39 to 9 wolf [sic]. And I believe it was 11 the next year,
40 and nobody was trapping on Prince of Wales. The trapping
41 was taking place on the little islands where we really
42 were trying to protect our deer resource. The state then
43 changed their method. They had this new way we're going
44 to manage wolves. We're not going by quota because we
45 can't seem to keep the trappers within that quota. Even
46 at 11, it went over a couple and, you know, it was a --
47 somehow, they felt they got a black eye. But, so okay,
48 we're going to open the season for two months. And we
49 believe the population is 171. And as they walked out
50 of the meeting, they said, you guys' gotta [sic] take

1 it easy. But to be honest with you, the trappers and the
2 hunter population was very upset about the conditions
3 of -- the deer were going down and there was a lot of
4 wolf. So, they went trapping and caught like 100 and,
5 anyway, there was supposedly only 6 left on the island
6 according to their estimate. And I've always said that
7 under most trapping conditions in Unit 2, I think that
8 I can say that I'm an exception because I know the ground
9 that I trap in really well. You can only -- if you're
10 doing pretty good, you could only catch like 50%. So,
11 the next year was a pretty normal trapping year. I mean,
12 obviously there was a whole lot more than 6 left on the
13 island, and I felt that there was probably 160 or 70
14 wolves remaining after that season. And then you had the
15 following year recruitment. Because we're building up a
16 huge population the local trappers got together, and we
17 decided -- we thought it was like 220 wolf, and they
18 said there was 87. So, you raised a pretty good
19 population of wolf which brought the deer population
20 down. And since then, we have not been able to level the
21 deer population off. We can't harvest enough under the
22 current regulations to stabilize the deer population.
23 Your graph is a little different than the one that the
24 department gave us. I forwarded it to DeAnna, and it's
25 still showing a trend down where yours is showing a
26 little trend up. But the way things are at this point,
27 we are not going to be able to bring that deer population
28 up until we can harvest some more of the predators. It's
29 just plain and simple. It's going to stay down. And
30 that's kind of where we're at. So, limiting other people
31 is not the total solution. That might help a little bit.
32 But until we can get a handle on the real problem, then
33 we're still going to be in the same condition. Thank
34 you.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
37 Frank, you have something?
38

39 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40 You know, we used to go hunting on Pleasant Island, and
41 then all of a sudden, wolves are there. There's no more
42 deer there. It's a small area compared to Prince of
43 Wales, but, you know, there's nothing there. So people
44 don't even go there anymore. So, imagine what it's like
45 if the wolf population grew on Prince of Wales to a
46 point where there's hooch deer meat, you know? So, can
47 you imagine that -- the devastation that it would have
48 on the local community if something like Pleasant Island
49 happened in Prince of Wales. You know, wolf, don't --
50 they don't just have one pup, like the deer. They only

00027

1 have 1, maybe 2 or 3, wolves have -- I don't know what
2 exactly what their biological birth rate is, but anyway,
3 I know they have more than one, so Pleasant Island is -
4 - I don't know, I don't think you can find a deer in
5 there. I think, I think I heard someone said they were
6 going after sea otters now, the wolves. You know, just
7 a comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Frank. John, go
10 ahead.

11
12 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Just some facts to back
13 that up. A wolf will -- female will have at least 6
14 pups, you know, during their birth, and then we're
15 talking about bears too. So, you know even in Juneau
16 we're seeing bears going around with four cubs to next
17 year. Normally maybe just 2 or 3, but the numbers are
18 going up. So, just realizing that the bear harvest deer
19 also -- I've even watched a bear actually make a deer
20 call sound from his lips. So, sharing that perspective,
21 and also exactly what he's sharing about. I have
22 relatives that hunt for sea otter on that island, and
23 there's no more deer, where me -- when I was a young
24 man, that's where we used to hunt. The -- what's
25 happening is the actual, the wolves are actually
26 starting to eat the sea otters and, just some facts.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John. Anybody
29 else?

30
31 (No response)

32
33 Okay. This is Chairman Hernandez again.
34 I just -- I think I want to agree with Mike Douville,
35 that I think the deer population on Prince of Wales
36 Island is kind of in a precarious state right now. For,
37 you know, a lot of different factors always weigh into
38 this. Predation is primary. We do have a lot of predation
39 of deer on Prince of Wales, and wolves and bears, people.
40 We got some serious habitat considerations that have
41 just been building as more and more acres, you know,
42 coming to that stem exclusion, and are no longer good
43 habitat. You know, we've been watching the way the --
44 just the way the predation patterns are changing on the
45 island. The wolves, they travel these roads, they --
46 extensively makes them very effective predators. The
47 fact that deer are more congregated in areas in the
48 winter because of all the habitat degradation, the deer
49 are forced to, essentially, kind of pack up more. And
50 what's left of the good habitat, the wolves are clued

1 into that -- they, I mean, it's pretty obvious when
2 you're out there, you know, observing what's happening
3 that the deer are concentrated in these good habitat
4 areas in the winter, and the wolves know that; they
5 concentrate their efforts. They're pretty effective
6 predators.

7
8 You know, all these factors, you know,
9 it's the fact that all of the hunting pressure put on
10 those -- the deer on Prince of Wales has really affected
11 the whole age structure of the herd. You just don't see
12 a whole lot of big, mature bucks. They don't survive
13 long enough to get there. That's your, you know, most
14 important breeding component. You know, what's that
15 doing to the viability of the reproductive rates, you
16 know, for the deer under the Prince of Wales? Just all
17 of these factors, all coming together. You know, I think
18 it just -- it puts that population in a precarious
19 position and, you know, we -- and now, you know, we're
20 talking about allowing more hunter -- hunting pressure
21 to be added on to that. And you know, we -- there's a
22 lot, of a lot of factors that I mentioned that we don't
23 see, we don't have control over. The predation we can
24 try and do something about, but that's always a
25 challenge. But we can look at the hunting component, and
26 that's what we need to do at this meeting. So, I think
27 there is ample evidence that there is a conservation
28 concern for deer on Prince of Wales, and we need to act
29 accordingly. So. Any anything else to add? We might start
30 looking at some motions here, but anything else to add?
31 Ted, go ahead.

32
33 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
34 Chairman. You know, I think you're right. You know,
35 there's those three things that we have some influence
36 on the predators, humans, bears and wolves. And I keep
37 thinking Unit 3, where I'm from, you know, they had two
38 bad winters. We can't control the winters, the weather.
39 We're -- if we have the perfect storm and we don't do
40 anything. I mean, there was no hunting on Mitkof Island
41 for 50 years because it couldn't rebound. I mean -- and
42 I would hate to see that happen on Prince of Wales. You
43 know, we can't control the weather, and if we get some
44 bad winters on top of all these other controllable,
45 somewhat controllable things, we're going to be -- it's
46 going to be devastating. It's going to be terrible. I
47 mean, we had it in Mitkof Island, and you didn't have a
48 boat, you didn't go hunting. You know, and it's -- Yeah,
49 I just wanted to point that out, you know. Thank you.
50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Ted. Yeah, it's
2 a good point. You dig yourself in a hole, it takes a
3 long time to get back out of it. That's true. We've seen
4 that in Unit 3. Harvey.

5
6 MR. KITKA: After listening to all the
7 discussion, I really think that limiting the hunters,
8 and the hunters is one thing that we have kind of control
9 over, and I think the other control would be, probably
10 -- we need to do something about the numbers of wolves
11 and bears that can be taken. There must be a study out
12 there about when the wolf population, and the deer
13 population, or the forage food, gets to be taken from
14 them, then what happens to the wolf population? Do they
15 stop having pups because of that or do they... Does it
16 decline too? Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
19 Harvey. Any other issues you want to get out on the
20 table here? Frank, go ahead.

21
22 MR. WRIGHT: I just have a comment
23 about..... One year we had a real bad winter in Hoonah.
24 Real bad. And the deer population had dropped. And then
25 I was called from the Forest Service, I think, and asked
26 if they would put out a paper, and I would sign it to
27 close down the hunting season. So, I signed it, and my
28 nephew says, why did you do that? I said, well, we got
29 to protect what we got. So, I remember that winter I was
30 driving up to the dump and I saw this deer running across
31 the street. The snow was so deep that the snow was above
32 the car. I mean, driving and driving in a little valley
33 with a deep snow, and the deer was trying to run away
34 from the car, and he was just up to his belly, just
35 trying to get away. But anyway, that winter we had, like
36 I said, over 200. We saw over 200 deer on a beach because
37 they couldn't forage it or anything. And I signed that
38 paper saying, yeah, we could closed it down, and people
39 are kind of upset with me, but I said, so what? That's
40 what I do. So, anyway, I'm always here to protect our
41 resource. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
44 Frank. Mike. Go ahead.

45
46 MR. DOUVILLE: You know the high deer
47 population we had in 2014, that was a result of a full
48 season of trapping for several years before that, under
49 a different biologist. And we were able to trap the
50 whole season. And I think we had a take of 120 was our

1 biggest, I don't know, maybe about like 120, but normally
2 it was like 80 or 90 per year, which resulted in a pretty
3 healthy deer population until we had a change in
4 biologists, and a different method of estimating the
5 wolves, and so on. And that method, I think, is deeply
6 flawed. Their estimates are based, a good portion on
7 anecdotal information at this point, and I fully
8 understand that the ESA, and related things are -- have
9 them concerned about genetic diversity. We -- this is
10 kind of unrelated in a way. But the change that genetic
11 diversity, or increase, is that you would have a wolf
12 from a similar area and inject it into the Unit 2, or
13 Prince of Wales. It's a simple fix without having to
14 sacrifice all of our deer because clearly that biologist
15 said, I asked him straight up, you are willing to
16 sacrifice the deer to raise wolves? And he said yes. So,
17 I mean, to me that is a solution without sacrificing the
18 deer, if you will. They do it in other places in the
19 United States, they take Canadian wolves and turn them
20 loose in the parks in Colorado and, you know, so I don't
21 see an issue with doing something as well in Unit 2.
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
25 Anybody else? Patti.

26
27 MS. PHLLIPS: It sounds like the trappers
28 on Prince of Wales Island subsistence needs aren't being
29 met for wolves. And maybe that -- the trappers should
30 be speaking that louder, because when subsistence needs
31 aren't being met, then you -- telling the, you know, the
32 management that, hey, they need more wolves harvested.
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
36 Patti. And I mean, that is an option at this meeting. I
37 mean, we could put in a proposal, both to the state and
38 federal side, if we wanted to, you know, address the
39 wolf harvest. So, before we leave here this week, we
40 could also consider that. So, John.

41
42 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I -- you know, just
43 some suggestions and some proposals. I mean,
44 perspective, you know, a lot of fur-bearers harvests,
45 you know, are open for quite a few months, you know,
46 sometimes even into March and April, and here where we
47 have wolves only open for two months. I really suggest
48 us looking at opening the season even longer in that
49 Unit, but also looking at the bears. I mean, even all
50 over southeast of Alaska, the bear population -- even

1 when I was a young man being out in the woods, I never
2 -- hardly ever seen a brown -- he brown bears around.
3 They never bothered us. But, you know, at my age now,
4 going out, I always see 1 or 2. So, I know that the --
5 even when I was a young man, it was 4 to 5 bear per
6 square mile. I can imagine what it is today. I'm 56
7 years old, so it's like, I really encourage even seeing
8 that the in Juneau and other places where the black
9 bears open, you know, people are harvesting the bears
10 for food and for their hide. You know, to actually
11 opening that up like 24/7, you know, all year round in
12 that area just to -- until the numbers come down, even
13 just for a year, it would make a big difference. Thank
14 you.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John. Any other
17 issues want to get put out on the table here, discussion?
18

19 (No response)
20

21 Well, I think this has been pretty
22 helpful. But we do need to craft some motions here, and
23 I don't know, I've kind of got an idea of what motions
24 I think we'd like to see. I think we're going to require
25 a motion that would request an 804 analysis for Unit 2.
26 And, and then I think we're going to need some motions
27 -- or a -- one or more, that would deal with special
28 action requests for this coming season. And then if there
29 want to be any motions for actual, you know, regulation
30 changes to go before the Board. So, yeah, maybe Council
31 members can mull those over and see if they have any
32 ideas of -- or maybe they want to add some potential
33 motions that they might want to see. Mike, go ahead.

34
35 MR. DOUVILLE: I would request ten
36 minutes, at least, to kind of think about it.
37

38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
39 Mike. I guess I might also want to add that I think we
40 may want to be considering motions dealing with the wolf
41 trapping season, both on the state and federal side. So,
42 maybe add that to the list to think about. John, go
43 ahead.

44
45 MR. SMITH: Mainly just a question
46 because I'm not knowing the process so well. But you
47 know, the special -- the act -- the special action
48 process, that would be actually talking about that. Am
49 I right or wrong? I'm not sure about changing, opening
50 the wolf season in that area. You know, keeping the

00032

1 bears, you know, putting those demographics in there.
2 Is that what the special action is?

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Oh, thank you,
5 John. Excuse me. I think the special action that I was
6 considering needed to deal with the upcoming deer
7 hunting season, and the situation where we may be looking
8 at a season where Ketchikan hunters are hunting under
9 the same regulations as the subsistence hunters on POW
10 and.....

11
12 MR. SMITH: So, then those demographics
13 of our changes would go into the proposal that we write?

14
15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: When you say
16 proposal, I mean, we may be putting forward proposals
17 that will go before the Board next winter that would
18 affect the hunting season after this upcoming season.
19 But we need to deal with this upcoming season as well
20 with special actions. Okay, Patti.

21
22 MS. PHLLIPS: I just need some
23 clarification. So, the special action request is for
24 when the non-rural designation goes into effect by being
25 signed off by the Secretary of Interior. Until then
26 Ketchikan is non-federally qualified, so it -- this is
27 a -- this action would not take place until formally
28 Ketchikan is federally qualified. Correct?

29
30 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes. Good point,
31 Patti. I mean, we were told yesterday that that Federal
32 Register may not even get published in time for this
33 hunting season. In which case, the special auction would
34 not be necessary, but I think we need to have, you know,
35 the wording in place that we would like to see. Yeah,
36 right. Thank you. Thank you for that. Anybody else?

37
38 (No response)

39
40 Okay. I think Mike had a good
41 suggestion. A good time to take a break. Think about
42 this, and we'll come back at ten after 11. 15-minute
43 break.

44
45 (Off record)

46
47 (On record)

48
49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, everybody.
50 I think the Council members have all come back to the

00033

1 table, and hopefully, we're ready to start putting some
2 motions on the floor here for discussion. It'll probably
3 be several. We'll see what comes up first here. Anybody
4 ready to put forward a motion for discussion? Yeah, I
5 see Cal. You're ready to take a stab at it.

6
7 MR. CASAPIT: Yeah, I'm ready to take a
8 stab at it. I've got a list here written down, and I'm
9 just -- I think for -- to keep things as clean as
10 possible. I'm -- I have this whole idea of what I'd like
11 -- you know, I have an idea, but I want to go point by
12 point. So, it's going to be a motion, but it's going to
13 be like three mini motions within the main one. So, if
14 you know what I'm talking about.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: But we'll only
17 deal with one motion at a time. But, okay, you want to
18 get.....

19 MR. CASIPIT: But I'm going to start with
20 the first overall one.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay.

23
24 MR. CASIPIT: And that is, I move to, by
25 special action and a regulatory -- regulatory proposal,
26 to close federal public lands in Unit 2 to non-federally
27 qualified users for deer hunting.

28
29 MS. PHELLIPS: Second.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
32 We have a motion and a second. And the motion is to
33 request the 804...

34
35 MR. CASIPIT: No. That's next.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Sorry. Go. Go
38 back.

39
40 MR. CASIPIT: Okay. I'll reframe it. I
41 move that we close federal public lands to deer hunting
42 in Unit 2, by non-federally qualified users. And a little
43 explanation is that I want to have that happen before
44 we talk about 804.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank
47 you for the clarification. So, one motion to close Unit
48 2 to non-federally qualified hunters for -- well, let's
49 just leave it at that. Yeah. Okay. We have a second for
50 that discussion. Cal? I don't know, do you want to start

1 off with your rationale there?

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: The reason I put this one first is that basically, in reading ANILCA, that before you do 804, and restrict subsistence users through an 804, that those same federal public lands should be closed to non-federally qualified users first. So, you want to eliminate all non-subsistence uses first, before we start restricting subsistence users.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Cal. Any discussion from the Council? Patti.

MS. PHELLIPS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In our booklet, under draft wildlife closure review, it provides local traditional and ecological knowledge from residents of Unit 2 saying that their subsistence needs aren't being met, and that one of the concerns they have is increasing competition from non-federally qualified. So, I'm going to support the motion. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Patti. I think we may need an amendment to this because I was just thinking. I think this motion needs to be a request for a special action. A proposal, as you stated, would be something that would go through the review process, come back to the Council for recommendation this fall, and would not be in place for this upcoming hunting season, and I think we're going to need this in place for this upcoming hunting season. So, Cal.

MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, in my motion I did say both special action and a regular regulatory proposal to close federal public lands to deer hunting by non-federally qualified users in Unit 2. So, if I was not specific -- if I was not clear on that, that's -- that was my motion, my intent, and my motions.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CASIPIT: Special action and a regulatory proposal.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Cal. I missed that I'm sorry. So, thank you for clarifying that. Okay. So, I think we're good on the motion here. Any other discussion? Mike.

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, I intend to
2 support the motion as I -- as a resident and a lifelong
3 resident hunter, trapper, subsistence user for a
4 lifetime on the island, I do believe there is a
5 conservation concern. And I believe this motion will not
6 completely solve the problem, but it is a step in the
7 right direction. Is it supported by substantial
8 evidence? It's supported by traditional ecological
9 knowledge. We don't have enough of biological
10 information. We do have some, but it's in my mind, this
11 is based on TEK. And it would be beneficial to
12 subsistence users to try to -- it would be helpful in a
13 competition sense and save some deer, but it would all
14 -- and saving a few deer would help to rebuild the
15 population. And the recommendation would restrict, but
16 not unnecessarily, other users. Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
19 Any other Council members want to add anything to the
20 discussion here?

21
22 (No response)

23
24 So, so once again, this is Chairman
25 Hernandez. I would just like to add that you know, for
26 this consideration of a closure, you know, one of the
27 other criteria is also, if it's necessary for the
28 continuation of subsistence uses, and I think we are
29 also clearly in a situation where subsistence uses are,
30 are not being met. And that's further justification for
31 this proposal. Any other discussion?

32
33 (No response)

34
35 Are we ready for the question? Question.
36 Okay. So, the motion was to request a special action and
37 a proposal to -- that would close Unit 2 to non-federally
38 qualified hunters. And the special action would be
39 necessary for this coming season, but we also want to
40 see a proposal analyzed as well, so. Well, we'll do roll
41 call votes on these. Frank, do you want to run through
42 the roster there?

43
44 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Cal
45 Casipit.

46
47 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

48
49 MR. WRIGHT: Mike Douville.

50

00036

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

2

3 MR. WRIGHT: Ted.

4

5 MR. SANDHOFER: Yes.

6

7 MR. WRIGHT: Patti.

8

9 MS. PHELLIPS: Yes.

10

11 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey.

12

13 MR. KITKA: Yes.

14

15 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.

16

17 MR. SMITH: Yes.

18

19 MR. WRIGHT: Lewis Hiatt.

20

21 MR. HIATT: Yes.

22

23 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

26

27 MR. WRIGHT: Frank, yes. Have quorum.

28

Motion passes.

29

30 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Motion passes.

31

32 Okay. Thank you, Council members. Now we may want to
33 move on to another proposal, or motion, excuse me. Cal,
34 go ahead again.

34

35 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36 Calvin Casipit. Gustavus. My next little piece of this
37 would be to request an 804 analysis through a special
38 action and a regulatory proposal for deer in Unit 2 for
39 the federally qualified communities.

40

41 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Do we
42 have a second?

43

44 MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

45

46 (Simultaneous speech)

47

48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Got a
49 motion and a second. Cal, do you want to give your
50 rationale for this? And we'll get to weigh in?

1

2

MR. CASIPIT: Again, this is a little bit of my rationale for proposing this special action and proposal, is that I'm really concerned for the deer population on Prince of Wales, if the significant new group of federally qualified users show up on Prince of Wales Island and harvest -- start harvesting deer. I think within a very short time we'll be into a major conservation issue. And that, at this point, we need to focus on the subsistence users that are most reliant on this deer population, which in my mind are the residents of Unit 2. That's my concern, is that I want to make sure that the residents of Unit 2 can get the deer that they need for their subsistence needs, and that conservation of the resources provided for through this 804 analysis.

17

18

19

20

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal. Other Council members' thoughts on this motion? Mike?

21

22

23

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can we put that up on the screen? Is that possible?

24

25

26

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. John, go ahead.

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I'm going to be in support of this. And I just want to share, you know, this is my second term, and we've been really working hard to protect that location. And we're seeing the conservation issues that's been happening. And to the point right now that, you know, it's important right now to really move on this. Thank you.

35

36

37

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John. Anybody else? Patti.

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to support the motion. ANILCA 8021 talks about consistent sound management principles in the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife; the utilization of the public lands is to cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents, who depend on subsistence uses of the resources of such lands and in -- with -- in accordance with recognized scientific principles, and the non-wasteful subsistence, use of fish and wildlife and other renewable resources shall be the priority consumptive uses of such resources on public lands. And the land managing agencies in managing subsistence activities on the public lands, in

1 protecting the continued viability of all wild renewable
2 resources in Alaska will cooperate with adjacent
3 landowners, land managers, Native corporations,
4 appropriate state and federal agencies, and other
5 nations. So, what I'm getting at is that this is a, you
6 know, it's -- this motion is, you know, pinpointed on
7 deer, but it's also -- deer are a part of a of a
8 management system, part of a overall ecosystem. So, it
9 -- this action shouldn't be taken alone in and of itself.
10 And that I hope that the land managing agencies take it
11 into concern to put in land management practices that
12 will provide a landscape that's going to promote deer
13 productivity. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
16 Patti. Anybody else? Okay. Chairman Hernandez again. I
17 think it's appropriate to point out that, you know,
18 discussions of 804 determinations were pretty central
19 in our deliberations on this Ketchikan rural
20 determination back in October. And it was acknowledged
21 by Ketchikan residents that they would see the need for
22 this 804 determination, and they were perfectly willing
23 to, you know, accept the results of what a determination
24 might show. At least, consider what a determination
25 might show. So, yeah, I think we've known this was
26 probably going to be necessary right from the start of
27 the whole discussion on this rural determination. So, I
28 think that is a good validation for the Council
29 requesting this 804 determination at this meeting.
30 Anybody else? Questions been called for. Frank, wanna
31 [sic] do a roll call on this?

32
33 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Lewis. Okay, Lewis
34 Hiatt.

35
36 MR. HIATT: Yes.

37
38 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.

39
40 MR. SMITH: Yes.

41
42 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

43
44 MR. KITKA: Yes.

45
46 MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.

47
48 MS. PHLLIPS: Yes.

49
50 MR. WRIGHT: Ted Sandhofer.

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

MR. SANDHOFER: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Is that how you say your name?

MR. SANDHOFER: Perfect.

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Me? Yes. Don Hernandez.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Motion passes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank. Okay. We've got two motions in place. I think might be more required. Anybody with another motion? Cal, go ahead. You're doing great so far.

MR. CASIPIT: I'm sorry about taking up all the time, but this one I am proposing with great conflict within myself. And I know it's going to affect people on Prince of Wales -- residents of Unit 2, but I do think it's necessary. And that is that through a special action and a regulatory proposal that this Council eliminate the opportunity for doe hunting on Prince of Wales in Unit 2. And I do that with great, with great heartache because I know folks on the island. For folks, this is their subsistence opportunity that don't hunt, and -- but I think the need for conservation probably outweighs that. And I have concerns with, again, another new population, another huge new population of users going to the island and harvesting large amounts of does, and really negatively impacting the reproductive ability of that of that herd. And I don't do this -- I don't propose -- I'm not proposing this lightly, and it's something I'm proposing knowing that it is going to be controversial. It will hurt people. Subsistence users on Prince of Wales. But I think it's necessary at this point for us to address other population -- deer population issues on Prince of Wales. And I totally understand if it fails, and it won't --

00040

1 you know, it's not going to -- you know, I'm okay if it
2 fails, but I just feel like this is something that should
3 be done anyway. Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. And do
6 we have a second for that?

7

8 MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
11 So, we have a motion and a second to close the doe
12 hunting opportunity for subsistence users in Unit 2.
13 Time for discussion. Council members. Cal, you've
14 already weighed in pretty well. Anybody else? Mike, are
15 you getting ready to -- go ahead.

16

17 MR. DOUVILLE: I will not support this
18 proposal. Maybe in 2001 or 2002, there was a meeting in
19 Saxman. I'm sure Patti was a member. I made the best
20 testimony that I possibly could to eliminate the deer
21 hunt, and Big Bill was the Chairman. He said, thank you
22 very much for your testimony. You did a great job. But
23 it is customary and traditional to harvest does, and my
24 next request was to at least give it some accountability.
25 And you had to go to the Forest Service to get a permit
26 to harvest the doe. I'm not sure what happened to that.
27 It kind of went away and, so then I made the proposal,
28 or the RAC did, or through the RAC to use tag five out
29 of sequence to give some accountability to the doe hunt,
30 which passed. I would rather give up a buck than to give
31 up the doe hunt. My Grandpa Ralph would specifically
32 request, and the old timers, grandson, I want the doe
33 meat. To me, it's all part of the mix of -- since I was
34 a kid. You harvested what was -- what you could at the
35 time, whether it was a buck or a doe. Those are, you
36 know, most people don't take them. I mean, the last
37 year, or 2003, it says only 32 were taken. That's a
38 really small number compared to 1,600 bucks. Even if it
39 was three times that for not good reporting, it would
40 still be insignificant. And I think that would be a
41 hardship on some people because they're not good
42 hunters, like as a young kid, we got mostly those because
43 we weren't good enough or smart enough to get bucks, and
44 that was perfectly acceptable all my life. I haven't
45 shot one in many, many years. But I don't think that
46 opportunity should be taken away. I don't know, for those
47 reasons, I will not support this proposal. I think it's
48 an undue hardship, and it will take away an opportunity
49 that a few people still use, not that many, but I think
50 it's important.

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
Ted, go ahead.

MR. SANDHOFER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, Mike, I understand the traditional and cultural taking of a doe. I think there are some people that like doe meat better than buck meat. But if we're talking about a conservation issue, a concern with the population, you could take 10, 20 bucks and it wouldn't have the impacts that taking one doe. I mean, I struggle, like Cal does, with this issue. But I think if we're talking about saving the population, this is a sound way to help that population out. So, I'll probably be voting in favor of it unless I can be convinced otherwise in our discussions. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
John. Go ahead.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. (In Native). I'm going to be in favor of this and, love and respect to, you know, the Prince of Wales. Jeff Shankley, my uncle, we used to -- we grew up over there, in the summer we traveled there while the uncles worked in the mill, and we would be at the house with the aunties putting away fish, and salmon and harvesting off the land. So, respect to all the people and, and I think because of the conservation issues and (In Native), you know, I'm Kaagwaantaan, and understand the cultural value of harvesting the doe. And so, I'm actually going to be for that because of the issue. I know that, like I -- I'll echo that you know all the studies don did with the wolf. You know, we requested all that quite a while back, and then seeing the data that you're bringing to the table today on the numbers of deer, and the drop in that area. Really, really makes me worry and I have the same -- it's really -- I just want to throw out to Calvin, the you know, the passion he has for protecting the Guwakaan kwáan, the deer people and, but also the community I think will benefit. And I just want to echo that, you know, I'm originally from Hoonah. Hoonah (In Native) that, you know, they did this in Hoonah, and it was really interesting to see, in a couple of years, how the population really exploded because of that done. But, you know, of course you have to sacrifice a little bit to make that happen. So, you know, I'm going to vote yes for this.

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
2 Patti, then Harvey.

3
4 MS. PHELLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
5 generally would say no on this motion. The only reason
6 I might say yes is because I would want to see what the
7 analysis has to say, but I'm pretty sure I'll be voting
8 no. But having sat on this Regional Advisory Council
9 for, I think, 30 years, and then heard all different
10 types of testimony related to doe harvest on Prince of
11 Wales Island, and -- what really stands out to me is
12 like a member of POW community saying that I'm food
13 insecure, and they didn't say food insecure. I don't
14 have enough food. If I see a deer, it doesn't matter to
15 me whether it's a buck or a doe. I'm going to shoot it
16 because I need to feed my family. I got to share with
17 my elders. It's like Mike was saying, it's customary and
18 traditional, if -- that they have such limited resources
19 for traditional foods on Prince of Wales Island that I'm
20 not going to take something that they could harvest. But
21 the other thing is that not that many does are being
22 taken. And yeah, everyone is going to -- everyone left
23 alive is going to produce for future generations. But I
24 think the biologists in this report, I read somewhere,
25 I can't find where it is, but a certain amount of does
26 should be taken. Maybe that was in areas that had
27 plentiful deer and, yeah, I don't remember, but I do
28 remember reading it in here somewhere. But also, if
29 somebody's cited for illegally taking a doe, the
30 ramifications are monetary and lose their gun. And I
31 mean, it's not right to take away somebody's resources
32 that are so limited. I mean, who has a savings account?
33 You know, who has a gun that they can give up, and then
34 they have to go get a new one. I mean, so there's more
35 to it than -- so, anyways, I just talked myself into
36 voting, no. Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. And
39 Harvey, go ahead.

40
41 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I too
42 am going to vote no on this. I realize that there is
43 some traditional knowledge that comes along with this.
44 Maybe not really that long ago, but it was before my
45 time. When we were still, before statehood, the U.S.
46 Fish and Wildlife did a study on why the deer population
47 wasn't expanding. Come to find out there was no hunting
48 for does. So, when the big bucks came down in November,
49 there was no food for them. They had to start eating the
50 branches and things. And in the process, they're

1 breaking their teeth. So, they weren't able to eat and
2 eat properly. So, a lot of them died during that, during
3 the time when after the rut, they're weak already. But
4 they had no way of renourishing. So, it was at that
5 point where they opened the doe season again. Thank you,
6 Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
9 Harvey. Anybody else? Lewis, go ahead.

10

11 MR. HIATT: Thank you. Lewis Hiatt. I too
12 would not support this. This is a tough one, like Mike
13 said. I think the take is insignificant. I don't take a
14 doe, but I have families in my community that depend on
15 it. So, I would have to say, no. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
18 Lewis. Mike, again.

19

20 MR. DOUVILLE: So, what I honestly
21 believe is at times we've taken 4,000 bucks, and I don't
22 know what the does rate was for those times, but 100 has
23 been the average for a lot of years. Harvesting a
24 disproportionate number of bucks also reduces the
25 ability for the does to get bred. And we see those that
26 don't have funds for no good reason. And to me, that is
27 a reason you of -- already have an imbalance. So, I
28 think there's an excessive amount of does to compare it
29 to the number of bucks, is what it amounts to. So, to
30 address rebuilding of the population is not going to be
31 addressed through eliminating 32 deer or 32 does in a
32 season. It's going to be through addressing the
33 predation issue that is the main culprit for bringing
34 the population down. Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
37 Anybody else? Cal.

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: One last comment. I --
40 again, I didn't propose this lightly and it conflicts
41 me. I'm not concerned about people on -- people that
42 live on Unit 2 harvesting does. I think that's completely
43 logical and makes complete sense. Customary traditional
44 use that -- I don't argue that. I think that's valid.
45 And I think all things being equal, if we weren't dealing
46 with this huge potential new number of subsistence users
47 showing up on the island, and if that wasn't happening,
48 I wouldn't be proposing this. I'm concerned about a
49 couple thousand people from Ketchikan who don't
50 necessarily have that customary and traditional way of

1 doing things. Showing up on the island and harvesting
2 thousands, you know, a thousand does. I just -- that
3 worries me because I know. The KIC portion of Ketchikan
4 is so much smaller than the rest of Ketchikan. And it
5 isn't just - yeah. There's just going to be a whole
6 bunch of users show up that don't have that traditional
7 customary way of doing things, and that worries me. And
8 I'm worried for the population of deer because of it.
9 I'll honor whichever way we go on this, and I'll support
10 -- I'll support it either way, but I'm just really
11 concerned. And if it fails, it fails. That's fine. And
12 no -- it doesn't, you know, doesn't change things for
13 me, but I'm just concerned. Thank you.

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

17
18 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You
19 know, I'm concerned about number of people coming to the
20 Prince of Wales too. You know, in Hoonah we have that
21 ferry system, and we have people that come from Juneau
22 or wherever, and you drive up the road and you see
23 hindquarters taken off a deer, front quarter sticking
24 up, the rest of it is left there. And you're going to
25 have people coming from a community that has no values
26 of tradition. Just like me, I just -- whenever I cut a
27 deer up, I make sure I leave meat on the bone so I can
28 boil the bone. Or the backbone, make chops out of it.
29 Some people don't do that or the liver or the heart.
30 They don't do that. The stomach, daak'li. You know, when
31 you're having to have people that are going to come just
32 to say, whoa, I shot a deer, whoa. Big deal. As we always
33 say. Oh, good for us; the community, that traditionally
34 it's so good to have daak'li and all the liver and the
35 heart and all that. You know, when my family asked me
36 if I wanted -- want some deer and liver and stomach, I
37 said, sure, bring it down. I'll have it tonight. Or I
38 tell some people -- next door there's -- a lady that
39 lived next door, she's a non-native and she said, you
40 want the bones? Sure. Bring it over, we'll boil it. You
41 know, traditionally we try to take everything. But I --
42 like I said, people from Juneau come over, shoot a deer.
43 If it's too small, they'll just leave. It looks big a
44 long ways away, looks big, then they shoot it, and they
45 walk up to it and little puppy, you know.

46
47 So, the only thing I fear is that I'm
48 going to have people coming from different areas and
49 shooting up deer that they see that they don't have no
50 idea what it is. I'm struggling with this. I'm really

1 struggling with this. Look at all the local communities
2 that depend on it. How do we -- well, I was just thinking
3 about a little while ago when I was -- my testimony
4 about the crab. No females in the crab pots. When I used
5 to have to sort through the crab to find a male because
6 there's too many females. This year was the worst season
7 ever that I had crabbing. Wasn't for the price, I
8 wouldn't have made a dime. So, we have to look at it as
9 a way that if the females are gone, we have nothing. So,
10 it's going to be how do we deal with it? You know, when
11 a big community is coming in with a ferry with a whole
12 bunch of trucks and everything? You know, we -- there
13 has been time in Hoonah when there's car, a truck going,
14 leaving Hoonah and his springs are real low because he's
15 got so many deer in there, and tradition -- you know,
16 that's where I struggle. How do we stop the people that
17 traditionally have a deer in their smoke house? Smoked
18 deer meat in jars. So, good, so good. You know, and I'm
19 struggling with this. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
22 Frank. Anybody else? Go ahead, Mike.

23
24 MR. DOUVILLE: I can support a proposal
25 like this, but it would have to be worded like non-
26 residents of Unit 2, rural or otherwise, be restricted
27 from hunting does in Unit 2.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
30 Mike. Patti.

31
32 MS. PHLLIPS: So, non-federally
33 qualified already cannot take does; its 4 bucks only.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Correct. So, as
36 -- Chairman Hernandez again, I'd like -- Yeah. Two bucks.
37 Correct. I'd like to, you know, give my thoughts on
38 this. I'm going to support this motion. I hope to
39 convince some other no votes that they should as well.
40 Because it was kind of really difficult decision for me
41 to even, you know, think about this. And I thought about
42 it long and hard, and just to kind of go back with a
43 little historical context here. Mike, you referenced
44 that meeting and Saxman in 2002, where you were there
45 to -- you oppose the doe hunt. And at that time, I was
46 the Chairman of our local Advisory Committee, and we
47 were opposing that doe hunt. I think that was when it
48 was first instituted on POW, that hadn't been prior to
49 that, quite a few years. And our community was adamantly
50 opposed to hunting does at that time. And they sent me

1 as the committee Chair to go and make that argument and,
2 of course, we lost that argument. And then after that,
3 I was encouraged to get involved in the process and put
4 in an application on the Council so I could have, you
5 know, more of a stronger voice in these issues. And I
6 got on the Council and, yeah, I was against the doe
7 hunt. My community was adamantly against the doe hunt,
8 but, yeah, the reason you gave that customary and
9 traditional use that Big Bill Thomas argued for so
10 strongly, I mean, that was the determining factor. And
11 since then, I mean, after that doe hunt was instituted,
12 we saw some really good deer hunting on Prince of Wales.
13 We had a, you know, a number of years where the hunting
14 was just fine after that. And I kind of came to realize,
15 you know, that there weren't very many does being taken,
16 and it didn't really seem to be hurting the deer
17 population. And, yeah, we could have a doe hunt on Prince
18 of Wales Island only for local residents. So. But -- and
19 I still think we can have a doe hunt on Prince of Wales
20 Island for Prince of Wales residents into the future,
21 if we take other conservation measures that are
22 necessary.

23
24 Like I say, all those other factors that
25 we look at, you know, the predation and habitat
26 improvements and all that. I think we could still have
27 a doe hunt. However, this special action that I see is,
28 you know, really necessary for this coming season where
29 we -- if I thought we could put in a proposal that would
30 say for this season, a special action for this season,
31 that would say that Ketchikan residents are still only
32 -- even though they're federally qualified now as rural
33 users, they still can only harvest 2 deer and no bucks.
34 If I thought we could do that, and get that passed,
35 that's what I would recommend. But given the regulatory,
36 you know, constraints we have, we have to go through
37 this 804 analysis process in order to justify something
38 like that. And I just think we need to get through this
39 season without creating a real serious conservation
40 concern, one that could put us down in that pit where
41 we can't dig our way back out of. So, that was kind of
42 the realization I had last night. If we want to keep
43 Ketchikan the, you know, 1,000 or 2,000, whatever it may
44 be this coming season, from coming over to Prince of
45 Wales Island and being able to harvest a doe, that I
46 think we're going to have to impose that restriction on
47 the local users as well. I think that's the only option
48 we have at this point and, moving forward, you know,
49 we'll put this on a proposal form that, you know, goes
50 through the process. I'd like to point out that we

1 already know that there is [sic] proposals coming to our
2 Council for next meeting from other people on Prince of
3 Wales Island that are asking for a closure to the doe
4 hunting for federally qualified users. So, we are going
5 to be dealing with that proposal whether we propose it
6 or not. But I think the Council needs to consider this
7 upcoming season and this special action to get us
8 through. And, yeah, that was kind of my realization last
9 night, that it's going to have to be a blanket closure
10 for all federally qualified users if we want to prevent
11 Ketchikan hunters from coming over here this fall. So,
12 that's why I support it. And Ted, go ahead.

13
14 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Thanks, Mr.
15 Chairman. You know, there's compelling arguments on both
16 sides of this. And, you know, it's actually -- I'm
17 struggling more now than I was when I spoke the last
18 time. You know, my heart says one thing. My head says
19 something else. I think individual hunters outside
20 Prince of Wales Island that come over there at an expense
21 and will shoot whatever is available. You know, if it
22 hops, it drops. Some people don't care, they need to
23 bring food home, and they don't have those opportunities
24 to go out every weekend, or on weekends. So, it's not
25 the users on Prince of Wales Island. It's those users
26 outside of Prince of Wales Island that I'm concerned of,
27 Much like Cal mentioned. I think regardless of the
28 outcome of this vote, I think we need to revisit it
29 again. Maybe, you know, next meeting, you know look at
30 it again. It's a tough one, but I still think I'm going
31 to vote yes. Thanks.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
34 Mike.

35
36 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. I still can't get
37 my head around why you'd have to close it for Unit 2
38 residents. They're real users. You can close it to all
39 other rural users and not affect Prince of Wales. And
40 you're wanting to close -- I'm not sure how that would-
41 - why it works that way, you'd have to close it for
42 everybody. The special action or whatever you're trying
43 to do, can be focused on real users, not residents of
44 Unit 2. And that's the part I'm having trouble with now.

45
46 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
47 I don't know. Maybe I'm wrong about that, but to
48 differentiate amongst subsistence qualified people, I
49 think you need to have that 804 analysis that we're
50 requesting to justify doing that. And I just don't know

1 if we can have that analysis in place in time to ask for
2 a special action for this season. That that's my
3 quandary. I -- Patti.

4
5 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you. First, I want
6 to talk about 18 months until Ketchikan is federally
7 qualified subsistence users. So, that means in the 2025
8 season, hunting season, they will still be non-federally
9 qualified unless something drastic happens and that 18-
10 month window is reduced to 4. Am I misunderstanding that?
11 Mr. Chairman?

12
13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
14 Patti. You may not have been here yesterday. At the
15 meeting, we were talking about this whole regulatory
16 process. And I think somebody from staff might be up
17 here to clarify it, but that Federal Register could
18 possibly be published this summer, which would make
19 Ketchikan residents federally qualified or, and they
20 also mentioned the possibility, that it might not even
21 get published by this hunting season, in which case what
22 you say is -- we don't know. It's an unknown. So, I
23 guess I mean, part of the consideration I have is -- and
24 I don't know how to express this in the context of a
25 motion, but if that Federal Register were not published
26 by this hunting season, I would not want to request that
27 special action. I don't know if there's a way to specify
28 that the special action would only be requested,
29 depending on, you know, when the Federal Register was
30 published. Maybe. I don't know if that needs to be put
31 in the motion. Or is that just an option we would have
32 to not make that request if not necessary. So, Lisa
33 Grediagin, maybe you can shed some light on that.

34
35 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
36 Chair. Lisa Grediagin, for the record, and I was just
37 actually going to clarify for Patti that we don't know
38 when the final rule will be published. I mean, I think
39 the longest it's taken has been 11 months. We're hopeful
40 it'll be mid-summer, at the latest. But yeah, basically,
41 we don't know. But to Don's point, yeah, that's actually
42 what I was going to ask you at some point was, if you
43 wanted to put that savings clause and all these special
44 actions, that they're only going to be submitted if the
45 final rule is published before the hunting season. I
46 think that's doable, as long as you guys are clear on
47 that. On the record that no -- I mean, the proposals,
48 yeah, will be submitted no matter what they'll be -- but
49 for the special actions, they'll only be submitted if

1 the final rule is published before the hunting season
2 starts.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes, that was --
5 this is Chairman Hernandez again. That's always kind of
6 been my intent, and I don't know when the appropriate
7 time to request that would be. I didn't think it was
8 something appropriate to put in a motion, but yeah, I'm
9 a little unclear on that.

10

11 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, I think if you guys
12 are just clear on the record, all the staff understands
13 -- and also that you're clear for all three special
14 actions, or if you want to move forward with one, but
15 not the others, just as long as it's clear for on the
16 record and to staff. That would be, you know, drafting
17 it up and submitting it.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
20 John.

21

22 MR. SMITH: I don't want people to
23 reconsider or, you know, change their vote or their --
24 but just making note to, you know, the few years that
25 this area has been struggling and, you know, the
26 conservation issue, but also just kind of echoing what
27 you said earlier, Don, was about that there was other
28 proposals on the table to do the same thing about the
29 does. So, just thinking, getting that put on the table
30 to think about that, that it takes a long time for us -
31 - this system to follow through. And I think it's
32 important that, you know, we move on it quickly. I truly
33 believe just even seeing -- excuse me. Even just seeing
34 the data that we saw earlier yesterday. Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
37 Anybody else? Patti.

38

39 MS. PHLLIPS: Yeah, I have another topic,
40 but we're in the middle of a motion right now, correct?
41 So, I'll wait till after the vote. Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
44 Patti. Questions been called for. Are we ready to vote?
45 Yeah, let's call for the question. Frank? Oh, yeah. Let's
46 have the question. Frank, do a roll call. The motion is
47 that, through special action and regulatory proposal,
48 that the opportunity for doe hunting on Unit 2 be
49 eliminated. So, this would be a closure to federally
50 qualified subsistence users to take a doe in Unit 2 by

00050

1 special action, and also a regulatory proposal. Frank,
2 go ahead.

3

4 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.

5

6 MR. SMITH: Yes.

7

8 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

9

10 MR. KITKA: No.

11

12 MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.

13

14 MS. PHLLIPS: Yes.

15

16 MR. WRIGHT: Ted Sandhofer.

17

18 MR. SANDHOFER: Yes.

19

20 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: No.

23

24 MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

25

26 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

27

28 MR. WRIGHT: Lewis Hiatt.

29

30 MR. HIATT: No.

31

32 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

35

36 MR. WRIGHT: Everybody. And me, yes. Six,
37 yes. Three, no. Motion passes.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
40 Frank. Okay. Patti. Yeah. I was going to -- I was going
41 to recess for lunch, but I don't know. Patti did mention
42 she had something else she wanted to mention, but she
43 left the room, so before we recess for lunch, I do want
44 to state clearly, for the record, that the special action
45 portion of this, we would only request that if -- is
46 that -- that would be a separate vote. That this would
47 only be submitted if the Federal Register is published
48 before the hunting season.

49

50

1 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, for a clear
2 record, I would suggest that you do a separate motion
3 covering all three special action requests that have
4 already been voted on, that they only be submitted when
5 the fed -- if the Federal Register does not publish by
6 the time hunting season begins.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Chairman
9 Hernandez again, the requests for the 804 determination
10 that stands though. That was our first motion. The closed
11 -- the closures. Now let's go back. More discussion here.
12 The request for the 804 determination, that stands
13 regardless of what happens with the publishing for this
14 season, because we want that analysis done. So, we can
15 use that in making recommendations on proposals this
16 coming fall, because we are anticipating -- we already
17 know that there are going to be proposals that will come
18 forward that will require an 804 determination for us
19 to act upon. So, the motion to request an 804 is not
20 dependent on whether or not the rule gets published. Is
21 that clear?

22
23 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin, for the
24 record. I mean, if you're submitting a proposal for the
25 804 analysis, then that would still -- that analysis
26 would still be ready for you all at your meeting in the
27 fall. But if you submit a special action for an 804
28 analysis and the final rule is not published, then that
29 804 could not include Ketchikan. I just don't.....

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is that true? I
32 mean the Board made the determination to make Ketchikan
33 rural.

34
35 MS. GREDIAGIN: Well, I mean, that's why
36 for the proposal -- yes, it's no brainer. I'm just --
37 this is just for the special action.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: No, we're
40 requesting an 804 determination for Unit 2. I don't see
41 that as a special action request. We just want an 804
42 analysis done.

43
44 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. The motion was for
45 a special action and a proposal for an 804.

46
47 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Special action
48 and a proposal. Okay. Special action.....

49
50 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Now I'm confused.

MS. PERRY: Since these three motions have already gone through the process, that was why I suggested that we have one last motion to take the special actions already voted upon, with the caveats stated regarding the publishing of the federal proposal. But maybe staff person Mr. Roberts has some more to add.

DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. I wouldn't worry too much about the special section 804, because we'll figure out whether it's valid or not, depending on how things shake out with the Federal Register publication. The other thing that someone noted to me is, you may want to change your language about the caveat for the special actions to something like, if the Federal Register is not published in time to have an effect on the deer season, or something like that, because what happens in the case where the Register is published a couple days after the deer season starts. Hopefully that helps or creates even more confusion. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal.

MR. CASIPIT: You know, I don't think any other motions are necessary. If staff determines that, you know, one of our requested special actions aren't valid, then it's not valid and they don't do it. And they tell us next fall why they didn't. Anyway, that's kind of where I'm at on that.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Lisa, you got a.....

MS. GREDIAGIN: I mean the special action to eliminate doe hunting is definitely valid. So, that one, you know, if you guys don't make this savings clause, you know, that one would be submitted. And, you know, you probably wouldn't have an opportunity to provide a recommendation on it.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Ted.

MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah, Don. I'm just curious, the procedure, I mean -- Oh, yeah. The procedure, I mean, so if -- I know we've already voted

1 on the three, and now it seems like on the 804 analysis,
2 we want that done regardless of what happens. So, is
3 there a way to go back and take the special action part
4 out of that provision, or vote on it again, and just
5 have -- say we want an 804 period?

6

7 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, that seems
8 to be the rub here. And Patti, go ahead.

9

10 MS. PHLLIPS: Mr. Chairman. Can we ask
11 for a reconsideration of the vote? I'm not real familiar
12 with parliamentary procedure? No? Okay.

13

14 (Pause)

15

16 Mr. Chair, I guess I voted in favor, and
17 then I could ask for a reconsideration. Do I do a motion
18 to reconsider? Is that how it would work? Move to
19 reconsider the last vote, Mr. Chairman. Given this
20 motion.

21

22 MS. PERRY: You're wanting just the 804,
23 right? Not this motion?

24

25 MR. CASIPIT: No, I think the 804 is
26 fine. I think what we're concerned about at this point
27 -- I think what we're concerned about is this one.
28 Because if Ketchikan doesn't get rural status before the
29 season, we wouldn't want to cut off the doe hunt to the
30 federally qualified users. And I understand that. So, I
31 think, you know, a savings clause, as Ms. Grediagin has
32 suggested, might be the right decision for this one.

33

34 MS. PHLLIPS: Mr. Chair. I made a motion,
35 but I haven't heard a second? So, does it fail?

36

37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John, we have a
38 motion. Let's.....

39

40 (Simultaneous speech)

41

42 MR. SMITH: I was just going to suggest
43 something. Sorry.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Motion was to
46 reconsider. Do we have a second?

47

48 MR. CASIPIT: And I'll second. I was in
49 the prevailing -- I voted yes, so I'm prevailing. So,
50 yes, I want to second that. So, I do want to reconsider.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. And we're talking about this motion on the doe hunt, to make that contingent on the publishing of the Federal Register for this season. That's what we're talking about. Okay. So, we have a motion and a second to -- for reconsideration vote. But we're adding language as well. So this contingency clause, that would only be requested if the Federal Register is published before the beginning of the hunting season. Patti.

MS. PHLLIPS: Mr. Chair, I think that then you would vote it down, but I'm not sure. I think you would vote it down, and then new motions would be made. You can't -- this is not about amending that motion. It's about reconsidering the vote, and then the vote would go again and then new motions would be made separating them, I believe, but I'm not sure, you know. So, somebody else might know. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: I think you're probably correct in that, but maybe we need a second opinion on that. DeAnna.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, on a motion to be reconsidered, we do have a second. The Council does need to vote whether they want to do that, and then it is debatable. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And let's see Mike first, then Frank.

MR. DOUVILLE: So, Mr. Chair, what we're debating now is whether to reconsider the vote then?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Correct.

MR. DOUVILLE: And we're not debating the motion itself.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Correct.

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Frank, did you want to add to that?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, there is a vote on a motion and a second to reconsider. So, we need to vote on whether we're going to reconsider.

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Correct. John.

MR. SMITH: Just a question. I'm getting confused here. So, (In Native). So, what we're actually doing is just trying to split this up from the special action to the proposal and make them two different separate. So, are we eliminating the special action and just sticking with the proposal? Can you clarify?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, John. First order of business, if we want to go back and take another look at this motion and maybe make some changes, we first have to essentially dispose of the vote we had in favor and start over. It's probably the simplest way to explain that, and that was the motion. That's the motion to reconsider is to -- right. Have another vote, or we would cancel out the action we took earlier, if the if the motion to reconsider were to pass, and then we'd probably word a new motion that better reflects what we want to do here. And, Ted, you had something.

MR. SANDHOFER: I just think we're ready to call for the question.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, I will speak in favor of the motion. I believe we have newer information or avenue of considering the motion we voted on. If you will.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike. I think the question has been called for. The motion is to reconsider our vote on the -- on the motion that passed previously with the requesting a special action closure for doe hunting in Unit 2. So, this is a reconsideration vote, if we want to do away with our previous vote and vote yes. If you don't, then vote no. Yeah. Okay. Frank, go ahead with the roll call vote.

MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

MR. CASAPIT: Yes.

MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville. Michael Douville.

00056

1 MR. DOUVILLE: For clarification. For
2 clarification, we're voting on whether to reconsider.
3 Is that correct?

4
5 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

6
7 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. My vote is yes.

8
9 MR. WRIGHT: Ted Sandhofer.

10
11 MR. SANDHOFER: Yes.

12
13 MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.

14
15 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

16
17 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

18
19 MR. KITKA: Yes.

20
21 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.

22
23 MR. SMITH: Yes.

24
25 MR. WRIGHT: Lewis Hiatt.

26
27 MR. HIATT: Yes.

28
29 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

32
33 MR. WRIGHT: Frank votes yes. Motion
34 carried.

35
36 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
37 Frank. Thank you, Council members. I think we need to
38 take a break for lunch here and collect our thoughts
39 once again. This is getting quite confusing. I knew it
40 would be, but yeah, I think we're getting close here to
41 get this figured out. So, let's come back at 1:30 and
42 take another look at motions here. Thank you.

43
44 MR. WRIGHT: Don't get emotional.

45
46 (Off record)

47
48 (On record)

49
50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, Council
2 members, if you're in the room, let's find our seats and
3 we will pick up where we left off before lunch. Right,
4 just a minute or so.

5
6 (Pause)

7
8 Okay. Thank you, Council members. I
9 think the Council is all seated at the table. There's
10 still a few staff members, maybe out in the hall. I
11 think they're coming back in. So, hold off for just a
12 second here. Okay. I think we can get started. So, where
13 we left off we had a motion on the floor that got --
14 proper term, rescinded there, by a reconsideration vote.
15 So, we took that one off the table. Needs to have a
16 little change in the wording, and that requires a new
17 motion. So, DeAnna, are you going to be ready to be able
18 to put this wording up on the screen for the Council
19 members to look at there.

20
21 MS. PERRY: Sure.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: If you can, when
24 you're ready, or somebody can over there. It's helpful.
25 It's helpful to have it up where we can all look at it
26 as it's being stated. Yeah. We'll be starting over on
27 that one because we have to change the wording on that
28 motion to ask for a special action to close the doe hunt
29 in Unit 2. So, Cal, would you like to help us with the
30 motion?

31
32 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah.
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Calvin Casipit -- Gustavus,
34 community Gustavus. I do have some revised wording here
35 that I'd like to read. And if staff.

36
37 (Distortion)

38
39 I'm sorry. There was some chatter over
40 the - okay. My new wording would be that we would submit
41 a special action to eliminate the doe harvest in Unit 2
42 for the 2025 hunting season. If the Federal Register
43 publishes the final rule making Ketchikan rule before
44 the end of the 2025 hunting season. And a little
45 explanation, I eliminated the part of a regulatory
46 proposal because I think they'll -- like folks said,
47 there'll be some coming in already from the public on
48 that, and I don't think it's necessary for us to submit
49 something that already is being submitted. But this is
50 just for the special action in the case that Ketchikan

00058

1 gets the rural status before the end of the 2025 hunting
2 season.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
5 Do we have a second?

6
7 MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, have a
10 motion and a second and, hopefully, we'll have Cal's
11 wording up on the screen for everybody to look at. That
12 is kind of helpful and -- so Council discussion. Mike,
13 go ahead.

14
15 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, I will support
16 the motion. It does address a conservation concern that
17 -- oh, well, it would affect Unit 2 hunters. It is
18 temporary, and it appears that it can be corrected after
19 the -- in the regulatory process following the -- of
20 this proposal cycle.

21
22 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
23 Anybody else? Patti.

24
25 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you for, you know,
26 the reconsideration. Because I was confused, I thought
27 it was, we were just voting on the regulatory proposal,
28 I didn't realize we were voting on a special action as
29 well. I'm going to be voting no. Because there are people
30 on Prince of Wales Island who rely on -- who customary
31 traditionally take doe and need it for food security.
32 So, I'm going to be voting no. Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
35 Patti. Anybody else?

36
37 (No response)

38
39 Okay. This is Chairman Hernandez again.
40 I would like to state again that I am in favor of this
41 this motion. It would only be in effect for this upcoming
42 deer season, and only if the Federal Register is
43 published before the end of the season, which would
44 allow, under current regulations, Ketchikan residents
45 to hunt under subsistence regulations, which would allow
46 them to take one doe in Unit 2. So, with those
47 stipulations, I will be in favor of this motion. And,
48 as was stated, we will be considering the main issue of
49 taking does in Unit 2 at our fall meeting, because we
50 know we're going to have a -- we already have a proposal

1 that's coming forward, that's going to be requesting a
2 closure for the doe hunt and -- but that can't go into
3 effect until the 2026 season. So, any changes to the
4 present regulations -- are not going to happen for this
5 year. So, I really think we need to take action for this
6 upcoming deer season to ensure that we don't end up in
7 a deeper conservation concern than we already have. So,
8 anybody else? Ted.

9
10 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
11 Chairman. You know, I'm just kind of thinking here. So,
12 the doe season is from October 15th to January 31st.
13 Let's say the Federal Register, the rural determination
14 for Ketchikan doesn't happen until, let's say, December
15 15th. We're not allowing those residents of Unit 2 to
16 hunt from October 15th through December 15th, when they
17 could hunt without Ketchikan being able to hunt. So, I'm
18 just wondering if there is a way to word the proposal
19 to allow some hunting, if the termination or the Federal
20 Register doesn't get signed. I think you know where I'm
21 going here. There might be an opportunity to hunt for
22 just Unit 2 without Ketchikan hunting sometime within
23 that time zone. So, I'm just -- it might complicate
24 things, but I just wonder if we should give every
25 opportunity the Prince of Wales residents that we can.
26 Yeah.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
29 Ted, and I think I understand what you're saying is, and
30 I think the -- it's really hard maybe to capture all of
31 this in the wording of a motion, but I think the intent
32 here is that this request for a special action closure,
33 essentially would only go into effect when the Federal
34 Register is published in the course of the season. So,
35 I don't know. That would be really tricky to work into
36 a motion. But if, as you said, come October 15th, if the
37 Federal Register has not been published and the present
38 regulations are all in place as they have been for, you
39 know, the last number of years, then this special action
40 is not really necessary until that special action or
41 until that -- until the Ketchikan rural resident
42 determination is published in the Federal Register. So,
43 that's the understanding. But I don't know if it's easy
44 to put into words in a motion though, but that is the
45 understanding.

46
47 MR. SANDHOFER: Okay, just to follow up,
48 the way that reads, it says Unit 2, the doe hunting will
49 be eliminated for the 2025 hunting season. That means
50 all the season and, you know, so as long as -- I mean,

00060

1 if they can be written, or the staff realizes where
2 we're heading with this, that.....

3

4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Somebody
5 on the staff might.....

6

7 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. I think
8 the way you have it addresses member Sandhofer's
9 concerns. We understand the intent.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you,
12 Jason. It was Jason Roberts from the OSM staff. Yeah.
13 Intent is kind of the key here. As long as you understand
14 the intent, then wording is probably fine. Okay. Thank
15 you. Anybody else?

16

17 (No response)

18

19 All right, are we ready for the
20 question?

21

22 MS. CASIPIT: Call for the question.

23

24 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
25 Cal. Frank, you got any more -- Frank needs more roll
26 call sheets. I got you. You got one? Okay. Very good.
27 Take the roll, Frank.

28

29 MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit.

30

31 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

32

33 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

34

35 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

36

37 MR. WRIGHT: Ted Sandhofer.

38

39 MR. SANDHOFER: Yes.

40

41 MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.

42

43 MS. PHLLIPS: No.

44

45 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

46

47 MR. KITKA: No.

48

49 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.

50

1 MR. SMITH: Yes.

2
3 MR. WRIGHT: Lewis Hiatt.

4
5 MR. HIATT: Yes.

6
7 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

10
11 MR. WRIGHT: Frank, yes. Motion passed.

12
13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
14 all Council members for working that -- through this
15 difficult process here. So, I think now it's time to
16 move on to see if the Council wants to put in any other
17 proposals to the Federal Wildlife system here. And,
18 Patti, go ahead.

19
20 MS. PHLLIPS: Mr. Chair. I said I had
21 another topic and, so I just wanted to feel this out.
22 Is that for Unit 2, the customary and traditional use
23 determination is resident for deer -- is residents of
24 Unit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and that's what is causing this 804
25 speculation. So, I was wondering if we could submit a
26 proposal that changes the customary and traditional use
27 determination for Unit 2 to residents of Unit 2? That's
28 my idea.

29
30 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, just -- not
31 making a motion. You're just asking for discussion, so.

32
33 MS. PHLLIPS: Yeah. Is there support for
34 something like that and, you know, what's the pros and
35 cons of it?

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. We'll open
38 that up for Council discussion and maybe somebody from
39 the staff wants to make a statement there on customary
40 and traditional use determinations. So.

41
42 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah. Lisa Grediagin, for
43 the record and, rescinding C&T, I think would be a hard
44 thing to do. You could certainly submit a proposal to
45 do that. But once there's been evidence documented and
46 established, saying residents have customarily and
47 traditionally used a resource in a certain area, it's
48 kind of hard to go back and be like, oh yeah, that past
49 analysis we did that, you know, documented, that
50 evidence is -- no longer applies. And we actually had a

1 proposal a couple years ago to rescind the C&T for
2 Kaktovik for sheep in Unit 25A. And that was -- it was
3 kind of an awkward proposal because, you know, the OSM
4 analysis was just full of documentation of how Kaktovik
5 had traditionally used sheep in that area. So, you know,
6 whereas Kaktovik stance was like, well, we don't go there
7 and hunt there anymore. And so anyway, it -- it's a
8 valid proposal. We've had proposals in the past to
9 rescind C&T, but the outcome of them, based on, you
10 know, documented evidence might be a little difficult,
11 you know, to get through, so.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Lisa.
14 Cal.

15

16 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Calvin Casipit, Gustavus. This issue of customary and
18 traditional use determinations and how they're used, has
19 it been discussed by this Council for at least 20 years.
20 I have problems with customary and traditional use
21 determinations being used to limit harvest by federally
22 qualified subsistence users and let me expand on that a
23 little bit. The customary and traditional use
24 determinations came from state management and state
25 management -- and there's folks from the state here from
26 Subsistence Division that might want to chime in on it,
27 but in the very early years, in the 80s, quite frankly,
28 the state used customary and traditional use
29 determinations to really narrow and minimize subsistence
30 use, as far as I'm concerned. They tried to make their
31 customary and traditional use determinations to be very
32 narrow, very small, resulting in very -- what I consider,
33 very little opportunity for subsistence users. And in
34 fact, the way the state was doing customary and
35 traditional use determinations was found
36 unconstitutional by the state judicial system, so -- and
37 we rolled over this customary traditional use
38 determination stuff from the state's regulations. And
39 quite frankly, I don't think they belong in federal
40 regulations. The way we restrict subsistence users
41 should be through the 804 process, and we've already
42 asked for that. So, I'm not in favor of changing any
43 customary traditional use determinations. I think the
44 way to restrict other subsistence users is -- the way
45 to do it legally in the federal system is through the
46 804 process.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
49 Somebody else from the staff is up there. If you want
50 to say something, Jason, or answer questions or...

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

DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Jason Roberts. I was just up here to answer any questions you might have about that.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Anybody else on the Council want to -- Patti?

MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While I remember us doing, you know, doing these broad C&Ts for deer, you know, across the region. And that we were going to trust the 804 system to narrow it down when we had to. I was just looking at, you know, like at Unit 5, where only Yakutat has, you know, the customary and traditional use, and then they were able to have a specific hunt just for them. So, it made me think that, well, maybe we could do that with POW Unit 2. So, it was -- I'm just asking. I said I had an idea. I wanted to hear what everyone else had to say, and so that's my thought. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Patti. Anybody else want to weigh in on that? Yeah. Once again, Chairman Hernandez. I think I agree with Cal on what he said. This Council decided to do broad C&T determinations for all the reasons that you stated. And yeah. The 804 process, I believe, is a way to address this, and I know we've never gone through an 804 determination here in Southeast before, so we probably got a lot to learn about the process, but we knew this was coming if and when Ketchikan ever was determined rural, and we thought we avoided that with our recommendation, but lo and behold, here we are. So, okay, so unless you're prepared to make a motion, Patti. Okay. Anybody else with other issues? Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: My questions would be about wolf. There's proposals going in to the through the AC -- Craig AC. I believe they're going to the state, but the tribe is also considering a proposal to extend the wolf season to 45 days. But it's been pointed out that it's already open for five months and regulated by special action, if you will. So, how do we -- the state is making all the recommendations, and we were supposed to, in consultation with everybody, which doesn't happen. They come to Craig, and they announce the season without consultation, and that's what they consider consultation, telling us what it's going to be. And you can yell and scream or do whatever you want, but it's already been decided. So, there is no consultation, in

1 my opinion. So, how do we fix it? So, it is a 45-day
2 season. How do we get to that point on federal land that
3 we have a 45-day season? The consultation is put to the
4 district ranger; I believe, and a district ranger
5 agrees. But how do we influence that to get a longer
6 season, which I think is necessary for -- to kind of
7 ease the pressure of predation on deer.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
10 I think we're going to need maybe some answers from the
11 staff on hold and how this consultation process actually
12 takes place, because, yeah, there's an issue there, and
13 I'm quite sure. And I don't know how this, you know, I
14 know we're supposed to cooperate with the state on this,
15 and I don't know how that's happening. You don't seem
16 to think it's happening very effectively, but I think
17 we've got some questions there, and -- well, we're
18 waiting for staff. Cal, did you have something you want
19 to add?

20
21 MR. CASIPIT: I just had a thought, and
22 it sounds to me like -- it's -- to me, it sounds like
23 the subsistence needs for wolf by residents of Prince
24 of Wales are not being met. That's what it sounds like
25 to me. So, to the extent that we can change regulations,
26 either extending the season or whatever ideas we come
27 up with, I think, it's to satisfy subsistence users'
28 needs for wolves, not so much whether, you know, their
29 effect on deer and predation. You know, that's part of
30 it. But to me, the issue is people on Prince of Wales
31 not getting the wolves they need, for whatever purposes
32 it is. And so that's kind of where I'm at. It seems to
33 me that the short seasons and the -- the short seasons
34 now and the low quotas in the past were not satisfying
35 the subsistence needs of Prince of Wales residents. But
36 that's my perspective. I don't know, I'm right on that
37 or not. But in hearing people talk and hearing testimony,
38 that's kind of what I'm getting, but I'll -- that's
39 enough.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
42 Harvey, you wanted to say something?

43
44 MR. KITKA: Oh, I'm just a little unclear
45 on extending the season. And basically, is there a set
46 number that people go by, and how much are subsistence
47 and traditional take on wolves? Is there a set number?
48 Do we need to increase the number along with increasing
49 the season? Thank you.

50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Harvey. So, let's go to the Forest Service staff here and find out a little bit more about this cooperative management between the state and the feds on wolf season in Unit 2. How does it all -- how does it all operate? And what are the opportunities for us as a Council to maybe influence that process?

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

MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record. My name is Rob Cross with the U.S. Forest Service. And I'll do my best to answer your questions, and maybe, give a little bit of background on the management and the harvest survey, just to clarify things. So, currently, as was mentioned, the in-season management is being used in Unit 2 by both state and federal managers to set wolf trapping season lengths to meet the intended or produce sustainable harvest rates. So, the state uses extensive hair board surveys, and that's in partnership with the Hydaburg Cooperative Association Forest Service and members of the public. And they use that to develop an annual population estimate and then from that estimate, managers determine the sustainable harvest range to meet the fall population objective of 150 to 200 wolves. And then season length is then calculated using the average daily harvest from the past five years, which is roughly 2.4 wolves per day. And so, the Prince of Wales District Ranger has been delegated in-season management authority by the Federal Subsistence Board to implement in-season management actions to temporarily alter regulations. So, as was mentioned, you know, the current trapping season under federal regulations is November 15th to March 15th, and then the hunting regulations are September 1st to March 31st. But again, the in-season management has, in the last few years, has been to set it to 31-day season. And so the district Ranger has been delegated authority for taking these actions for the reasons of conservation concern, continuation of subsistence, public safety, and to assure continued viability of the population. However, the delegation of authority letter outlines a few requirements and restrictions to that delegated authority, and one of those is required consultation with ADF&G to make sure that actions that are -- primarily to make sure that actions that we're taking do not further, or contribute to a conservation concern. So, for that reason, we -- we've been working with ADF&G in coordination on these in-season management actions because there is a potential conservation concern. And so, we're following the ADF&G management

1 plan, which very clearly outlines the fall population
2 objective and then how they're getting to these season
3 lengths.

4
5 And as far as the public hearings go,
6 there's a requirement for temporary special actions
7 lasting more than 60 days, where the in-season manager
8 needs to hold a public hearing to hear concerns. So,
9 that's one avenue of affecting change. I would say that
10 it's difficult with the conservation concern that we
11 see, and with the amount of research that ADF&G is doing,
12 to stray from that management plan. And then just a
13 little bit more background. So, and I'm speaking for --
14 or on ADF&G's behalf here, but there's a lot of new
15 research that they're doing to try to get at what the
16 population is, and how effective their monitoring and
17 population estimates are at this point. So, they're
18 using cameras to determine hair board use rates,
19 primarily to make sure that they're not missing or
20 overestimating demographics. So, if we have certain
21 genders or ages that are more prevalent or more prone
22 to roll on the hair boards, they're using cameras to
23 determine that. A post-doctoral researcher at National
24 Genomics Center, University of Montana, is sponsored by
25 ADF&G to conduct a genome analysis of over 500 wolves
26 from Units 1 through 5. They're investigating population
27 structure, and those findings will be used to
28 investigate management options to maintain or increase
29 genetic diversity and resilience in Unit 2 wolves. And
30 they may also learn about the number of wolves needed
31 for a sustainable Unit 2 population. They're also
32 collaborating with a master's student and researchers
33 in Canada, to collect DNA samples from wolves in coastal
34 British Columbia to learn about gene flow and
35 interbreeding between wolves in southeast Alaska and
36 wolves in adjacent British Columbia. And another effort
37 they're making is that it currently takes about 8 to 10
38 months to get the population estimate, and that's why
39 there's usually sort of a time crunch right at the end,
40 where we find out how long the season needs to be, what
41 the population estimate is, and then enact the in-season
42 management. And so they have some newly developed
43 markers, genetic markers, that will allow managers to
44 choose from multiple different labs and cut the
45 processing time down from months to weeks. And then
46 University of Alaska Fairbanks, they -- ADF&G has a post-
47 doctoral research -- sorry, researcher, that's
48 investigating factors that influence the current
49 abundance modeling approach. They have a PhD student
50 investigating whether images from over -- about 100

1 trail cameras systematically placed throughout POW can
2 be used to estimate and monitor wolf abundance. They
3 have an Oregon State University PhD student, that's also
4 sponsored by ADF&G, that will attempt to estimate wolf
5 numbers on up to ten outer islands by using a dog to
6 locate wolf scat. So, that's -- I bring that up because
7 this is obviously a very important topic, a very
8 important season and situation. And so, you know, there
9 have been requests for the federal managers to do
10 research on this population. And so, again, I bring this
11 up because ADF&G is clearly looking into a bunch of
12 different options to increase, you know, the confidence
13 in the estimates and, look at different ways to, to
14 manage this population. So, for those reasons, again,
15 it's pretty difficult for the in-season manager to stray
16 from what the current management plan is.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any questions on
19 that? Comments? Patti, go ahead. You first.

20

21 MS. PHLLIPS: So, thank you, Chairman
22 Hernandez. Mr. Cross, when will these genetic studies
23 be ready or -- to submit to figure out, you know, the
24 genetic results that cut it from months to weeks? When
25 will that implement?

26

27 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
28 Phillips, I have that somewhere in my notes, and I don't
29 have it. So, again, I apologize. I'm speaking on behalf
30 of ADF&G, but -- oh, maybe Ms. Grediagin knows.

31

32 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin for the
33 record, generally the hair board samples -- Don might
34 know, he helps collect them, but the hair board samples
35 are collected, you know, in the fall, and then they're
36 analyzed, sent to a lab and analyzed, and they're not
37 available until the following September. And so that's
38 why there's this kind of rush. I mean, actually, it's
39 supposed to be September, sometimes it's October. And
40 so they're not getting these genetic estimates from the
41 previous year until October, to set a season that starts
42 in November. And you can see the problem partially is
43 that they're basing this -- the harvest season on last
44 year's population estimate. But then you have harvest
45 and then you have reproduction. And so, it's not perfect,
46 but it's the best they can do for, you know, the
47 situation.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Harvey, go
50 ahead.

1

2 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
3 question is, I heard conservation concerns for wolves.
4 This kind of distressed me a bit because the conservation
5 concern for wolves was taken to the state and scientific
6 studies. Have they ever consulted with the traditional
7 knowledge people on what they know about the wolves?
8 Have they taken into consideration that some of this
9 traditional knowledge might be better than what they're
10 using for their scientific data? Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
13 Harvey.

14

15 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair, member
16 Kitka. I can't speak for ADF&G as far as what they've
17 considered. I know that during our public hearings, we
18 do get quite a bit of testimony. And that we certainly
19 take note of that and don't diminish it in any way. The
20 conservation concern is -- my understanding, is largely
21 due to signs of inbreeding and the potential for
22 inbreeding depression.

23

24 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin, for the
25 record, and an important thing to remember about the
26 wolf population is it's been petitioned to be listed
27 under the Endangered Species Act three times. And that's
28 one reason -- I mean, and one of the reasons that a
29 species can be listed is due to inadequate regulatory
30 mechanisms. So, if there are indications that the
31 harvest regulations are too liberal, that could
32 potentially be a reason that these -- this wolf
33 population will be listed as an endangered species. And
34 I'm sure that's the last thing you guys would want or
35 agree with. But I will say that during the last petition,
36 the Fish and Wildlife Service that conducts the species
37 status assessment, or evaluates whether or not it should
38 be listed, did do quite extensive interviews to try and
39 gather traditional ecological knowledge to inform the
40 decision on whether or not it should be listed. And that
41 was the first time that's ever been done in one of those
42 petitions for an endangered species. So, I mean, that
43 doesn't get to the state's management of the wolf, but
44 at least when they're evaluating whether or not it should
45 be a listed species, they have started taking into
46 account traditional ecological knowledge.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Cal.

49

50

1 MR. CASIPIT: Well, my question was
2 similar to Harvey's, but my question is a little more
3 pointed. How does the traditional knowledge and local
4 knowledge get incorporated into this management plan?
5 How does it get incorporated? I mean, you said you really
6 don't know because it's the state, but as you as a --
7 as a federal employee, as a staff, through your in-
8 season manager, how does the in-season manager take that
9 traditional ecological knowledge and local knowledge and
10 incorporate it in his decision whether or not to go
11 along with what the state's doing? Because if the state's
12 ignoring traditional knowledge and traditional -- local,
13 traditional -- local knowledge and the knowledge of the
14 people who are on the ground every day doing the
15 trapping, doing the hunting, walking the woods. If the
16 state's not incorporating that, somebody should,
17 probably should be us. And if that results in a different
18 decision than the state, so be it. I don't know. I just
19 -- it just seems to me that there's a lot of traditional
20 knowledge about wolves on Prince of Wales that's not
21 being incorporated. And I don't think it's completely
22 the federal programs' responsibility. I think the state
23 has some responsibility to include that too. And they --
24 the managers, you know, the state managers never show
25 up to these meetings. It's only subsistence division
26 that shows up to this meeting. And it -- you know, we
27 need to have the wolf managers here listening to us. The
28 deer managers, whatever. Anyway, that's all I have. You
29 don't have to answer. I probably know the question --
30 know the answer, but.....

31
32 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Rob, would you
33 like to answer? Go right ahead.

34
35 MR. CROSS: Yes, Mr. Chair. So, member
36 Casipit, I -- again, I don't really want to speak for
37 the state, but one of the reasons why I brought up all
38 this new research that's happening is that it's either
39 spawned from comments that have been brought up during
40 these public hearings, or at the very least, will address
41 some of these comments. And some of that is, you know,
42 the wolf populations are greater on the outer islands.
43 And so, they're looking into what the wolf populations
44 are on the outer islands as opposed to currently looking
45 at densities and, you know, estimating the population
46 based off of density across the island. Another one is
47 the -- looking at genetic transfer and gene flow. I
48 think that that could be getting at, you know, some of
49 the comments as to the fact that wolves are swimming
50 onto the island from other places and things like that.

1 So, I really think a lot of the research that's being
2 done right now will address or lend credence to some of
3 the comments that we've gotten from the public; some of
4 the traditional ecological knowledge.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
7 Rob. Mike, something to add?

8
9 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That
10 was part of the Fish and Wildlife, TEK, I was a
11 participant, and it was it was okay. I'm glad they
12 reached out and talked to people who had local knowledge.
13 But I'm not afraid to say that the methods that the
14 department is using these hair board things are -- if I
15 tried to trap a wolf that way, it just simply wouldn't
16 work. What you're trying to do is make contact with them
17 and, you know, all these hair boards are made of plywood.
18 They're wrapped in barbed wire. They're not treated in
19 any way to knock the smell off. They have them in the
20 back of their cars or wherever, and they walk around--
21 the wolf is really wild, very sensitive, and they use
22 these scents to put on them. Then when they get a sample,
23 they use a blowtorch to burn it off and put some more
24 scent on it and put it back down. If I set my traps like
25 that, trying to catch one, forget it, you know. It's not
26 going to work. They did get a little bit better when
27 they started using cameras, which I had -- in these
28 meetings, asked several times why they would not use a
29 camera to verify what these things are doing. And when
30 they did, finally, the wolf population went up
31 considerable. But the sampling is flawed, and it's not
32 anywhere near accurate And the gates that I use -- is
33 if we're losing our deer population to predation is too
34 high, and you have too high of a wolf population to
35 maintain any kind of balance, which we're seeing today.
36 And if it keeps going the way we are, that line will go
37 clear off the bottom. So, that's why the residents are
38 asking for a longer season. I don't care how they
39 calculate it. It's not working. We're still losing our
40 deer.

41
42 It's plain and simple, looking at it
43 like that, it's -- the deer has to be the gates. Not
44 anything else. So, if you're willing to sacrifice all
45 the deer while it raises wolves, well that's exactly
46 what you're doing right now. Not you, but the department.
47 And they do not incorporate any local knowledge. The
48 state does not. They will not listen to it. They will
49 not listen to any of it. And the consultation we get is
50 when they come to the Craig and announce the season,

1 here's what it is. And if they are consulting with the
2 district Ranger, we don't know that, but the district
3 Ranger, I guess as a general rule, agrees with everything
4 they're doing and there we go. But I do not have strong
5 faith in their estimates, because they freely write in
6 there that they use a considerable amount of anecdotal
7 information, and that doesn't come from TEK either.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
10 John.

11
12 MR. SMITH: Yeah. You know, it depends
13 on what entity. You know, I've been to many different
14 events, and you know, some -- this group will say that
15 it's endangered and many of the others will say that
16 there's lots of them. And even seeing the cultural
17 knowledge that's being shared, and people's names that
18 are being used to say they're endangered. So, my concerns
19 are, you know, good data needs to be on the table. And
20 I know Don spent a lot of time using the boards and, you
21 know, he did a lot of his own visual. I mean, not seeing
22 but, you know, taking the knowledge from the people,
23 like, what Calvin was sharing, we're out in the field.
24 We're out in the woods. We're seeing visually, and I
25 really do think I got a site that's on my phone that
26 they've put the cameras on the wolves. And it was amazing
27 because the wolves are going to gather together, and you
28 can see all the activities they do and actually count
29 the numbers of how many wolves are actually right there
30 in this group. So, I encourage what Mike's saying about
31 the, you know, the cameras, but also trying to get these
32 identity -- entities that are sharing that they're
33 endangered, you know, to get their facts correct.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.
36 Anybody else? Patti.

37
38 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
39 mean, in this -- in our meeting materials, we got a copy
40 of the Federal Register for proposed rules. And I don't
41 see where it mentions ESA in here anywhere. And then if
42 you look in the Harvest of Wildlife book, that's
43 effective through June 30th, 2026, on page 152, it talks
44 about wildlife in season, delegation of authority. And
45 if you go and look at the wolf, proportions of Unit 2,
46 we have delegation of authority with both the Craig and
47 the Thorne Bay for wolves. And so, they can close, reopen
48 or adjust the federal and trapping hunting season for
49 wolves. But, you know, nowhere is it telling us this is
50 the policy and procedures we're going to follow if we

1 have a species that's ESA listed. And then, this wolf
2 has gone -- has -- isn't that ESA listing been decided?
3 And now it's back to a regular subsistence management
4 regime or what? I mean, I keep hearing -- yeah, we've
5 been through three ESAs. Yes, we've shown that it's not
6 ESA listed. So, let's get back to managing it. You know,
7 I see in here, you know, we should have the voice of
8 customary and traditional. We should have the voices of
9 tribes. But I don't see where it says that ADF&G has
10 exclusive rights to make decisions on this federal
11 harvest of wolves on Unit 2. So, when does the federal
12 program get it back? What I'm hearing, we're not. We
13 don't have it back. And so, what kind of recommendations
14 can we make that brings it back? Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Ted, go ahead.

17

18 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Yeah. I don't want
19 to pile on, but, I mean, you're absolutely right. You
20 know, we shouldn't base our bag limits and season on the
21 threat of an ESA listing, because regardless of what we
22 do, these groups are going to petition to list the wolves
23 regardless. So, if we're basing our management on the
24 threat of an ESA listing, then we're not doing the job
25 we should be. So, I just want to throw that out. Thanks.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ted.
28 So, it's Chairman Hernandez again. I just want to you
29 know, talk a little bit about Mike was saying there
30 because with the hair boards, I mean, I'm running a
31 string of hair boards, you know, for the Department of
32 Fish and Game in the fall. I kind of contacted them
33 because there was this big blank spot on the north end
34 of Prince of Wales Island that wasn't getting covered.
35 And I asked if there was, you know, any way somebody
36 like me could, you know, help with -- help with that.
37 And they said, yeah, we'd love to get more information
38 from the north end of the island. It's a pretty big area
39 that was, you know, not covered, and we see a lot of
40 wolf activity up there, and there's very little trapping
41 presence. So, they said, yeah, you know, we can hire you
42 and you could run a string of hair Boards, so. I also
43 wanted to find out more about how this all works because
44 I know there's been some questions about it.

45

46 So, what Mike was saying is true. I
47 mean, if you were a trapper, you would not go about it
48 the way that we go about it. And that's kind of necessary
49 because, you know, you're trying to run through --
50 there's a very strict protocol that we have to follow

1 on running these hair boards. Everybody has to do it
2 exactly the same way, you know, very strict schedule.
3 You know, scientific method says it, you know, if you
4 want valid results, all the collection has to be done
5 exactly the same. So, I'm running, what, 65 boards? I
6 have to get them done in the course of a day. And like
7 I say, you just can't do that and follow all the
8 protocols you might do if you were trying to set traps,
9 you know, you got to run through a lot of boards and get
10 them scented, and take samples, and clean them off, and
11 you know, all of that. So, I -- you know, I've questioned
12 the biologists about that because, you know, we spend
13 time together out there. He's showing me how to do this
14 and explanation -- I think, you know, the best way I can
15 describe it as this scientific method. You get a bunch
16 of people out there doing something in a consistent
17 manner year after year, and you get these results, and
18 you look for establishing an index, essentially. You
19 want to see changes over time as more of the key factor.
20 If everything's done the same year after year, you look
21 for changes over time, and if anything changes, then you
22 know something's happening. So, I think the camera is a
23 new technique. And I think that could be pretty valuable
24 because, you know, you're probably getting instances
25 where, you know, wolf might be attracted by the scent,
26 but not necessarily rolling on the board because he's,
27 you know, shy of it. He knows, you know, he's a smart
28 wolf. And by having cameras out and being able to watch
29 this activity, yeah, you could probably get a whole
30 different, you know, perspective on what wolves are and
31 aren't rolling on the boards, and maybe get a better
32 idea. So that's an improvement, but -- so, you know, it
33 has kind of a dual purpose. They want the DNA collection.
34 And that gives them all kinds of information they can
35 get from DNA. And then they use the DNA also for this
36 population estimate, which is all a statistical
37 analysis, which, you know, Fish and Game is try to
38 explain to the Council in the past of as mark recapture
39 technique of, you know, being able to identify
40 individual wolves and whether or not you know, you're
41 recapturing them at different times tells them a lot.
42 But it's all statistical analysis, and I think the Fish
43 and Game -- I mean, I think they've admitted over the
44 past that the actual population estimate aspect of this
45 analysis is maybe not totally accurate. The index part
46 of it is more important than the actual population
47 number. That's kind of the understanding I have. And
48 yet, you know, they do follow this population estimate
49 number to set the seasons. And now we've, you know, had
50 this protocol for a number of years. And since this

1 whole fiasco that happened, you know, back when they
2 were operating on a quota system and they said there
3 were 89 wolves and all of that, that was kind of a mess.
4 I mean, nothing added up. You know, they don't say
5 there's 89 wolves and trap more than the population. You
6 know, in a year that everybody realized that was kind
7 of nonsense. But now over the last 4 or 5 years, they're
8 getting fairly consistent population estimates, and
9 they're getting fairly consistent harvest in this two
10 and a half wolves per day. It's kind of been holding,
11 you know, fairly steady for 3 or 4 years now. So, okay,
12 all of that might sound good that Fish and Game seems
13 to be pretty happy that they now seem to have this more
14 of a stable look at what's happening with the wolf
15 population. But that still doesn't necessarily mean that
16 their population estimate of whatever, 200 and some
17 wolves, is very accurate. It could still be off by a
18 pretty big factor. And, you know, be remaining
19 consistent in all other aspects, but higher than what
20 they say it is. And that's what -- that's the situation
21 I think we're looking at. I think that number population
22 estimate has been consistently low. And they're managing
23 to that number. And I think we need to try and convince
24 them that -- yeah, if the -- if their management plan
25 says 200 -- I don't think it's that, but I think it's
26 150 wolves, it's a 30-day season, and that's what they
27 managed for. We say well maybe actually the number is
28 closer to 300, and you should be having a longer season.
29 I don't know. That's just -- that's kind of where I'm
30 thinking, I don't know if you agree with any of that,
31 Mike, but -- go ahead, Mike.

32
33 MR. DOUVILLE: I think no matter how hard
34 they try, it's going to be very difficult to come up
35 with any sort of population estimate that's accurate
36 when you are looking at things in such a conservative
37 manner at all times. But, like I said, in the late 80s,
38 90s, we were able to trap wolves for a full season from
39 starting in December, or whenever it was, November 15th,
40 onto March 31. Previous to that, in the 70s, I could get
41 a special permit and trap out of season from the state.
42 Back in the day, when I was a teenager. But in any way,
43 the gauge has to be -- we don't eat wolves. We eat deer.
44 And, you know, in the 90s, up until the 2000s, we had a
45 good deer population, and we're able to trap a full wolf
46 season. And whatever the take that was depending on
47 weather, and so on, that no one was counting wolves. But
48 we had a healthy deer population. And since the estimate
49 of 89 wolves, we've been going downhill, to me -- and
50 we've never been able to trap at that rate since then.

1 I don't care what their population estimate is. They
2 keep us down to a level that is not adequate to maintain
3 a deer population. And that's the plain and simple truth
4 of it, and that's what I see.

5
6 We haven't been able to catch enough to
7 stabilize the deer population, and true loss of old
8 growth and second growth of stem exclusion, if you will,
9 is somewhat of a factor. And also, you mentioned
10 something else that, in these leaf strips where the deer
11 gather up, they're not big enough. And the deer gather
12 up in there and they basically just sit there, because
13 there's not much food in those, and they stay in the
14 shelter and the wolves understand that totally. And they
15 get them. But they're geographically -- I still believe
16 there's plenty of land to be -- that is productive deer
17 habitat. It doesn't have to be big timber. As long as
18 there is some timber that can still raise a lot of deer.
19 San Fernando was mostly Muskeg country and everything,
20 and it can produce a lot of deer if there's no predators
21 on there. But the bottom line is, we're not able to
22 harvest enough wolf to stabilize the deer population.
23 And so, like you said -- Ted said that no matter what
24 we do, we're under the microscope for another ESA at any
25 time. That really doesn't matter. And that's -- that
26 shouldn't cause us to run in fear when we have this
27 issue. I mean, a suggestion of mine is to introduce some
28 -- we haven't even seen the study to see how the
29 narrowing of the DNA is. And they keep using that for
30 an excuse. Oh, it's a couple years away, a couple years
31 away. Well, that was like three years ago. And they're
32 still holding us down because of that issue there. The
33 state is very fearful and not willing to let us drop a
34 little more to preserve the deer population. And they
35 freely admit that. It's not okay. We have too many
36 wolves, whatever that number is, and you must use deer
37 as a gauge because we gotta [sic] have some balance. I
38 lived on that island a long time. When I was a kid, we
39 could hardly get deer. I mean, there just wasn't much.
40 And the federal Fish and Game went on a had a program
41 to poison the wolves, and they made considerable effort
42 up until statehood to eradicate the wolves in Southeast.
43 They did pretty good. In the 60s, and early 70s, growing
44 up, we had a ton of deer. It wasn't unusual to see 50
45 or 60 on San Fernando or Saint John or Baker. They all
46 were the same. But towards the end of the 70s, the wolf
47 started coming back and all that changed, and they came
48 back with a vengeance. You know, because the bounty was
49 taken off the wolf and not too many people were trapping
50 them, you know, because the hinds really aren't super

1 valuable. It's just kind of a -- anyway, I've seen a
2 cycle more than once. In any case, we have a higher
3 population than we need, whatever that might be, because
4 the deer are not stable.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
7 Harvey.

8

9 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had
10 a question. Basically, are we arguing over whether the
11 deer or the wolves are put on the endangered species
12 list? Is that what were looking at here? Or is this --
13 cause [sic] it seemed like, customarily, we were not
14 getting our shares of wolves for some reason.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John.

17

18 MR. SMITH: Just sharing a little
19 perspective and maybe, you know, to the study that you
20 were doing. I really feel that to get better results,
21 even with your boards, is that these boards are made in
22 a clean environment and all the boards are made, and
23 they're all put in a bag with the scent in there so that
24 they can rub, and then they're sealed and closed. And
25 so all your job is to go out and actually open them and
26 lay it on the ground, and after you're done is to exit
27 them. They're done. Once you get your sample, you know,
28 to actually eliminate any -- on the other hand, too,
29 it's like getting the cameras onto the -- you know, I'm
30 sure Harvey and myself are Kaagwaantaan, and we have a
31 lot of history -- stories that are related to the wolf
32 and the wolf teaching us to -- you know, the deer call,
33 and the wind, and the scent, in the story where the wolf
34 came in and shared us because we helped him with the
35 bone, getting the bone out of the jaw. And so, if you're
36 wanting to get a camera on them, the wolves are very
37 territorial with even other wolves that come into their
38 territory. So, if they, like me, if I'm out in the woods
39 and I see their tracks and I want to see them -- I was
40 in Gustavus with the Mount Fairweather when I was a
41 young man. And they say they never seen the wolves, but
42 I took the elders out because they wanted to see the
43 wolves, and that's all I did, is took them out into the
44 Muskeg that was there, and I just howled. And not before
45 you know it, wolf came out of the woods to see, okay,
46 who is this that's on my area. So, just sharing some
47 cultural perspectives, but also some possible science
48 and -- yeah.

49

50

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
2 John. Patti.

3
4 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
5 Hernandez. Well, first I want to say that I have a lot
6 of respect for the science that's being put into this
7 Wolf Management, but that doesn't mean that I can't have
8 a disagreement with, you know, how it's being
9 implemented. And I really appreciate the, you know,
10 explanation of the process of what you do with hair
11 boards. I have a couple of questions. And one is going
12 to be directed at Rob Cross here. Is that, so our book
13 says that that it's what the district Rangers, you know,
14 can close or open it so it doesn't -- is it so for wolves
15 is that -- is it -- that's what the management is. It
16 falls under that. But in the state book it says wolves,
17 five wolves, September 1st through March 31st. It
18 doesn't say anything else. So, how do those line up?
19 Thank you, for one.

20
21 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Member
22 Phillips. So, the state does an emergency order, and we
23 do a special action. So, they're both in-season
24 management actions to set a more restrictive season
25 length and those are concurrent.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead. Follow
28 up, Patti.

29
30 MS. PHLLIPS: So, my other -- so, you
31 mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that, you know, this hair
32 board's helping to establish an index, and looks for
33 changes over time. Well, the change over time is, we're
34 not managing, we're not doing predator control. What
35 we're suggesting is that we had longer seasons in the
36 past for subsistence harvests that allowed for a larger
37 take, and that the residents of the island, as federally
38 qualified subsistence users, took that number of wolves
39 for their subsistence uses, for their customary
40 traditional uses. And those residents would like to get
41 back to a level that they used to take. So, if you're
42 looking for changes over time, by not allowing the
43 federal subsistence harvester to take what they've
44 traditionally taken in the past we're -- it's turned
45 into this -- now our deer are disappearing because we're
46 saying there's only 170, 150 to 170 wolves, but we're
47 only basing that on the studies that we do in these
48 special areas -- specific areas. Yet Unit 2 is humongous.
49 And so, there's a lot of unstudied areas that we don't
50 know the population -- obviously, the population of wolf

1 is much higher than we think. So, if we're looking for
2 changes over time, the change over time is more and more
3 deer are being harvested by a wolf that is not being
4 managed to a sustainable level. We're letting the wolves
5 take over the landscape where -- and as a result, it's
6 diminishing the subsistence use of deer for who? For our
7 federally qualified residents on the island, who depend
8 on it, whose subsistence needs are not being met, and
9 whose subsistence needs are not being met for the harvest
10 of wolves either, because if they could take more wolves,
11 they would take more wolves.
12

13 So, getting back to my original question
14 is how do we get it back to us, while not diminishing
15 the studies that are going on? We recognize the
16 importance of that, but we also want to get back to
17 managing the ecosystem of Unit 2 at -- as a whole. You
18 know, holistically, not as let's just do this for wolves
19 over here and, you know, be damned to what's happening
20 to the deer population. That's not how we think. And you
21 all know that. So, you know, if we can submit a proposal,
22 you know, saying that we want more wolves taken because
23 the subsistence harvesters would take more if it was
24 available, and that we believe that the number of the
25 wolf population is higher than what these studies are
26 showing, because the studies, really, you know, it's
27 impossible to know. They're giving it their best effort,
28 but they're more reacting to a Endangered Species Act
29 filing than they are to what's really going on the
30 islands. There you go, Mr. Chair. Thank you.
31

32 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
33 Patti. So, I mean, as to the question, are we going to
34 submit a proposal to change things? Well, it's not in
35 that realm of a of a proposal now, because the present
36 proposal calls for a very lengthy season. The issue is
37 that the in-season management takes that lengthy season
38 and shortens it to 30 days. So, that's not a proposal
39 issue. It's a in-season management issue. And I think
40 probably the best thing to be said about what we're
41 doing here today is we're building a public record on
42 the local knowledge that we have around this table, that
43 can maybe be influential in adjusting that in-season
44 management decision and, I don't know, Fish and Game
45 department seems pretty locked in to what they do. I
46 guess I do have a question, maybe Rob can answer. It's
47 a Fish and Game question, but you know, they have a
48 management strategy that says that, you know, if there's
49 150 to 200 wolves, the season will be this length. Is
50 that strategy -- is that written into regulation, or is

1 that just a kind of a working -- let me say a management
2 tool that -- and the reason I ask that is, I mean, if
3 it's not written into regulation, then there's probably
4 some flexibility there. But if they actually wrote it
5 into regulation, well, it might be a little less
6 flexible.

7
8 MR. CROSS: Yeah. Mr. Chair, this topic
9 came up earlier and we were trying to find the answer
10 to it. The answer is I don't know at this time. I do
11 know that Lisa Grediagin is coming up to the table. I
12 was just going to say, I do know that there was quite a
13 few public hearings with ADF&G when they were developing
14 their new management plan for Unit 2 wolves.

15
16 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, Lisa Grediagin, for
17 the record. So, currently in state regulation, the state
18 admin code. So, under 5 AAC 92.008 harvest guideline
19 levels. It reads, for the purposes of management of the
20 named species, the department shall manage harvest by
21 hunting and trapping as follows: wolves. The annual
22 harvest of wolves in Unit 2 should be managed to maintain
23 the Unit wide population within a range of 150 to 200
24 wolves. So, that's what's in the state regulations, and
25 when they adopted this in 2019, the ADF&G submitted a
26 RC 11 record copy that has -- that -- it's a harvest --
27 wolf harvest management strategy. And on one of the pages
28 of that, they have this harvest management, where you
29 have like Zone 4, the population is way over objectives.
30 It's greater than 200 wolves and that's an up to a four-
31 month season. Zone 3, the population equals the
32 objective. It's up to a two-month season. Zone 2, the
33 population is below objectives of 150, up to a six-week
34 season. In Zone 1, less than 100 wolves. The season
35 closed until population increases to greater than 100
36 wolves. So, that was -- the Board of Game adopted, you
37 know, proposal 43 in their 2019 meeting, as shown in RC
38 11. And so, it's a little confusing to me, you know,
39 like what's in the state regulation is just that
40 population objective range of 150 to 200 wolves. But
41 then this harvest management strategy that kind of bases
42 the length of the season based on the population, you
43 know, that was submitted as the RC at the Board of Game
44 meeting that they adopted, but how that explicitly ties
45 into regulation, I'm not sure. And I don't think they
46 fully follow that. At least, you know, you guys probably
47 know better than me what the population has been and
48 what the season has been announced, the length.

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, yeah, that's
2 a good question because I don't know. Rob, do you have
3 the population estimate that they base this past season
4 on? I thought it was, you know, closer to 200 wolves,
5 which would indicate a longer season. I don't know if
6 they're following their protocols here. Do you have
7 that? I think, I don't know. They may be being more
8 conservative than they -- their stated objective.
9 Because I know, you know, Harvey, you were asking about
10 the endangered species listing. And, you know, we've
11 gotten past the endangered species listings without a
12 finding. But now they're talking about, you know, this
13 concern about the narrowing of the genetic stock and
14 whether or not that could possibly result in a [sic]
15 inbreeding population decline. So, I mean, there's all
16 these things going on and, are they being more
17 conservative than they really need to be?

18
19 MR. CROSS: Mr. Chair, so to answer your
20 question about the estimate for fall 2023, ADF&G
21 estimated that the pre harvest GMU 2 population was 238
22 wolves, with a high confidence that the true population
23 size was within the range of 184 to 308 wolves. And then
24 that came to a 31-day season at 2.4 wolves per day. So,
25 that equated out to a roughly a target of 74 wolves.

26
27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, do you want
28 to read again the standards that they were using? I
29 mean, it seemed -- I thought, Lisa, you said if it was
30 in 200 wolf range, it would be like a four-month season.

31
32 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah. So, and my
33 recollection on this is, you know, they've emphasized
34 up to a four-month season. So, if the population is over
35 200, it would be up to a four-month season. They weren't
36 saying it would be a four-month season. It just could
37 be up to a four-month season, and I think what may happen
38 is you guys already mentioned the first year they did
39 this, they had a fairly long season, and then there is
40 an outcry because it seemed like people harvested more
41 wolves than they even estimated were on the island.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Does -- Chairman
44 Hernandez -- that only indicated that their population
45 estimates were way off?

46
47 MS. GREDIAGIN: I think after that they
48 got pretty conservative with the season length.

49
50 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: It -- John.

1

2 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I know there was
3 testimony that came up that I -- you know, maybe we have
4 it in the documents somewhere. But where the -- where
5 some of the wolf hunters were on the table, where they
6 never even got close to that range, and then they shut
7 them down, so they were kind of upset. I remember that
8 was on the table. I don't know if any of you others
9 could remember, but I was just, like, poking down here
10 on my chart here of the map, it says five wolves. You
11 can go up to five -- get five wolves between August and
12 April in Unit 4. So, there's a few months there. In 1C,
13 five wolves is in August through May. 1B five wolves
14 between August and May. And then you get down further
15 south. You have 1A, where you get five wolves between
16 August and April and then over on the Prince of Wales,
17 you -- there's no limit. You know, there's many wolves
18 as you can, but it doesn't start until September 1st and
19 ends in March. So, looking at that, you know having no
20 limit there is probably important, but also maybe even
21 opening up a -- requesting to open it up earlier and
22 hold it later until April, like these other places that
23 are here. Just a thought in opening it up in August, you
24 know, just -- but that's interesting that there's no
25 limit there. That's a positive thing, you know, leaving
26 it open. But, of course, there's going to be a range
27 limit that they're leaving in that area.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you,
30 Jonh. It's another point of consideration, but. I don't
31 know if any other Council members want to add anything
32 to this. I know -- I really think that all we're doing
33 here is trying to build a record because there really
34 is no proposal that would fix this situation. So, anybody
35 -- anything else? No. Patti.

36

37 MS. PHELLIPS: I mean, Mr. Chair, why do
38 you say we can't submit a proposal to change the amount
39 of harvest?

40

41 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: The amount of
42 harvest. So, we're not harvesting on a quota. We're
43 harvesting on a season length, and the season length is
44 already longer in the regulation than what's being
45 allowed through in-season management. So, yeah, once we
46 got away from that management strategy where we were
47 setting quotas, I mean, we're not managing by numbers
48 anymore. We're managing by season length. And I say the
49 season length is already putting long in regulations.
50 So. Oh, go ahead.

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

MS. PHELLIPS: Mr. Chairman. So, why can't we go back to setting a quota?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That's a good question. Yeah. And I, you know, the subsistence users were the ones that had the biggest problem with the quota. So, I don't know. Mike, do you want to weigh in on that?

MR. DOUVILLE: The quota worked okay for us, but it didn't work okay for the department because they couldn't seem to shut it off in time to, or anticipate that exact number. And we always seem to go over it a little bit, which they couldn't -- and I think the conservationists were quite vocal about it. What the ACs want, and the tribe, is suggesting is a minimum 45-day season. I don't care what the numbers are. We want a 45-day trapping season. And that doesn't affect what the hunting season might be because it generally runs, it opens a little bit earlier, but runs through the end of the trapping season. So, what they want to see is a 45-day minimum season period. Don't care about the numbers.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, that's something to go by. Like I say, that's not a proposal. That's just a request. So, I mean, if we want to officially make that request as well, maybe we could. I don't know, that's kind of new ground. Ted.

MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. Thank you, Don. I was wondering, I mean, is can the RAC send a letter to the DFO, the ranger on Prince of Wales Island saying this is how we see things, and we are requesting a 45-day -- I mean, because right now it's his decision based on some agreement with the state and they're -- I mean, it might not do anything, but it would at least let him know what our thoughts on the -- this situation is. I mean, is there anything wrong with us sending a letter to the Ranger on Prince of Wales Island saying, hey, we believe you have some -- I don't want to say flaws, but we see things a little differently than you do. And we're requesting a 45-day trapping season on Prince of Wales.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. That's a new idea. Just asking for a minimum 45-day season. That's probably a good discussion. I guess we'd have to maybe consult with the staff on our letter writing policy on

1 that, but that could be possible. Mike.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE: Well, since it's already
4 established, it goes through November 15th to March 31st
5 in the book. But this is a special action, I guess is -
6 - how do we take that special action away and just make
7 it a season? How do we override that special action and
8 just say, okay, here's what the wolf season's going to
9 be. It's going to be 45 days. You know, and the long and
10 short of that is you're only going to get so many wolves.
11 It's -- there's lots of wolves. You're going to get a
12 few more. And if there's less, you're not going to catch
13 them. I mean, you just -- they're too smart. And it's
14 sort of self-regulating in a way, you know. And if
15 there's less wolves were not doing too good, we're not
16 going to trap because it's simply not worth it. But that
17 was the case when we had longer seasons. You know, if
18 it wasn't all that great, everything froze up, we just
19 -- you know, it's not like I was going 24/7 the whole
20 season, you know, with the -- that's the kind of way it
21 works. But in any case, when we started this
22 conversation, and the wolf went from 150 to 200, my
23 suggestion was 100 to 150. So, and that got by the
24 wayside. But as a result, we're seeing our deer
25 population go down, so. And I understand that there's
26 some flaws, and I know there's flaws in the estimates
27 and how we get here. It's not, you know, that's a
28 guesstimated number that they come up with anecdotal
29 information and that's what we have to go by. But it's
30 either the island can't handle as many as 150 to 200,
31 or the number is off. And that's a plain and simple
32 truth of it.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
35 This is Don Hernandez again. I want to weigh in on
36 something Mike just brought up because he just turned
37 the whole conversation on its head here. Because, hey,
38 we've just been looking at this all wrong. I mean, we've
39 got this four-month season that's shortened to 30 days.
40 Why don't we just do away with the four-month season and
41 say we want a 45-day season? Write it into regulation.
42 I don't know. That kind of changes everything, doesn't
43 it? Ted.

44

45 MR. SANDHOFER: I mean, I still would
46 think that based on the information the district ranger
47 has right now, he'd say, okay, we can do a 45-day, but
48 we're going to only give you 30, because that's, you
49 know -- so I don't think we should shorten the season
50 at all. But one other -- I just had a question for Ashley

1 or Rob. You know, is --with the state, you gave us this
2 handout with the wolf harvest, you know, and the dates
3 are November 15th to December 15th. You know, in 2024,
4 it was 74 wolves. Was that hunting or trapping? So, you
5 know, the state regulations have a hunting season,
6 that's September 1st to March 31st. So, they've done
7 away with hunting, their hunting regulations, and just
8 say you can only trap. So, why aren't people hunting
9 also wolves within that longer period?

10
11 MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. That might
12 be a better question for someone who lives on POW. So,
13 there's a federal hunting season as well. We just don't
14 see a lot of harvest in it. So, again, I might defer to
15 somebody who has more experience in wolf hunting or
16 trapping.

17
18 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah, both of us. The
19 regular. Excuse me, the regulations have a seven-month
20 hunting season, both federally and state, from March,
21 or September 1st to March 31st. So, I was wondering, Don
22 or Mike, Lewis, why aren't people shooting more wolves
23 under a hunting season and just concentrating on the
24 trapping? Just curious.

25
26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Well, it's Don
27 Hernandez again. Maybe the best explanation for that
28 lengthy hunting season is that if somebody's out
29 essentially deer hunting encounters a wolf and they want
30 to take it, they have the opportunity to do that. It
31 starts in September just because, you know, for
32 biological reasons, it was, you know, it's kind of
33 considered to be -- not a good idea to be taking wolves
34 as early as August, you know, when the deer hunting
35 season opens. I think that kind of impacts the, you
36 know, the pup survival, potentially, and things like
37 that. But I think that's the idea that as long as the
38 deer season is open and it's practical, if somebody is
39 out there hunting and encounters a wolf, they -- they're
40 - it's legal to take it and, yeah. And there's -- you
41 know, and there's some wolves taken that way, no
42 question. And there are also, I don't know, there's
43 people that go out and target wolf hunting as well. You
44 know, they try and call them in and take them that way.
45 So, it's not a real big take. But people do that. I
46 don't know. Mike, you agree with all of that?

47
48 MR. DOUVILLE: I do agree. I think that
49 September was a starting point because they are off and
50 running and mobile and stuff like that, and only, a

1 couple of 3, 3 or 4 years ago, 17 were taken via hunting,
2 which is like an all-time record. Normally it's only 2,
3 3, 4, but for some reason that year there was a lot of
4 a lot of harvest. Everybody's running into them. But
5 anyway.

6

7

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: John.

8

9

10 MR. SMITH: It's kind of why I was
11 reading from a couple -- I mean, what Ted was saying,
12 you know, you have hunting and trapping and they're, you
13 know, it's a couple months of time to be out in the
14 field. So, it's like maybe getting the posse, you know,
15 in your local area and maybe an education to, you know,
16 teaching about harvesting the wolf. And the importance
17 of. So, you know, that's the way I am if I'm out in the
18 -- I have my hunting, I have my trapping, I have my --
19 all with me. So, if that like you're saying, if you see
20 one, you're going to harvest and knock that number down.
21 Respectfully.

21

22

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Patti.

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. DOUVILLE: The Craig tribe is, I believe, drafting a proposal for a 45-day wolf season on federal land. The Craig AC submitted a proposal to the state for a 45-day season. We're not talking about numbers, we're just talking about a season. It's not a quota. It's -- or any other target goal. It's a season.

1 And it would take a few years to determine whether that
2 would stabilize things, if you will, because it wouldn't
3 happen overnight. When you bring a deer population down,
4 like you're seeing on Prince of Wales, it takes years
5 to bring it back up. And I've witnessed this personally
6 on a particular island next to Craig, it's called Saint
7 John or San Juan Bautista. There was [sic] wolves on
8 there and we got them cleaned off and the deer were just
9 starting to be okay to hunt there, and a pack moved on
10 there, there was nine, and they literally wiped the
11 island out. They're not on there now because they were
12 harvested. But it's rare to see even a deer track on the
13 beach there, right now and it's going to take -- it'll
14 take 20 years before -- if you can keep the wolves off
15 of there before you can hunt there again. And that was
16 a mainstay island for Craig when I was growing up as a
17 teenager. You could go around there in the wintertime,
18 when the north wind was blowing, and you could see 50
19 deer. And so, it was a go-to place. Even for Hydaburg
20 used to come up and because it's the only place there
21 was no wolf.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Well, so now
24 you're telling us that we're probably going to see
25 proposals coming in on wolves. I don't know if we want
26 to chime in as well with proposals or wait and act on
27 other people's proposals. I don't know what the best
28 course here is.

29
30 (Pause)

31
32 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you. Thank you. I
33 would like to see a season like that in a regulated,
34 with all the hocus pocus we see [sic] in the last few
35 years.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
38 Ted.

39
40 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah, I, you know, I'm
41 just looking at the state trapping regulations right
42 now, and Unit 2 goes from November 15th to March 31st
43 with no limit. Why would we request a shorter 45-day
44 period? And we would be reducing what? I mean, you know,
45 it's a special action by -- in conjunction with the
46 state, by the federal designated official that is
47 shortening the take. Why would we ask for a 45 day with
48 no limit, when right now the regulation is a five months
49 with no limit? I mean, it doesn't make sense to me
50 because the limit and the season isn't the issue right

1 now. It's this, these special actions by the departments
2 that are limiting the take. I would vote against
3 something that decreases the present quotas, the present
4 -- what's presently allowed. I just don't know why we'd
5 reduce it if we have a concern with not taking enough
6 wolves.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: And, Mike, go
9 ahead.

10

11 MR. DOUVILLE: I think that maybe that's
12 a misworded a little bit. Probably the intent is a 45-
13 day opening within that season minimum, and not a season.
14 A 45-day opening, similar to what we have today that's
15 governed by special action. And it's been around 31 days,
16 but we're looking for a 45-day minimum opening within
17 that season.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mike.
20 Don Hernandez, again. I take that to indicate that the
21 tribe is essentially making a request of the federal
22 managers that that's what would happen, and we could do
23 likewise. Like I say, we discuss a letter of some kind
24 or something to that effect that would tell the federal
25 manager at least that that's what we feel should happen
26 and, might align with, you know, what the tribes are
27 requesting. So, that might be an option. I don't think
28 I mean, I think we have to consider that unless we're
29 putting in a proposal that needs to be analyzed and come
30 back to us in the fall. I mean, we have an opportunity
31 at our fall meeting prior to the next hunting, trapping
32 season, to look at, you know, anything else that tribes
33 or Advisory Committees on the island are doing, and do
34 something in October as well. We may have a new
35 population estimate that might give us more information
36 for the upcoming season. We don't have to do anything
37 at this meeting, in my view. But we certainly, you know,
38 have a lot of discussion and a lot on the record here.
39 So, any other Council members weigh in on that? Patti
40 were you going to say -- yeah, go ahead.

41

42 MS. PHLLIPS: And I think we need to --
43 you know, my original request is like, maybe we need to
44 let the Forest Service know that this management of the
45 wolves on Unit 2 is not meeting the needs of subsistence
46 for wolves and deer, and that leaving the management of
47 the wolves strictly in the hands of Fish and Game is
48 blocking out the voice of the subsistence harvest --
49 federally qualified users on the island. I mean, it's
50 like they've had consultations with tribes. They've had

1 community meetings, and yet that strong opinion of the
2 local forum is not coming out of it. So, we're ending
3 up with a declining deer population and increasing wolf
4 population. And they're going to make it seem like it's
5 more predator control than trying to meet the needs of
6 subsistence. So, you know, what's it going to take? I
7 mean, I haven't heard an answer yet. I mean, I hear what
8 your suggestions are, and we need to wait and see what
9 proposals come before us, and that, you know, maybe we
10 should do a letter about the special action thing about,
11 you know, keep the full four months, six months season.
12 But when you do a special action, keep it at a 45-day
13 minimum. And then, you know -- but I don't see them
14 listening to us as a forum. We're a forum for that
15 subsistence voice. It's not -- we're not being heeded,
16 Mr. Chairman.

17
18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
19 Patti. Frank.

20
21 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
22 heard that -- a while ago that Mike Douville said that
23 Craig was putting some proposal together. Is that right?

24
25 (Pause)

26
27 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes.
28 The Craig tribe is going to submit a proposal for a 45-
29 day opening on wolf. And that proposal also went -- but
30 I think it's worded season, by the AC, going to the
31 state.

32
33 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. I think that, you
34 know, if there's a proposal being put out by a community,
35 then that's -- local knowledge. And I think that we as
36 Council should listen to what they have to say. We're
37 always saying that, you know, traditional knowledge is
38 valuable. So, we need to listen to them first. And then
39 when we see their proposal, then we act. As Mr. Hernandez
40 says, we don't really need to do anything today. Am I
41 right?

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. It's not
44 absolutely necessary to do anything at this meeting, but
45 there are things that we may want to do at this meeting,
46 still.

47
48 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 Well, I think that, then we should look at the Craig
50 proposal and then move on, or else we may contradict

1 what they're doing. And we need to listen to the local
2 people first. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
5 Frank. It's Don Hernandez again. I'm -- I don't think I
6 see any problem with this Council sending a letter. I
7 guess, would probably go to the Board. Because the Board
8 is the one who issues the delegation of authority letters
9 to the local managers and, you know, just tell the Board
10 our concerns here with how this is being managed and
11 maybe encourage the Board to, you know, redirect their
12 in-season manager, you know, under delegation of
13 authority letter somehow in there to you know, strongly
14 consider, you know, the local knowledge and the fact
15 that, you know, subsistence uses are not being allowed
16 to continue on the use of wolf, and we would want to see
17 this idea of a minimum 45-day season. I don't see why
18 we couldn't send such a letter to the Board. I'm pretty
19 sure we'd have to go to the Board if we wanted the
20 district ranger to make any changes in his in-season
21 management. But I don't think I see any problems with
22 that. Ted.

23
24 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah, I guess just
25 procedural. Do we need to make a motion such and then
26 vote on it?

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: If we want to
29 send a letter to the Board, yes, we would need a motion
30 to do that.

31
32 MR. SANDHOFER: I propose making a motion
33 to send a letter to the Board supporting the 45-day
34 opening for Unit 2 wolf, minimum. I think that letter
35 we should show our support to the local tribe that is
36 authoring a request, also. I think, you know, I mean,
37 at a minimum, we should do that.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Motion, do
40 we have a second?

41
42 MS. PHELLIPS: Can I suggest that, you
43 know, we have heard from, you know, the federally
44 qualified users on the island that there is concern and
45 before it continues to escalate is why we're bringing
46 it to their attention.

47
48 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank
49 you, Patti. I mean, yeah, we'll have to discuss maybe
50 exactly what goes into the letter, but we do have a

1 motion to write a letter. Do we have a second?
2
3

4 MR. CASIPIT: I will second that. And to
5 begin the discussion, I would suggest that in that
6 letter, number one, we say that subsistence needs for
7 wolves on Prince of Wales Island are not being met for
8 federally qualified users. It's obvious. Two, that
9 additional knowledge must be included in the decision
10 of the local -- in the delegated authority that
11 traditional knowledge must be considered, and if it
12 isn't incorporated into the decision, there is an
13 explanation of why it isn't. All right. And this is
14 going to the Board through the delegated official.
15 Third, in that, would be that 45-day opening, that we
16 expect a 45-day opening. And if we cover those three
17 things, I think we're good. It's important to say right
18 up front, though, that the subsistence needs of the
19 residents of Prince of Wales for wolves are not being
20 met under the current strategy. I think we're pretty
21 safe in saying that. I mean, I've heard -- I've been
22 hearing a lot about Prince of Wales. Prince of Wales
23 wolves. And it's obvious to me that people are not
24 getting their needs met. Wolves. But anyway, that as a
25 minimum that's -- to me that's what would be in the
26 letter.

27
28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
29 And, yeah, we point out that you know, we have a motion
30 to write a letter and then the details of what goes into
31 the letter is -- right. We should get as much of that
32 out as we can to help the writing of the letter. So,
33 that's good. Just one minor adjustment, I think I make
34 to what you said, instead of the subsistence need for
35 wolves, I would use the language the continuation of
36 subsistence uses by -- for wolf is not, yeah, is not
37 being met. It might more accurately reflect, you know,
38 how they're being used. Okay. Anybody else? Patti.

39
40 MS. PHELLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That
41 the letter should including -- include something about
42 its current policy is unnecessarily restricting
43 subsistence uses.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
46 Patti. Anybody else? Okay. Are we ready for the question?
47 Motion to write a letter to the Board expressing our
48 wishes on the wolf management in Unit 2. I think I can
49 do a voice vote on this. All in favor, say aye.

50

00091

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3

4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
5 opposed? Say no.

6

7 (No response)

8

9 Okay, let's write a letter. And let's
10 take a break. Come back at -- what is that? 3:35.

11

12 (Off record)

13

14 (On record)

15

16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Hey, Council
17 members, you can work your way back to your seats here.
18 We'll get started again.

19

20 (Pause)

21

22 Okay. Thank you everybody. We will just
23 take a quick roll here -- not roll. Just question here
24 and see if we're done with Federal Wildlife Proposals.
25 Kind of get the impression that we may have covered
26 everything. But if there's a proposal that anybody in
27 the Council still wants to put forward from another area,
28 other than Unit 2, perhaps? We want to hear that now.

29

30 (No response)

31

32 I'm not seeing any. So, I think we're
33 done with our call for Federal Wildlife Proposals, and
34 we can move ahead on the agenda here. Next item up would
35 be an update on Wildlife Proposal 24-01, which is a
36 statewide sale of brown bear hides. And we have Jason
37 Roberts up here to inform us about that. Go ahead, Jason.

38

39 DR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mister Chair.
40 Jason Roberts, anthropologist, OSM. So, we probably
41 could have labeled this a little bit better, but this
42 this is an action item. We're hoping to get your input
43 on what you'd like to do for your region regarding this
44 proposal, based on updated information. And so, Pippa
45 Kenner, who many of you might remember, is online and
46 she is the author and kind of expert on this proposal,
47 but I'll be presenting the high points for her here
48 today. The analysis for this proposal is in your
49 supplemental materials, and it starts on page 117. The
50 proposal, if you remember, you've seen it before, was

1 submitted originally by a resident of McCarthy, Alaska,
2 who requested that the Federal Subsistence Board allow
3 the sale of brown bear hides under federal subsistence
4 regulations. The proponent states subsistence users in
5 many areas of Alaska must salvage the hides of brown
6 bears. However, the hides must not be sold, and the
7 proponent continues that the hides of many other legally
8 harvested big game species may be sold and brown bears
9 should be added to this regulation. The Board deferred
10 this proposal at its April 2024 meeting. Since then, OSM
11 has added an addendum to the proposal analysis, which
12 adds new information and a new revised OSM conclusion
13 at the end of the analysis. And so, the purpose of the
14 addendum is to identify information that the Regional
15 Advisory Councils hadn't seen when you first made your
16 recommendations in the fall of 2023? The Federal
17 Subsistence Board again deferred action on this proposal
18 at its February 2025 meeting, based on this new
19 information. And at that time, the Board requested that
20 all ten regional advisory Councils provide updated
21 recommendations or maintain their original
22 recommendations at their winter meetings, based on, you
23 know, the new information and the analysis. So, this is
24 a statewide proposal that's being reviewed by all ten
25 Regional Advisory Councils, and each Council may inform
26 the Board whether the regulation is culturally
27 appropriate for their region. So, the Board deferred
28 action on the proposal because adopting it as originally
29 submitted might conflict with the Convention on
30 International Trade in Endangered Species known as
31 CITES. This is an international treaty. The U.S. Fish
32 and Wildlife Service has delegated to the State of Alaska
33 Department of Fish and Game, the authority to provide
34 for the international trade of brown bear hides only if
35 ADF&G issues permits, reporting that the trade will not
36 be detrimental to the survival of the species in the
37 wild. And so, a permit from the Alaska Department of
38 Fish and Game is required. And the Department of Fish
39 and Game currently issues a permit to sell the hide of
40 a brown bear, but only if it's taken in an area with a
41 two brown bear harvest limit. So, as background to this
42 issue, brown bears outside of Alaska exist in much
43 smaller populations than in Alaska, and the state of
44 Alaska limits sales of hides currently, because
45 unlimited sales might incentivize legal and illegal
46 harvesting in Alaska, and elsewhere in North America.
47 And for this reason, the State of Alaska's purpose is
48 to prevent hides from entering commercial markets.
49

1 And so, while limiting the sale of brown
2 bear hides is necessary for the hundreds of brown bears
3 harvested in the sport and general hunts each year in
4 Alaska, in which the edible meat does not need to be
5 salvaged, the much lower number of brown bears harvested
6 for subsistence, and for which the edible meat must be
7 salvaged, does not need the same level of restrictions
8 on the sale of hides and OSM's consideration. So, the
9 revised OSM conclusion begins on page 138, and that is
10 to support proposal WP 24-01, with modification that the
11 hide of brown bears, with or without claws attached, may
12 be purchased within the United States for personal use
13 and not to be resold. The hunter must request an OSM
14 customary trade permit and must return the permit.
15 Additionally, the modified regulation will align federal
16 sealing regulations with State of Alaska sealing
17 regulations. And the justification for this conclusion
18 is that the Federal Board deferred the proposal in April
19 2024, because adopting it as submitted might conflict
20 with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered
21 Species. In response, OSM created this modification to
22 allow the sale of a hide of a brown bear under federal
23 subsistence regulations, and the bear may be taken in
24 an area with a 1 or 2 brown bear harvest limit. The
25 focus of the OSM modification is to limit sales to
26 purchases within the United States, because CITES only
27 limits international purchases of brown bear hides. So,
28 this modification, allowing only domestic purchases,
29 would fall in line with CITES. The following two elements
30 of the OSM modification will align federal regulations
31 with State of Alaska regulations and permit
32 requirements. The first being that the purchase of a
33 hide must be for personal use and not to be resold,
34 which is intended to prevent a customary traded hide
35 from entering a commercial market, and two, the seal
36 number must be included in any advertisement of sale,
37 which allows law enforcement to identify that a brown
38 bear advertised -- brown bear hide advertised for sale
39 on the internet, for example, is from a legally harvested
40 brown bear. The OSM modification also goes on to allow
41 hide to be sold with or without claws attached and will
42 allow federally qualified users who remove a claw to
43 incorporate it into a handicraft to then sell the hide
44 also. Current federal edible meat salvage requirements
45 will likely protect brown bears from overharvest.

46
47 So, in conclusion, the OSM modification
48 complies with the provisions of Cites and allows
49 federally qualified users to legally sell the hides of
50 brown bears while balancing customary trade and

1 conservation. And we're asking all ten Councils to
2 provide their own recommendation based on this revised
3 conclusion, and each Council can tell us whether the
4 regulation is appropriate for their region. In the fall
5 of 2023, this Council took no action on this proposal.
6 And you all noted that you wanted to know more about
7 other regions' traditions and recommendations before
8 making your own recommendation on the proposal. And so
9 that's why we're bringing it back to you for
10 consideration. And we'd like to hear your recommendation
11 on this proposal. And I can try to answer any questions
12 and give you feedback on how other Councils have weighed
13 in on the proposal during this round.

14
15 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you,
16 Jason. Any questions from the Council? Harvey.

17
18 MS. KITKA: One of the things we found
19 out years ago when there used to be a bounty on the
20 noses of the bears, and the population of the bears
21 decreased so rapidly. When I was young there was no
22 bears within Sitka area, basically. There were bears but
23 we never saw them. I worry that, at some point, they're
24 diminishing a lot of areas and brown bears are very
25 important to our salmon streams. A lot of people don't
26 realize that the brown bear keep the fish moving so they
27 don't just end up in just one spot and then die before
28 they get to their spawning grounds. Like everything
29 else, there's a purpose for them. Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
32 Harvey. John.

33
34 MR. SMITH: Just a question. So, what
35 you're saying is a subsistence bear hide being able to
36 be sold and in one piece. Is that what you're saying?

37
38 DR. ROBERTS: Yes, through the Chair. So,
39 this would allow a subsistence user who harvested,
40 legally harvested a brown bear under federal regulations
41 to sell that the hide of that bear.

42
43 MR. SMITH: And so most fur bears that,
44 you know, mink, marten and that, they're all strip them
45 down into -- and you can sell them that way, right?

46
47 DR. ROBERTS: Yes. From my recollection,
48 that's correct. Many others are allowed to be sold.

49
50

1 MR. SMITH: And so just to perspective
2 and my feelings about that is looking at the sea otter.
3 Our families -- and of course, there's an abundance of
4 them that are just wiping out all the clams, the cockles,
5 the crab and many other things, and our people work hard
6 to harvest them, and they have to go through this process
7 of actually harvesting, preserving the hide and then
8 actually making something before they can -- and I know
9 that's in a whole different management, you know, other
10 mammal management program that manages that, and the
11 halibut, and the seal. And so, I kind of feel like if
12 they're going to do that with the bear, that they would
13 be doing that for the Alaska people that harvest the sea
14 otter, and it would actually, to me, would encourage
15 more people to go out because it's a lot of work. So,
16 I'm just sharing a perspective that if that was to happen
17 how can we do that for sea otter? It's just a thought.
18 So, it's a whole different management, I know that. Yeah.

19
20 DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. Through the Chair
21 that would fall outside the jurisdiction of the Federal
22 Subsistence Management Program, but yeah, and certain -
23 - definitely outside the scope of this proposal here,
24 but could be something to follow up on with a different
25 agency.

26
27 MR. SMITH: And I really do agree in
28 harvesting the bear and the black bear, just in the same
29 reason that there's many of them, and the population of
30 them is growing and growing and, you know,
31 overpopulating many areas.

32
33 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Any other
34 questions? No. Harvey, go ahead.

35
36 MR, KITKA: Just a question. How many
37 brown bear are we allowed to take subsistence in
38 Southeast?

39
40 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. I'd have
41 to look. It depends on which Unit you're in. A couple
42 of them are one every four years, and then, let's
43 see.....

44
45 MS. KENNER: Jason, this is Pippa Kenner.
46 For the record, it's-- the one that's different is Unit
47 5, where you may take a brown bear every year.

48
49 DR. ROBERTS: Yeah. Right. So, Units 1
50 through 4, one every four years and Unit 5 is one every

1 year. Oh. Yeah, that's not even -- 1 and 3 don't have a
2 season. Yeah.

3

4 MR. SANDHOFER: It says Units 1, 2, 3, 4
5 and 5. You can take one every year. Unit 4 is one every
6 regulatory year. So, it says here in the regs and on
7 Mitkof Island -- brown bear have come to Mitkof Island,
8 or Unit 3, when historically, they haven't.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Could you repeat
11 what you said there, Ted? I kind of missed it. How --
12 what was the numbers again?

13

14 MR. SANDHOFER: So, according to the
15 subsistence harvest. So, Unit 4, it's one every four
16 regulatory years. In Unit 1, 2, 3, well, it says 4 and
17 5, it says one bear by federal registration permit here.
18 I don't know why it has 4 on both of those, the way I'm
19 reading page 35 and 39.

20

21 MS. KENNER: Yeah. This is Pippa Keener,
22 for the record. I think, I heard a question in there?

23

24 MR. SANDHOFER: My mistake.

25

26 MS. KENNER: Oh, you've got it?

27

28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We're just
29 trying to confirm what the current regulations are for
30 Southeast Alaska. Okay.

31

32 DR. ROBERTS: Do you want me just to go
33 through and read it from the book?

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

36

37 MS. KENNER: Well, I think what the
38 gentleman is doing is he's looking at the C&T for brown
39 bear, which includes residents of Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and
40 5, so they're eligible to harvest a brown bear.

41

42 DR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Pippa. I'll take
43 care of it. Thank you.

44

45 MS. KENNER: Okay.

46

47 DR. ROBERTS: So in Unit 1, residents of
48 1 through 5 have C&T, and it's one bear every four
49 regulatory years by state registration permit only. Unit
50 2, there are no regulations for black -- or brown bear,

1 only black bear. Unit 3, there is no federal open season
2 for brown bear, though residents of 1 through 5 have C&T
3 for brown bear. Unit 4, residents of 1 through 5 have
4 C&T for one bear every four regulatory years, and Unit
5 5 residents again, Units 1 through 5, have C&T for one
6 bear every year.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
9 Any follow up on that or any other questions? Patti.

10

11 MS. PHLLIPS: I personally don't have a
12 problem with them selling a hide if -- even if the
13 harvest is one bear, or one bear every four years, I
14 think they should be allowed to sell their bear hide.
15 That's my personal opinion. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
18 Patti. Harvey. No. Okay. Anybody else with a question?
19 Okay. Maybe not. And I was told there -- I think there
20 might be somebody standing by from the state on the
21 phone, if you have any questions about this for the
22 state. So. But if we are done with questions, and it's
23 time for Council action on this, and they do want a
24 decision on this. It sounded like, so. We'll have to put
25 forward a motion and discussion, and have a vote. And
26 yeah, Cal, go ahead.

27

28 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, I'm prepared to
29 make a motion. I move that the Council support this
30 proposal, WP 25-01, as shown in the OSM conclusion of
31 February 2025 that talks about the customary trade
32 permit and that sort of thing. So, the OSM conclusion
33 as it appears on page 118 of our books.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Question Cal,
36 before we get to a second, do you support as modified
37 by the OSM, is that.....

38

39 MR. CASIPIT: Basically, I'm my motion
40 is to support the OSM preliminary conclusion of February
41 2025, on page 118, which includes all that stuff that
42 Jason was talking about.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. We won't
45 ask you to state all the modifications that that might
46 be a bit much, but. Yes, support as modified by OSM. Do
47 we have a second? Okay. We have a motion and a second.
48 Motion was to support. Now for discussion. Patti.

49

50

00098

1 MS. PHELLIPS: Oh, thanks. Thanks, Cal. I
2 think that eliminates the two brown bear limit per
3 regulatory year with the modification. So, I will
4 support that, the modification.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
Patti. Anybody else in discussion?

(No response)

Just a procedural thing here, we're --
we are acting, I guess, on a proposal. Are we going
through any of the other proposal protocols here on this?

MS. PERRY: Thank you for asking, Mr.
Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator. Yes,
we are. If you would like to call for public comments,
although I don't think we have any in the room, it would
be prudent to ask if there's anybody on the phone that
would like to make a comment on this. If you want to
step through all the procedure, that would probably make
it for a clean record. I know that they've been
soliciting public comments in the other regions as well.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
DeAnna. And then our then our justification will
probably want to cover the criteria that we use for
justifying our action here. So, keep that in mind as
well. So, let's see. Do we have any tribal or corporate
consultation on this proposal? Seeing none, does ADF&G
or other federal agencies submit -- well, let's go. Did
ADF&G submit comments on this? No. Wait a minute.

MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair. This is Mark
Burch. I'm happy to respond if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I
think I heard somebody from the state on the phone. Go
ahead.

MR. BURCH: Yes. For just for the record,
this is Mark Burch with the Department of Fish and Game.
We have submitted comments to the last couple of Board
of Game meetings, and our position has been that we
support the modification, really of OSM a year ago, and
that would be to mirror the state. It's not an unusual
position for us to have. And I'm not here to so much to
try to get you to change your regulations, as I just

00099

1 want to note, as you already have, that I'm here to
2 answer any questions that the Council may have. So, I
3 appreciate you doing that, and that's all I have for
4 now. Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mark.
7 Any other federal agencies comment on this proposal?

8
9 (No response)

10
11 Oh, sorry. We do have a question for
12 you, Mark. Patti, go ahead.

13
14 MS. PHLLIPS: Thank you. I had asked if
15 I could ask him a question. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll
16 ask it. Is there any conservation concern with brown
17 bear in Southeast Alaska?

18
19 MR. BURCH: Through the Chair. You know,
20 intuitively, when I first saw this proposal, and I think
21 many of us did, we wondered about that. Since sale is
22 not allowed in Southeast, and Southeast is a destination
23 for harvest of brown bears, for sure. But when we looked
24 at it, there really are not very many hides being sold
25 anywhere in the state as a result of this existing state
26 regulations. So, it's pretty difficult for us to raise
27 that as a concern. Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
30 Burch. Any other questions for Mr. Burch?

31
32 (No response)

33
34 Okay. So, we'll get back to the list
35 here. Any other federal agencies comment on this
36 proposal?

37
38 (No response)

39
40 No. Tribal entities, comments?

41
42 (No response)

43
44 Don't have any. Okay. Advisory group
45 comments? How about -- I think you mentioned there are
46 comments from other regional Councils. Maybe we should
47 hear.

48
49 (Pause)

50

000100

1 DR. ROBERTS: Yep. Sorry. Left too soon.
2 Through the Chair. Jason Roberts. I've got how the
3 previous RACs, who have already met -- I will read you
4 how they voted. So, the Bristol Bay, Yukon-Kuskokwim
5 Delta, Eastern Interior, Western Interior, South Central
6 and North Slope Councils have met and all supported the
7 revised OSM conclusion and the addendum that I just
8 updated you all on; the Kodiak Aleutians Council opposed
9 the proposal as not being culturally appropriate for
10 their region.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
13 Jason. Fish and Game Advisory committees. No comments?
14

15 (No response)

16
17 How about subsistence resource
18 commissions? I think we do have somebody on the line for
19 that with a comment. Yeah. Amber Cohen, are you on the
20 line?

21 (No response)

22
23 Amber Cohen, are you there? Unmute. Say
24 she is there.

25
26 MS. PERRY: She is. She's still muted
27

28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: If you're there,
29 Amber, you need to unmute the phone on your end, I think.
30 While we're waiting, can I ask, is there a summary of
31 written public comments? Through there -- Ms. Cohen,
32 we'll get back to you here shortly. Stand by.

33
34
35 DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. Jason
36 Roberts again. There are no written public comments on
37 this new conclusion.

38
39 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Do we
40 have Amber Cohen on the line yet?

41
42 (No response)

43
44 Okay. Anybody in the public, on the
45 phone, or in the audience who wants to comment on this
46 proposal?

47
48 MS. PERRY: Through the Chair. For those
49 folks online who might wish to make a public comment,
50 if you're on the phone, please press star five, that

000101

1 will let us know that you would like to speak and if
2 you're on Teams if you'll use the raise hand feature.
3 And we'll give that just a moment. Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Amber
6 Cohen, are you with us now?

7

8 MS. COHEN: Hi, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes. Good. We
11 hear you fine, go ahead.

12

13 MS. COHEN: Hi, Mr. Chair. This is Amber
14 Cohen, can you hear me?

15

16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes, we hear you
17 fine.

18

19 MS. COHEN: Okay. Thank you. Sorry for
20 the technical difficulties there. Again, this is for the
21 record, this is Amber Cohen from Wrangell-St Elias
22 National Park and Preserve. And I have the comment for
23 our Subsistence Resource Commission, which is a federal
24 Advisory Committee that represents subsistence users of
25 federal lands within Wrangell-St Elias National Park and
26 Preserve, including lands within Southeast region. The
27 Wrangell-St Elias National Park Subsistence Resource
28 Commission unanimously supported WP 24-01, with the
29 revised OSM conclusion in addendum. Given the
30 requirement to salvage the hide, subsistence users
31 should be able to sell them. Additionally, customary
32 trade of brown bear hides is important for use in
33 handicrafts. Member noted that he doesn't make
34 handicrafts himself, but he could sell the hide to
35 someone who does make and sell handicrafts. Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Hey, thank you,
38 Amber. And now we get to the Regional Council
39 recommendation with the motion, but we already had the
40 motion. We kind of got a little out of order here, but
41 we do have a motion to support this proposal. So, any
42 other Council discussion? And keep them in mind with the
43 proposal, we probably need to have the justifications
44 behind our action here. Cal, are you ready to go?

45

46 MR. CASIPIT: Yes, I'm prepared to take
47 care of that, I think. First of all, before I start, I
48 want to say that you know -- I, I do look at these type
49 of proposals, as far as, you know -- I guess what I'm
50 saying is, I look at these fairly critically because I'm

1 -- I don't want to see commercialization of bears. I
2 don't want to see a bunch of bears die for their
3 gallbladders. That sort of thing. So, I look at this
4 stuff with a lot of caution, and I'm satisfied with how
5 this is written and how it alleviates my concerns about
6 commercialization and bears just being shot for their
7 gallbladders. So, I'm okay with that. But I just wanted
8 to say that up front that I'm -- that's something that
9 I look at pretty closely; I really get concerned about.
10 Is there a conservation concern? I don't think there is.
11 I think there's plenty of brown bears in Southeast
12 Alaska, and the way this regulation is laid out in our
13 regulations for the take of them, I think we're safe
14 there. There is no conservation concern. I think this --
15 -- there is substantial evidence in this analysis for --
16 there's enough analysis, enough information here where
17 I, I understand that people do need to be able to sell
18 these hides so that folks who want to make handicraft
19 items out of them can. And I think that's an important
20 part of culture, as well as providing the raw materials
21 for skin sewers, and what have you to do, make their
22 handicrafts and continue their culture. So, I think
23 that's important, and I think there's plenty of evidence
24 for that. Will it be detrimental to subsistence users?
25 And I don't think it will. I think this provides an
26 opportunity for subsistence users to utilize something
27 and make something of value with it. And again, like, I
28 said, the regulations protect the biology, and the
29 animals themselves, from overharvest. Will, this
30 recommendation unnecessary restrict other users? No, not
31 at all. So, with that, I'm prepared to vote in favor of
32 this. Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Cal.
35 Any other Council members want to add to the
36 justification? John, go ahead.

37
38 MR. SMITH: (In Native) My intentions
39 aren't to hurt anybody, but like, what I was sharing
40 before is like being equal, not being discriminative,
41 you know, knowing that all the fur bears were already
42 in access to be sold like the fox, the mink, marten, and
43 those others and then now we're talking about the bear.
44 And I really think that the mammal management should
45 look at that on sea otter. So, I just want to make a
46 point. I know that looking at the table that the voting
47 is going to pass, but I'm going to vote against, just
48 to make a point that I think that it would be positive
49 for the Mammal Protection Act to actually do the same
50 thing with their sea otter hides, so that we could sell

000103

1 them in whole.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John.

4 Other Council members want to give their thoughts on
5 this proposal. Are we ready for the question?

6

7 MR. CASIPIT: Call for the question. This
8 is Cal.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
11 Questions have been called for. The motion was to support
12 wildlife proposal 25-01, as modified by the OSM staff.
13 And it's proposal that would allow the sale of brown
14 bear hides taken by subsistence -- under subsistence
15 regulations. And it's a statewide proposal. So, Frank,
16 I want to do a roll call vote on this one. If you could.
17 I don't know, I've got enough forms there to do a roll
18 call. Yeah, there's another one.

19

20 MR. WRIGHT: Cal Casipit

21

22 MR. CASIPIT: Yes.

23

24 MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.

25

26 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

27

28 MR. WRIGHT: Ted Sandhofer.

29

30 MR. SANDHOFER: Yes.

31

32 MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes.

35

36 MR. WRIGHT: Patricia Phillips.

37

38 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

39

40 MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.

41

42 MR. KTKA: Yes.

43

44 MR. WRIGHT: John Smith.

45

46 MR. SMITH: No.

47

48 MR. WRIGHT: Lewis Hiatt.

49

50 MR. HIATT: Yes.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Frank, yes. Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank. Hey. Next up on the agenda is a call for proposals to the Alaska Board of Game. And DeAnna, it says that you might open this discussion.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Board of Game proposal window is currently open, and this would be the opportunity for the Council to develop any Board of Game proposals for this current cycle. And we would like to welcome any local ADF&G staff in attendance that could help during this meeting and any of the proposal process. So, yeah. I'm just kind of opening that up, advising the Council that this would be their only opportunity as a Council to put together a proposal. Obviously, any of you could do a proposal individually, but this will be the only time that the Council meets before the end of the proposal cycle for Board of Game, and I believe that's May or -- yeah, May 5th, I believe or May 1st -- I'm sorry. The deadline is May 1st. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, DeAnna. So, Council members, have you thought of any proposals that you might want this Council to put forward to the upcoming Board of Game meeting?

(No response)

So far, it's looking like maybe the Council doesn't have any ideas on Board of Game proposals. Okay. I guess I'd just say if, you know, it's probably an opportunity. If anybody does think of something before the end of the meeting, we could probably revisit this, but looks like, at this time, we don't have any proposals coming forward. So, we can move on the agenda. And that brings us to the Council Charter review also. DeAnna, topic for you.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is DeAnna Perry, Council Coordinator for the Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. On page 209 of your meeting books, you'll find the Council's charter. The Council's charter is up for regular review. This charter is essentially the Council's bylaws, and it notes the authorities under which this Council operates, such as ANILCA, Alaska National Interest Lands and Conservation Act, and FACA, the Federal Advisory

1 Committee Act. It provides context for how the Council
2 operates. I'm providing a little bit more information
3 since I know that we have a new member on our Council.
4

5 So, under the Federal Advisory Committee
6 Act, your Council charter is renewed every two years.
7 Before the charter is renewed, the Council has a right
8 to review it and discuss any changes they would like to
9 propose to the Federal Subsistence Board. The Board then
10 reviews proposed changes and, if the Board agrees, the
11 request for proposed changes is forwarded to the
12 Secretary of the interior. A lot of language in your
13 charter is actually required by the Federal Advisory
14 Committee Act and its implementing policy, so you can't
15 change that language. Some language that you can request
16 is the change of the name of your Council. You can ask
17 to change the name. You can ask to change the number of
18 members on your Council, which would require a
19 reasonable justification. You can also request an
20 addition of language that specifies a desired membership
21 balance that, if achieved, would allow the members of
22 the Council to represent the entire region. So, for
23 example, a few years ago, Kodiak Aleutians Council
24 requested, and was granted, approval to geographically
25 rebalance the membership, and that was to have four
26 members from Kodiak Archipelago, three from the Alaska
27 Peninsula, and three from the 30 Aleutian Pribilof
28 Islands. Because that region is so spread out, the
29 Council wanted to state that having a broader geographic
30 representation is a value for them. The Western Interior
31 Alaska Council also had similar language added to their
32 charter a few years ago. I did want to point out under
33 12, under number 12, the recently added provision
34 continuing to serve, which allows a member to serve after
35 the expiration of his or her term until a successor is
36 appointed, that does remain in there. You'll see that
37 that carryover language was approved a few years ago,
38 and it does remain in the charter. And you'll also see
39 language addressing a request from many Councils, and
40 that was for the appointment of a non-voting young leader
41 member, and that's also under number 12. It's an
42 opportunity to recruit and educate young leaders in our
43 region. As many of you have been on this Council for
44 years, I believe you recognize that young people, if
45 they applied for a regular seat, and were competing with
46 people such as yourselves who have years of experience
47 and knowledge in subsistence uses, leadership, extensive
48 communication skills, it would be hard for them to
49 compete, and be competitive, since they have a pretty
50 limited ability to gain experience and skills in their

000106

1 18 to 25 years.

2

3

4 So, this is an opportunity for youth to
5 compete with their peers, those that have had about the
6 same amount of time to learn the skill necessary to sit
7 on the Council, and be able to fully participate in all
8 the different activities that Council members do, except
9 for voting. And this is going to help us grow the next
10 generation of people who, hopefully, wish to apply for
11 a regular seat in time. If the Council is satisfied with
12 all charter provisions as is, and requests no changes,
13 then the Council can simply vote to forward the charter
14 to the Board, and the charter would then carry over and
15 is formally approved every other year. You can review,
16 edit, you can make recommendations if you desire, but
17 if not, it just continues. So, Mr. Chair, I'll hand it
18 over to you to see how the Council wishes to move
19 forward. Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
21 DeAnna. So, this is an item that the Council votes on
22 to approve the charter. So, we will need a motion to do
23 that. Oh, Patti.

24

25 MS. PHLLIPS: Move to adopt the amendment
26 charter of the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional
27 Advisory Council.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
30 Patti.

31

32 MR. CASIPIT: I'll second that. This is
33 Cal.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. So, we have
36 a motion and a second to approve our charter. Discussion.
37 Anybody want to question anything in there or draw
38 attention to anything?

39

40 (No response)

41

42 Any questions about what the charter
43 contains? Give you a few minutes to maybe look at it a
44 little. A little closer after DeAnna's synopsis there.
45 (Pause) Patti.

46

47 MS. PHLLIPS: Is this wordage also, the
48 DFO should ensure a public-facing website is created and
49 maintained for the Council. Is it -- you do that for
50 what? The federal -- for the federal website?

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

MS. PERRY: Through the Chair. We do have a team that does that for the Federal Subsistence Management Program, and I am on there almost daily. So, I do put in requests to make sure that our information is updated, and it's a really quick turnaround, and we have a great team up there that makes sure that's updated. Thank you for the question.

MS. PHELLIPS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Patti. Anybody else with a question?

(No response)

Harvey had a question or comment?

MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This has always been one of my concerns, is one of the paragraphs in there that says appointees will be served without -- will serve without compensation, except when they're away from home or business. And a lot of times some of these people go back to their own homes, but they're still away from their business, and they lose their time, their leave and what have you. But you don't get any compensation for it. And they should.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Harvey, for that comment. Maybe that can change someday. Frank.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with Mr. Kitka. You know, you know, tomorrow I'm supposed to be in a tribal meeting about -- I'm president of the tribe, so I'm going to be missing that meeting. But I think there are people that are -- come to the meeting and, you know, these people are coming from communities. Some of them don't have the resources to be able to go to the restaurant and eat whenever they feel like it, or whenever they come here they have to be careful on the -- what little resources they have. You know, I've seen some people that I've talked to that, and I know one person that would have been very good in his position, but couldn't do it because they didn't have the resources to do anything, and be able to come and come here, you know, and I wonder about some people that would like to do this. There's another person I talked to, and he says, well, I can't afford it. You know, coming here and being a volunteer is -- it does a

1 lot of stress on some of our resources. Supposing the
2 person had to go fishing, he couldn't come here.
3 Supposing, you know, they had to do something else
4 besides, you know, it's -- I think it's a hardship on a
5 lot of people that do come. Sometimes you're thinking
6 about other things. You know, I'm thinking about my boat
7 right now, and I, you know, because I sure hate to have
8 a young person looking after it for me, but he doesn't
9 know everything about the boat. So, I think that -- I
10 remember one time there was a person that had -- didn't
11 have the resources and asked to go out and have dinner.
12 And I said, yes, sir, I'll help. Then someone said, no,
13 I'll take care of it because they didn't have the
14 resources to buy themselves dinner.

15
16 So, coming to these meetings is kind of
17 unfair. We have people here that are from the government,
18 governments that are getting paid because they're --
19 that's their job. Well, we as a Council think this is a
20 job, too, because we make decisions that are so important
21 to Southeast Alaska and decisions that is important to
22 not only Southeast Alaska, but I would say to the world.
23 You know, whatever resources we take care of is
24 important. Like, we take care of the salmon that feeds
25 the world. We take care of the deer that feeds the
26 communities in Southeast Alaska. We take care of all the
27 resources. Then we look into some of the rivers or the
28 forests -- when we talk about the forest, we're talking
29 about the world, so that it can feed oxygen to the world.
30 Because Southeast Alaska has the biggest rainforests --
31 one of the biggest rainforests in the world. And here
32 we are making decisions to take care of it. So, this is
33 a job, gunalchéesh. That's all I have to say.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
36 Frank. DeAnna, did you have something about on that?

37
38 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair. I just wanted
39 to let the Council know on page 199 of your main meeting
40 materials is the response to this Council's letter
41 regarding compensation. It was a rather lengthy letter
42 that the Council sent. And in that letter, we did ask,
43 pursuant to a USDA directive as well as a DOI directive,
44 that local travel expenses that are normally incurred
45 could be reimbursed. And so, we did request that in
46 addition to just regular compensation for the Council
47 member's time. So, if you want another copy of that
48 letter, I can send that to you. It's not in the book. I
49 think it was in the last meeting book, but I'd be happy
50 to send that back out. But the response to that letter

000109

1 you can find on page 199 from the Secretary of Interior.
2 So, I just wanted to point that out. Thank you, Mr.
3 Chair.

4
5 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
6 DeAnna. Yeah, I know we did make a formal request for
7 compensation. So, right, their responses is there for
8 us. But, yeah, I mean, you know, maybe it's something
9 we could always ask for again. I mean, Boards change
10 from year-to-year, over time, but I think, you know, I
11 think we've made some pretty good points there, Frank.
12 And we have in the past and, you know, you look around
13 the table and it seems like everybody, almost
14 everybody's either retired, semi-retired or work
15 seasonally. It's kind of hard if you're -- got an actual
16 job where, you know, to get away from work to come attend
17 a week of meetings, and are either going to use your
18 vacation time, which would be a pretty big ask for
19 somebody. And it's probably one of the reasons, you know,
20 we don't have a lot of younger people on the Council. I
21 mean, you know, they're busy and they might have a job
22 or, you know, they're more involved in the fishing, and
23 taking time away from that costs them money and
24 compensation could help attract different Council
25 members. I can see that. So, yeah. We didn't -- the
26 request wasn't acted upon now, but it could be something
27 we can keep asking for. So, thanks for that, Frank. Any
28 other questions or comments on the charter?

29
30 (No response)

31
32 Looks like people stopped reading for
33 the most part, so we're ready for the question.

34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
38 Questions have been called for to approve the Council
39 charter for another two-year period. And all in favor
40 of approving the charter? Say aye.

41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43
44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there anybody
45 opposed? Say no.

46
47 (No response)

48
49 Okay. Charter approved. Next item for
50 business is review and approval of our annual report.

000110

1 And once again, DeAnna will lead us through that
2 discussion.

3
4 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again,
5 this is DeAnna Perry Council Coordinator, and for those
6 who have meeting books, you'll see an explanation of
7 what our annual reports are about in your supplemental
8 meeting materials book. That's on page 157. Again, a
9 little bit of additional information for folks who might
10 not be familiar with our annual report, it's a way for
11 Regional Advisory Councils to bring regional subsistence
12 uses and needs to the Secretary's attention by
13 communicating them in a letter form to the Federal
14 Subsistence Board. At the last meeting, this Council
15 discussed various issues they would like to see included
16 in this report, and from that, I've drafted the annual
17 report that can be found in your Supplemental Materials
18 book, the next page, page 159. Topics include concerns
19 about scheduling conflicts between federal subsistence
20 Management program meetings and Board of Fisheries or
21 Board of Game, North Pacific Fishery Management Council
22 meetings, the definition of rural as it pertains to non-
23 rural determination Proposals, request for information
24 about unit for deer monitoring, the desire to have
25 additional data for the Fish and Wildlife status
26 reports, the need for funding a Unit 4 deer survey and
27 a moose survey in Yakutat and, in addition, the Council
28 also informed the Board about its intent to provide input
29 on the Tongass National Forest Plan revision process as
30 appropriate in the coming years.

31
32 Since this annual report draft was
33 posted in, or printed in your books, I did get some
34 feedback from OSM leadership regarding a few edits that
35 needed to be made. And the first edit would be on page
36 three, the third full paragraph that starts Title VIII,
37 where it was originally added. There towards the end of
38 that line it says Native Alaskans and it's been suggested
39 we change that to Alaska Native peoples, and that's per
40 the indigenous communication style guide. And then at
41 the bottom of the same page, we make reference to a
42 House conference report and legislative history. It was
43 suggested that we note that Congress considered the
44 subsistence priority for Alaska Native people prior to
45 the 1994 edition of Alaska's Tribes to the Federally
46 Recognized Tribal List Act, and therefore the political
47 designation for tribal citizens did not yet exist for
48 indigenous people in Alaska. It does now exist, and the
49 political distinction is a legal and critical, and
50 necessary distinction in the law. It just bolsters, I

000111

1 think, what the Council already had in there and it's
2 more appropriate, again, according to the guide that I
3 mentioned before, the indigenous communication style
4 guide. So, if the Council can, consider those two
5 suggestions as they also review the report. I'll hand
6 it back to you, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank
9 you, DeAnna. So, yeah, we need to take a little time to
10 look this over again, and I want to pay particular
11 attention to the amended language. And then we will need
12 to have a motion to approve the annual report, and a
13 vote, to send it on to the Board. Any questions at this
14 time, initially? What's in the annual report, okay.
15 We'll take a little time to look at it a little closer
16 here.

17
18 (Pause)

19
20 DeAnna, I do have a quick question here.
21 So, the suggested amended language that you were saying,
22 that is how this document reads now, right? We're not
23 expected to make that change. Is that correct?

24
25 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, that would be
26 additional language changed. This version went to the
27 printer so it could be in your meeting books before the
28 review took place. So, since that printing, those two
29 changes were suggested. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30
31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, so we're
32 not looking at those changes.

33
34 MS. PERRY: No, I just verbally mentioned
35 those. Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, that
38 was kind of a lot to take in, all in one sitting there.
39 Any way you could put those up on the screen? Could you
40 do that, please? Cal.

41
42 MR. CASIPIT: I've got another -- excuse
43 me. I've got another quick edit, easy to change, I
44 suppose. Page 161 of our books. The -- seven paragraphs
45 down, it refers to basically report language from, it
46 says here ANILCA congressional history. That actually
47 is ANCSA, Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
48 congressional history, that I recognize. The secretary
49 -- basically where the Secretary can protect Native
50 interests by their withdrawal authority. That was out

000112

1 of ANCSA. It wasn't out of ANILCA. ANILCA was -- what
2 they called it remedial legislation. ANILCA VIII was
3 remedial legislation for the shortfall in ANCSA, by
4 basically saying that the secretaries are going to use
5 their withdrawal authority to protect Native
6 subsistence, and that was, in my opinion, a broken
7 promise of ANCSA.

8
9 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you,
10 Cal.

11
12 MR. CASIPIT: At the bottom of page 161.

13
14 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, I'm reading
15 that -- I'm reading that paragraph, and said sentence -
16 - I think you're referring -- referencing there says
17 with the Secretary of the interior be able to take action
18 to protect the subsistence needs of Alaska Natives
19 acknowledging language and ANILCA congressional history.
20 Then it says, specifically from the 1971 House
21 conference report. Well, in 1971, they were discussing
22 ANCSA, not ANILCA, so, right. So, that change might need
23 to be made as well. Did anybody see anything else in the
24 annual report that needs addressing?

25
26 (No response)

27
28 Hopefully, DeAnna can get at the annual
29 report up on the screen with those suggested changes as
30 well. Take a look at those.

31
32 (Pause)

33
34 So, that's up on the screen now if
35 Council members want to take a look at that.

36
37 (Pause)

38
39 So, DeAnna, I have a question. Maybe
40 you, or somebody else on the staff, could answer on the
41 second edit. I guess I don't really understand the
42 implications of that, especially this -- that last
43 sentence. It says it does now exist and the political
44 distinction and a legally critical and necessary
45 distinction in the law. What are they referring to there?

46
47 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Necessary
50 distinction in the law, I guess, is the question what

000113

1 is that referring to?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. PERRY: I would actually have to probably send out a lifeline. These edits came through the OSM director Crystal Leonetti. And I think it's probably as a result of her vast experience in this area and writing a lot of tribal letters and tribal -- oh, I see Jason is coming up. I'll stop there.

DR. ROBERTS: Through the Chair. I think what that edit is referencing is making note that, you know, this happened prior to Alaska Native groups becoming recognized as federally recognized tribes, and so that's what they're trying to point out there. There was a period of time where they were not yet federally recognized tribes and then, currently, they are.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, and that was -- that time period was -- the time period when the ANILCA was being enacted? That predates the federally recognized tribe? Is that the situation there?

DR. ROBERTS: Yes, that's what it's alluding to.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. I don't question it. I just want to understand it. I know there's a lot of expertise, you know, involved there. I just kind of like to know what it's referring to. So, thanks for that. Anybody else? Any other questions or comments on the annual report?

(No response)

Okay. No. You made the motion right, Patti? Do we have a motion? No.

MS. PERRY: Sorry, sorry. My bad.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Did we have a motion? Oh. There is no motion. Okay. So, we're ready for a motion.

MR. SANDHOFER: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we accept 2004 annual -- biannual -- annual report with the edits we've discussed.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. And -- okay, motion and a second. So, any further discussion on the annual report topics? Are we ready for the

000114

1 question? Okay. All in favor of accepting this draft as
2 our final product for the annual report, say I.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?

7 Say no.

8

9 (No response)

10

11 Okay. Annual report is ready to go. We
12 can probably move on here to future meeting dates, and
13 I'm thinking that will probably conclude our session for
14 today, but let's see where that goes. Future meeting
15 dates. Probably DeAnna again.

16

17 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, we're handing out
18 updated calendars. So, if you can, give us just a moment.
19 This reflects all of the dates that have been chosen for
20 or from the Regional Advisory Councils that have met
21 already this cycle. So, we'll take just a moment to make
22 sure those all get passed out. And then we have the
23 latest and greatest in front of the Council members when
24 they choose their dates.

25

26 (Pause)

27

28 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: You want to
29 introduce us again, DeAnna? Would you like me to?

30

31 MS. PERRY: Oh, I can. Mr. Chair, we can
32 start with the fall 2025 Council meetings. Previously,
33 this Council selected October 21st through the 23rd,
34 2025, in Wrangell. Wrangell is not a hub community for
35 this region. So, we did need to do a cost comparison and
36 a formal request to the Office of Subsistence Management
37 to be approved to have our meeting in that location. And
38 OSM director Crystal Leonetti did give us approval to
39 do that. So, we will be able to have our meeting in the
40 fall in Wrangell. If you could just confirm the dates
41 and that this Council still would like to meet in
42 Wrangell, we can set that in stone.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Council
45 members, this also requires a vote, right, to approve
46 this. So, consider our October 21st meeting in Wrangell,
47 date and time and, yeah, we'll take a motion. Ted?

48

49 MR. SANDHOFER: Yeah. I make a motion
50 that we set our fall 2025 Regional Advisory Council

000115

1 meeting for the dates of October 21st to 23rd in
2 Wrangell.

3

4 MR. CASIPIT: Second.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, we have a
7 motion and a second. Any discussion?

8

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Question has
12 been called for. All in favor of meeting in Wrangell,
13 October 21st, 22nd and 23rd of the -- this year. Say
14 aye.

15

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Anybody opposed?
19 Say no. Okay. Going Wrangell. Now, we have to look ahead
20 to the next winter meeting as well, at this time?

21

22 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair, and just as
23 a reminder the -- and during the meeting cycle, only two
24 Regional Advisory Councils can meet during any given
25 week. So, for winter of 2026, there are two weeks --
26 actually three, that this Council would not be able to
27 meet. And we're getting new calendars passed out right
28 now. The meeting weeks that we could not choose begins
29 February 23rd. There's the week of March 2nd, and the
30 week of March 16th, there are already two Regional
31 Advisory Councils meeting those weeks. And typically,
32 this Council likes to meet Tuesday, Wednesday and
33 Thursday, with Monday and Fridays being the travel days.

34

35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you,
36 DeAnna. So, it appears to me looking at this calendar
37 that we probably have options to meet on March 10th or
38 March 24th, or possibly February 17th, it looks like.
39 Is that correct?

40

41 MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: So, if any
44 Council members have a suggestion, this is a discussion
45 first, and then, do we vote on this one as well, or.....

46

47 MS. PERRY: Yes.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Just -- okay,
50 then we'll have a vote on that as well.

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

(Pause)

Go ahead, Patti.

MS. PHLLIPS: So, will we be discussing proposals or approving -- or making recommendations for proposals at that meeting?

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Winter meeting that will -- we will be developing fisheries proposals, I believe. Yes. Developing proposals. John.

MR. SMITH: Well, just to talk about it at first is, I think that would be great to do a Juneau adventure, February 17th through the 19th. And that's just a thought to throw up there, you know, to talk about it because there's, you know, March 10th and then March 24th week. So, but I'd suggest that too, because in March, usually the end of March is usually Gold Medal and, you know, they're pretty busy.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, John. So, that's open for discussion, February 17th. Yeah. Are there any other meetings going on close to then? Go ahead, Patti.

MS. PHLLIPS: I thought we couldn't do it on a week with two already scheduled meetings.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: February 17th. February 17th is only one meeting. Frank.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: If I'm still on the Council, I probably wouldn't make it because crabbing opens in that week, and the fishing.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Frank. That's probably always been a consideration in the past, I recall. And I don't know, as for my own self, traveling in February has proved to have been pretty difficult for me. Just quite often the winter weather just traps me in Point Baker. So, I'd like to meet a little later than that, if it works for other Council members as well.

MR. SMITH: March 10th.

000117

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Do we have a
2 discussion -- a suggestion of March 10th? How does that
3 sound to people?

4
5 MR. SANDHOFER: I kind of like that day
6 better, especially with staff and stuff. They'd have to
7 travel on a federal holiday if we had it in Juneau,
8 which isn't usually very nice for the staff. I mean,
9 that's retired people. Oh, well, but.

10
11 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: That's a good
12 observation, Ted. That February date would involve
13 traveling on a holiday for -- wouldn't probably matter
14 to us much, but for the staff that would -- that could
15 be an imposition. So, okay.

16
17 MR. SANDHOFER: They might not like us,
18 you know, getting into their three-day weekend with
19 their families, you know.

20
21 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We like to keep
22 the staff happy with us. So, I'm hearing March 10th.
23 John.

24
25 MR. SMITH: Just a thought too that, if
26 we did do it in March 24th, usually it's the last week
27 or so is when Gold Medal, but that's when everybody in
28 all of Southeast Alaska is actually going to Juneau. So,
29 that could be a positive because they're not always
30 playing ball every day. Maybe they'll want to come down
31 and testify or talk about something that -- so, just
32 throwing that up there. I'm not declining March 10th, or
33 anything, I'm just sharing a perspective.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah, just --
36 Mike was saying that, you know, later in March kind of
37 starts to also conflict with some fishing and
38 subsistence harvests. So, I know halibut season usually
39 is the latter part of March as well. Some folks are that
40 might be involved in halibut fishing. I don't know, I'm
41 kind of liking March 10th. Anybody else? Frank.

42
43 MR. WRIGHT: I'll make a motion.

44
45 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: You want to make,
46 if you're ready for a motion.

47
48 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, move to March
49 10th.

50

000118

1 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Mike.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, I second this
4 motion.

5

6 MR. MSITH: Question.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Question has
9 been called for. We'll come up with a place here as
10 well, but seeing it's out on the floor. All in favor of
11 March 10th for a meeting date. Week of March 10th, 11th
12 and 12th. Say aye. Is there anybody opposed? Say no.

13

14 (No response)

15

16 Okay, so the place, I mean, we've
17 obviously been talking about Juneau. It's one of our hub
18 communities. Is that where we would like to be in March?
19 Anybody want to make a motion and open it up for
20 discussion?

21

22 MR. CASIPIT: Now I move from -- I move
23 that we hold that meeting in March-- through March 10th
24 to 12th at -- in Juneau. Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Do we have a
27 second?

28

29 MR. SMITH: Second.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other
32 discussion?

33

34 (No response)

35

36 MS. PHLLIPS: I'll call for the question.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you. All in
39 favor of meeting in Juneau? Say aye. Anybody opposed?
40 Say no.

41

42 (No response)

43

44 Okay. Juneau in March. One more. They
45 want us to look ahead to.....

46

47 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yes. Go ahead,
50 DeAnna.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. PERRY: As we're waiting for the next calendar, just as a reminder, the Council has three hub communities currently. That's Juneau, Sitka and Ketchikan. We are able to possibly go to other Southeast communities, similar to what we did with the request on Wrangell. We would just do a cost comparison and a formal request to the program to do that. So, those are all options. Again, in addition to the hub communities that you have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We had a great meeting in Hoonah one time in the past. I'd love to be able to go back to Hoonah or Angoon or Kake, or any of those places, but just I don't know. They don't want us to anymore. So, now we have a calendar that looks ahead to the fall of 2026. A year from this fall, and we've got a little more leeway there. September 15th, September 22nd, October 13th and October 20th, look to be open. So, we have any preferences for a date there, and if you want to throw in a suggestion for a location at the same time, talk about that as well. I'm going to throw out October 20th. It's kind of well past the end of all the fishing activities. And it's just prior to the real active hunting season. Any thoughts? Mike?

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, I move that October 20th through the 22nd.

MR. SANDHOFER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Second. Okay, we have a second. Any discussion on October 20th?

MS. PHLLIPS: Call for the question.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: We don't have a place yet. Question has been called for. All in favor of a meeting the week of October 20th, 2026, say aye. Anybody opposed? Say no.

(No response)

Okay. Suggestions for a place? Do you have anything in mind there? Okay. Fall of 2026 we will be -- fall of 2026 we'll be making our recommendations on fish proposals. So, I don't know if that influences where we might be.

000120

1 MR. SMITH: I'd suggest we come here,
2 Sitka.

3
4 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Come back to
5 Sitka.

6
7 (Simultaneous speech)

8
9 MR. SANDHOFER: Its really nice. Hotels
10 are real close. Yeah. Activities.

11
12 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah. We're --
13 you know we're pretty limited in the places we can meet.

14
15 MR. SANDHOFER: Go get some shrimp.

16
17 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Well, Wrangell.
18 Cal.

19
20 MR. CASIPIT: I would love to invite you
21 guys to Gustavus and have you come to Gustavus. And
22 we've never met there. You know, I know last time I
23 suggested it and that it, you know, didn't really work
24 because of the timing, and having lodges open and all,
25 but I think within October 20th, we could probably make
26 that work and have a lodge. Have a lodge available for
27 us -- or for you. I would need the lodge.

28
29 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Is there still
30 jet service at that time?

31
32 MR. CASIPIT: No, the jet service is over
33 by then.

34
35 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: But there's
36 pretty good, pretty good flight service, so.

37
38 MR. CASIPIT: Oh, seaplanes is excellent.
39 Yeah.

40
41 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, and
42 there's that. Yeah. There's an airport. I, you know,
43 love to meet in Gustavus. I think that would be a great
44 spot, if it's allowed. I don't know. Other Council
45 members want to weigh in? It would require, you know,
46 Deanna doing her cost analysis, but, you know, it might
47 work out okay. I think the most -- I think Deanna told
48 me that probably the most expensive place we can meet
49 is in Juneau. Just because of the cost of everything.
50 So, if -- I don't know, if somebody -- if you're inviting

000121

1 us and we want to put that down now, it's -- you know,
2 there's opportunity to change it. If they decide it's
3 not a good idea. But so do we want to -- Johnny, have a
4 question or...?

5
6 MR. SMITH: Yeah, just a question. Who
7 owns the lodge now that's out there at the end of the
8 road?

9
10 MR. CASIPIT: Oh, you mean Glacier Bay
11 Lodge?

12
13 MR. SMTIH: Yeah. So, is that...?

14
15 MR. CASIPIT: It's -- it would be closed
16 in October 20th. It would be closed. It's -- the lodge
17 itself is actually owned by the Park Service, and they
18 concessionaire it out. Right now, it's being run by
19 Aramark. The actual day-to-day operations. But in town,
20 there's plenty of lodges and B&Bs, and probably the best
21 one is probably -- God, I can't even remember the name
22 of the place now, but it's out at one at the end of the
23 road. It's a really beautiful location, right along one
24 of the rivers, and Moose Walk through the yard, and that
25 kind of stops.

26
27 MR. SMTIH: Invite some moose in for
28 lunch. Yeah.

29
30 MR. CASIPTI: So, anyway, I think we
31 probably could find you -- find a lodge that would be
32 open and would provide food and all that stuff. And I
33 can kind of help you with lining that out. And we have
34 a great meeting location. We have a new community center
35 that's a great place to have a meeting.

36
37 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Do we
38 have...

39
40 MR. CASIPIT: I mean, we can also go and
41 visit the house.

42
43 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Yeah.

44
45 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah. Out at the park.
46 That'd be way cool. And there's, you know, maybe even
47 have a meeting there one of the days.

48
49 MR. SMTIH: A lot of work to move all
50 this stuff to the.....

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

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Frank, go ahead.

MR. WRIGHT: That would be pretty cool, you know, Hoonah Indian Association owns that tribal house, and it was a building that we had fought for, and we got -- and the federal government helped us pay for. And one time, the federal person asked me, how are you going to make money off of it? And I told the young lady, I said, it's not money. It's the acknowledgment from the National Park Service saying that Hoonah Xunna is the ancestral home of the Hoonah Lingit and the Hoonah (In Native), who is the building that is there that represent Hoonah, gunalchéesh.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank.

MR. SMITH: That'd be awesome.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Do we have a motion for Gustavus on the floor yet? I think, I don't think you made a motion, did you, Cal?

MR. CASIPIT: No. I didn't make a motion. I was trying to convince people that would be a good place. But I do -- okay, I'll move that we hold our fall 2026 meeting in Gustavus, the week of -- or the days from between October 20th and October 23rd -- 22nd.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Do we have a second? Okay. Motion and a second. Any other discussion? Question's been called for all in favor of meeting in Gustavus in our fall 2026 meeting, say aye. Anybody opposed? Say no.

(No response)

Okay, great. I like it. And with that, we can recess for the evening. Yes, John.

MR. SMITH: Just an announcement. Over at the Naa Kahidi will be here. They're having an event honoring a code talker elder. So, just to let you know that that's going on at the Naa Kahidi. It started at 4:00 and it gets over, like, 7:00 o'clock. Yeah. So, we still have an hour or so.

CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, John. Just something for Council members to keep in mind, we

000123

1 had our work session or working -- workgroup meeting on
2 the Tongass Forest plan. I might just ask staff, you
3 were, you know, try taking notes and trying to compile,
4 you know, what was discussed. And I just want to make
5 sure that you think you have what you need to present -
6 - help us present back to the rest of the Council for
7 tomorrow. Otherwise, we could, you know, potentially
8 have another get together this evening if, if necessary.
9 But.

10

11 MR. BOLWERK: Mr. Chair, this is Ashley
12 Bolwerk, for the record. Yeah, we think we have what we
13 need, unless you all had other things you wanted to add,
14 so.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay, good. So,
17 I'll just leave that up to the working group. If you
18 think there's anything else you want to work on. Let us
19 know. And otherwise, that will be one of the things on
20 the agenda tomorrow. We want to work up a letter that
21 might take some time. Otherwise, looks like tomorrow we
22 have reports and presentations to look at, so. Okay.
23 Have a good evening, everybody.

24

25 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Harvey. Yes?

28

29 MR. KITKA: I won't be able to attend
30 tomorrow's meeting. I travel tomorrow.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thanks for
33 letting us know, Harvey. Appreciate it.

34

35 (Off record)

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 123 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II recorded on the 19th day of March;

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

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

DATED at Isabela, Puerto Rico this 16st day of May 2025.

Rafael Morel
Chief Project Manager