```
0176
 1
                   SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUBSISTENCE
 2
                    REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
 3
 4
                         PUBLIC MEETING
 5
 6
                           VOLUME II
 7
 8
 9
10
                          TELECONFERENCE
11
                         March 17, 2021
12
                            9:00 a.m.
13
14
15
16
    COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
17
18
   Donald Hernandez, Chair
19 Larry Bemis
20
    Calvin Caspit
    Michael Douville
21
22
    Albert Howard
23
   Ian Johnson
24
   Harvey Kitka
25
    Cathy Needham
26 Harold Robbins
27
    James Slater
28
   Frank Wright
29
30
31
32
    Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
    Recorded and transcribed by:
41
42
    Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
43
    135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
44
    Anchorage, AK 99501
45
    907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net
46
47
48
49
50
```

0177 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 (Teleconference - 3/17/2021) 4 5 (On record) 6 7 MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna, I'm the 8 Council Coordinator for the Southeast Subsistence 9 Regional Advisory Council. Before we get our meeting 10 started this morning I'd like to take a moment to do a 11 few housekeeping items and to also take roll call and 12 make sure that we have a good record of who is on with 13 us today. 14 15 If you're just joining us, again, I 16 would like to remind you that all of our meeting 17 materials can be found.... 18 19 (Teleconference interference -20 participants not muted - echo - screeching) 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: So I know that most people, if you work in the Teams environment you've noticed that there are some issues with Teams lately so it's going to be really important for us to make sure that all of our electronic devices are muted, so that's your computer speakers, if you're listening on the computer, be mindful that your cell phone is muted or your regular phone is muted, that creates a lot of feedback like what we just heard. So just be mindful that you're on mute when you're not speaking. Again, if you don't have the mute button press star six and that'll mute your phone, when you're ready to speak you can star six to unmute your phone. Again, please, also do not place us on hold. If you're on the phone and something comes up, you need to step away, please feel free to disconnect and then dial back in. That's also a big disruption if we're on hold and there's music or something playing over folks that are trying to speak. We will be disabling the audio on Teams here in just a second so I'll remind you again of the phone number to call. Again, we have to use a dedicated phone line for court reporting purposes so the audio can be heard on 1-866-560-5984, they'll ask for a passcode, and that's 12960066, and then you'll hit the pound button. Again, all audio will go through that channel. As soon as I get through these housekeeping items I will be disabling the audio on Teams, that's the part of trying to mitigate any distractions.

```
0178
 1
                     If you would like a link to the
    Microsoft Teams meeting, please call 1-800-478-1456, we
 2
     can send you a link to that Teams meeting.
 4
 5
                     And lastly, I would just ask folks that
 6
     if....
 7
                     (Teleconference interference -
 8
     participants not muted - coughing)
 9
10
                     MS. PERRY: Again, please press star
11
     six, I know it's really easy for us to forget but
     yesterday there was quite a bit of crosstalk and I'm
12
13
     sure that most of those conversations weren't maybe
14
    meant for the general public. So just please be
15
    mindful of star six to mute your phones.
16
17
                     Okay. I'm going to take a quick roll
18
     call with Staff first. And, again, I have a partial
19
     list from folks yesterday and then I'll also ask, who,
20
     from the public is joining us today as well. So when I
21
     call your name if you can let me know that you're on, I
22
     would appreciate it.
23
24
                     Dave Schmid. Were you allowed to join
25
     us again this morning.
26
27
                     (No comments)
28
29
                     MS. PERRY: Wayne Owen.
30
31
                     MR. OWEN: Here. Present.
32
33
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Wayne. I know
34
     you've got to step out here shortly.
35
36
                     Brie Darr, did you join us today?
37
38
                     (No comments)
39
40
                     MS. PERRY: Greg Risdahl.
41
42
                     MR. RISDAHL: Good morning, DeAnna, I'm
43
     here.
44
45
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Greq.
46
47
                     Scott Shuler, not sure if you were back
48
     with us today.
49
50
```

```
0179
 1
                     MR. SHULER: Yes, I am.
 2
 3
                     MS. PERRY: Oh, great, Scott, thank
 4
    you.
 5
 6
                     Delilah Brigham.
 7
8
                     (No comments)
9
10
                     MS. PERRY: Terry Suminski.
11
12
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Yes, I'm here, good
13
     morning.
14
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Terry.
15
16
17
                     Robb Cross.
18
19
                     MR. CROSS: I'm on, good morning,
20
     DeAnna.
21
22
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Rob.
23
                     Jake Musslewhite.
24
25
26
                     MR. MUSSLEWHITE: Yes, I'm here, good
27
     morning.
28
29
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Jake.
30
31
                     Susan Oehler.
32
33
                     MS. OEHLER: Good morning.
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
36
37
                     Justin Koller.
38
39
                     (No comments)
40
41
                     MS. PERRY: Gregory Dunn.
42
43
                     MR. DUNN: I'm here.
44
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Gregory. And,
45
     again, Gregory is doing all of the Teams, behind the
46
47
     curtain stuff for us, so appreciate that.
48
49
                     Melinda Hernandez-Burke
50
```

```
0180
 1
                     MS. HERNANDEZ-BURKE: (In Tlingit) I'm
 2
    here.
 3
 4
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Melinda.
 5
 6
                     Okay, those are, I think, all the folks
 7
     that I had from the Forest Service. Anybody else from
     the Forest Service that I didn't call.
 8
 9
10
                     (No comments)
11
12
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. OSM Staff. Sue
13
     Detwiler, were you able to join us today.
14
15
                     (No comments)
16
17
                     MS. PERRY: Katya Wessels.
18
19
                     (No comments)
20
                     MS. PERRY: Brent Vickers.
21
22
23
                     MR. VICKERS: Yes, good morning
24
     everyone. Good morning, DeAnna.
25
26
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning Brent.
27
28
                     Pippa Kenner.
29
30
                     MS. KENNER: I'm here.
31
32
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Pippa.
33
34
                     George Pappas.
35
36
                     MR. PAPPAS: Good morning, Team
37
     Southeast.
38
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, George.
39
40
     know George is going to be stepping in and out with us
41
     today.
42
43
                     Steve Fadden.
44
45
                     (No comments)
46
47
                     MS. PERRY: Tom Kron.
48
49
                     (No comments)
50
```

```
0181
 1
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. Anybody else from
 2
     the Office of Subsistence Management that I didn't
 3
 4
 5
                     MR. FOLEY: Good morning, DeAnna, this
 6
    is Kevin Foley.
 7
 8
                     MS. PERRY: Sorry, Kevin, I had you on
 9
    my list from yesterday and I just didn't turn the page.
10
     Thank you.
11
                     Okay. So from the National Park
12
13
     Service, Joshua Ream, I see you're on Teams, are you
14
     also on the phone line.
15
                     MR. REAM: Good morning, DeAnna and
16
17
    Council members. I'm here.
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
20
                     Pat Petrivelli.
21
22
23
                     MS. PETRIVELLI: I'm here, good
24
    morning.
25
26
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Pat. Pat's from
27
     Bureau of Indian Affairs.
28
29
                     Okay. Let's see, do I have Valerie
30
    Lenharper back with us today.
31
32
                     (No comments)
33
34
                     MS. PERRY: How about Orville Lind.
35
36
                     (No comments)
37
38
                     MS. PERRY: Barbara Cellarius from the
39
    Park Service.
40
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
                     MS. PERRY: Victoria Florey from the
44
     Park Service.
45
46
                     (No comments)
47
48
                     MS. PERRY: Adam Durmish also from the
49
     Park Service.
```

```
0182
 1
                     MR. DURMISH: Good morning, I'm here.
 2
 3
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
 4
 5
                     All right. And I'm going to see who we
 6
     might have with us on the phone from the State now.
 7
     Ben Mulligan, are you able to join us today.
 8
 9
                     (No comments)
10
11
                     MS. PERRY: Mark Burch, I think I saw
12
     you on Teams, are you also online.
13
14
                     MR. BURCH: Yes, good morning.
15
16
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
17
18
                     Tom Schumacher. I know you were going
19
     to be in and out today, I'm not sure if you're on right
20
     now, Tom, are you there.
21
22
                     (No comments)
23
24
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. Ryan Scott.
25
26
                     (No comments)
27
28
                     MS. PERRY: Troy Thynes.
29
30
                     (No comments)
31
32
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. And then I have
33
     several biologists that I know we had them scheduled
34
     for yesterday and I'm not sure if they're back with us
35
     today. Mark, before I go through this list, do you
36
     know if any of the State biologists that we had
37
     scheduled yesterday are back with us today.
38
39
                     MR. BURCH: You were asking me, DeAnna.
40
     I'm not aware of any.
41
42
                     MS. PERRY: Okay.
43
44
                     MR. BURCH: We'll try to get fisheries
45
     biologists in when you get back to fisheries proposals.
46
     So I'll send an email and see what we can do.
47
48
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. All right, I
49
     appreciate that Mark. Just wanted to doublecheck
50
```

```
0183
 1
    there.
 2
 3
                     MR. CHADWICK: Yeah, excuse me, this is
 4
    Bob Chadwick, Southeast Regional Management Coordinator
 5
     for Sportfish. I'll be in and out today but I'll be
 6
     listening on the phone and try to be available when you
 7
     need me.
 8
 9
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. Appreciate that Bob.
10
11
                     MS. DUBLIN: And this is Robbin Dublin
     with Subsistence Fish and Game and I'll be in and out
12
13
     as well.
14
15
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Robbin,
16
     thanks for joining us.
17
18
                     MS. DUBLIN: Uh-huh.
19
20
                     MS. PERRY: Lauren Sill, are you with
21
    us by chance.
22
23
                     MS. SILL: I'm here DeAnna, good
24
    morning.
25
26
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
27
28
                     Okay. And then I'll doublecheck with
29
     some of the folks from the public that were able to
30
     join us yesterday. Marina Anderson, are you back with
31
    us today.
32
33
                     (No comments)
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: And as I go through this
36
     list if you would like to provide some public
37
     testimony, if you could let me know that would be
38
     great, we can make sure that we put you on the list and
39
     come back to you. Katie Riley, are you with us today.
40
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
                     MS. PERRY: Keenan Sanderson.
44
45
                     (No comments)
46
47
                     MS. PERRY: I know Keenan said he would
48
    be with us sporadically today.
49
```

```
0184
 1
                     Sally Schlichting, are you back with
 2
    us.
 3
 4
                     (No comments)
 5
 6
                     MS. PERRY: Judith Eaton.
 7
 8
                     (No comments)
 9
10
                     MS. PERRY: Heather Bauscher.
11
12
                     (No comments)
13
14
                     MS. PERRY: Jeff Feldpach.
15
16
                     MS. BAUSCHER: Good morning, DeAnna.
17
    Heather's here.
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: Oh, hey, Heather, thank
20
    you.
21
22
                     Larry Edwards.
23
24
                     MR. EDWARDS: Larry is here.
25
26
                    MS. PERRY: Good morning, Larry.
27
28
                     Okay. And Cathy Henson.
29
30
                     MS. HENSON: I'm here.
31
32
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning. And do we
    have anybody else from the public or a tribal member
33
    who would like to make comments today or who is on the
34
35
    phone. Again, we're just making note of that so that
     we have a good administrative record. So if you could
36
37
     identify yourself at this time.
38
39
                     MS. WELLER: Good morning. This is
     Celeste at Pelican and we have a few community members
40
41
    here.
42
43
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you. And were
44
     you wanting to provide some testimony this morning.
45
46
                     MS. WELLER: Yes, please.
47
48
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, great. When we get
49
     to that, if each person would just identify themselves
50
```

```
0185
 1
    before they speak, again, that's so that the court
     reporter can capture that for the transcript.
 2
 3
 4
                     Anyone else on the phone who would
 5
    either like to listen in or speak today.
 6
 7
                     MR. WIRTA: This is Terry Wirta.
 8
 9
                     MS. PERRY: Terry, I'm sorry, I didn't
10
    get your last name.
11
12
                     MR. WIRTA: Wirta, W-I-R-T-A, and also
13
     with me is George Phillips and we're going to talk
14
     about the subsistence hunting here in Lisianski Inlet.
15
16
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you very much.
17
                     MR. SIMMONS: And, good morning. Good
18
19
    morning, this is Avery Simmons and I'm on the phone as
20
     well this morning and I'd like to testify on
21
     subsistence hunting Lisianski Inlet this morning as
22
    well.
23
24
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. Wonderful.
25
26
                     MR. SIMMONS: My wife Edwina is with me
27
     and she'll probably have a few words to say as well.
28
29
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you for that.
30
31
                     MR. SIMMONS: You bet.
32
33
                     MS. PERRY: Anyone else joining us
34
    today.
35
36
                     MR. WALLACE: Hello, can you hear me?
37
38
                     MS. PERRY: Yes.
39
40
                     MR. WALLACE: Yeah, this is President
41
    Lee Wallace from Organized Village of Saxman. I hope
42
     to -- again, I'm late, so I'm not sure where you are in
43
     the agenda but I did want to make some public comment
44
     on nonagenda items when that's time.
45
46
                     Thank you.
47
48
                     MS. PERRY:
                                 Thank you, President
49
     Wallace, good to hear from you. Anyone else on the
50
```

```
0186
    phone with us today.
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, well, thank you all
 6
     for that. Again, it's important for us to capture an
 7
     accurate administrative record and although I know it
     takes time each morning that really helps out a lot.
     So before we hand this over for the official kickoff
 9
    from the Chair, I would just like to check what Council
10
11
    members we have with us today.
12
13
                     Mike Douville, are you with us this
14
    morning.
15
16
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville is here,
17
    good morning.
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Mike.
20
                     Jim Slater.
21
22
23
                     MR. SLATER: I'm here, DeAnna, thank
24
     you.
25
26
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Jim.
27
28
                     Bob Schroeder.
29
30
                     MR. SCHROEDER: Ready and able, DeAnna,
31
     good morning.
32
33
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, good morning, Bob.
34
35
                     Albert Howard.
36
37
                     (No comments)
38
39
                     MS. PERRY: Albert, are you on mute by
     chance I think I saw you on Teams earlier.
40
41
42
                     MR. HOWARD: I'm here, DeAnna, good
43
    morning.
44
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, good morning.
45
46
47
                     Harold Robbins.
48
49
                     MR. ROBBINS: I'm here, good morning.
50
```

```
0187
 1
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Harold.
 2
 3
                     Harvey Kitka.
 4
 5
                     MR. KITKA: Yes, I'm here.
 6
 7
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
 8
 9
                     Larry Bemis, Jr.
10
11
                     MR. BEMIS: Here, good morning.
12
13
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning.
14
15
                     Cathy Needham.
16
17
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Good morning, I'm here.
18
     Thank you.
19
20
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Cathy.
21
22
                     Ian Johnson.
23
24
                     MR. JOHNSON: Hey, good morning. Yep,
25
     I am half here. We're without power in Hoonah right
     now so I have no visuals but I am on the phone.
26
27
28
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thanks, Ian.
29
30
                     Frank Wright, are you with us this
31
     morning.
32
                     MR. WRIGHT: I'm here.
33
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: Good morning, Frank.
36
37
                     Cal Casipit.
38
39
                     MR. CASIPIT: Good morning from snowy
40
     Gustavus.
41
42
                     MS. PERRY: Yeah, I just looked out the
43
     window here and it's snowpocalypse. Okay.
44
45
                     And, Don Hernandez, our Chair.
46
47
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
48
49
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You
50
```

have all 12 seated Council members and obviously you have a quorum.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Thanks, DeAnna. Good morning everybody. Yes, today we will pick up where we left off on old business. My intention is to get through all of the proposals to the Alaska Board of Fish this morning and then we can move on to new business this afternoon and get started on our wildlife proposals, call for proposals.

 $$\operatorname{DeAnna},\ I$$ want to check with you, we have -- we still have an appointment with Earl Stewart at 1:30.

MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair.

 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. That will happen. And also before the end of the day I'd like the Council members to be thinking more about comments on the wolf proposal that we heard about yesterday afternoon at the end of the day, we should get that formulated and written up before the end of the day today.

But we start our meetings every morning with public comment and it sounds like we have a number of people wanting to talk to us this morning so that's where we'll begin.

 I heard a number -- I don't know the best way to go through the order here but I did hear a number of people from Pelican that may all be in the same spot there possibly so I thought that might be a good place to start and I guess I'll just ask you folks to decide who wants to go first and the Council is ready to listen.

MS. WELLER: Good morning, this is Celeste Weller, can you hear me.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, hi.

MS. WELLER: Thank you. My name is Celeste Weller, I'm a City Council member for the City of Pelican. I live in Lisianski Inlet with my family.

0189 1 MS. PERRY: Celeste, did we lose you, 2 you can go right ahead. 4 (No comments) 5 6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Did we lose a 7 connection. 8 9 MS. WELLER: I'm sorry, can you hear 10 me. 11 12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, I can hear 13 you now. 14 15 MS. WELLER: Okay, sorry about that. 16 This little phone device is failing. My name is Celeste Weller. I live in Lisianski Inlet, and a City 17 18 Council member and I work in commercial fishing as 19 well. I do live a subsistence lifestyle focusing on 20 fishing and hunting. The only meat that I eat is what I've caught or shot. I'm calling to testify about the 21 22 increased pressure from outside parties on the 23 resources we depend on for our daily life here, 24 specifically in Lisianski Inlet and Straits. 25 26 There are several groups that live 27 outside the area and state that come seasonally and target some of our key resources here in Lisianski 28 29 Inlet. These include the coho run in Lisianski River 30 and Sitka black-tail deer hunting in the habitat 31 surroundings. In addition, there has been an 32 expediential growth in the last couple years with 33 visitors coming with the charter lodges. We're 34 expecting 500 to 750 visitors this year during the 35 summer. We're really concerned about the expansion of 36 these charter numbers, especially the boat charters 37 that will target our local rockfish and ground fish. 38 One lodge is even working to become a hunting lodge 39 further exploiting the resources here. The outside 40 pressure has affected our ability and especially the 41 ability of our older community members. They depend on 42 easy access to these resources. 43 44 This year several members were not, 45 including myself, were not able to harvest a deer or 46 saw very limited access. This is a low income 47 community, subsistence hunting and fishing is really 48 not optional for many folks here. Recent food scarcity

has been exacerbated by the fact that our ferry service

49

0190 has been intermittent and food supply has been undependable because of that. 2 3 4 I'd like to encourage the Federal 5 Subsistence Board to consider limiting our area to 6 community members, if only part of the season. Pelican 7 and the surrounding homesteads must be ensured access to the resources that they live in. 9 10 Thank you. 11 12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. 13 Would you like to take any questions from the Council 14 if they have any? 15 16 MS. WELLER: Yeah, that's fine. 17 18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, okay, 19 Council members any questions. 20 21 MR. WRIGHT: Hello, this is Frank. 22 23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Frank. 24 25 MR. WRIGHT: The hunting lodge, is it a 26 pretty -- this will be during the deer season, and 27 another question is limiting your hunting season for 28 outsiders, is that what you're talking about and what 29 are you proposing? 30 31 MS. WELLER: Thank you. The lodge that 32 I spoke of is currently a summer fishing lodge and to 33 be honest we've only just heard the idea that this is 34 going to become a hunting lodge so this is just 35 something that we're looking into the future to limit, 36 if possible, if that were to become an option for a 37 hunting lodge. As far as the dates that we're -- I

38

39

40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Inlet/Straits and Stag Bay.

MR. SLATER: And, Celeste, hi, this is
Jim. I think we were -- just kind of information -- we
don't have a definite proposal at this point, we're
looking at coming up with one, that would start this
afternoon. I think the main thing is expressing your
concern over the problems we've been having with the

think we're asking -- and Jim Slater -- I'm sorry, I

don't have these dates right in front of me but we are

asking that our subsistence time be closed, I believe

starting October 15th to locals only for Lisianski

```
0191
    resource availability.
 2
 3
                     MS. WELLER: Okay.
 4
 5
                     MR. SLATER: Thank you.
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Anybody
 8
     else with questions.
 9
10
                     MR. SLATER: Celeste, you have a couple
11
     other people there, right, is that two or one other
12
    person with you?
13
14
                     MS. WELLER: Yes, I also have Mike
15
    Allard and Mayor Walt Weller.
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead and
18
    get the next person online and there may be other
19
    questions come up so we'll go ahead with the next
20
    person.
21
22
                     MR. ALLARD: Hi. My name is Mike
23
    Allard. I'm a local resident of Pelican and commercial
24
    fisherman and on the Pelican City Council. And I've
25
    lived here for about 30 years or so. And it used to be
26
    back when I first came here that a lot of the hunters
27
    or family and friends that come out because as we all
28
    know, we all hunt the same area we grew up in. But
29
    over the few years we've seen a lot of big parties
30
    coming out and doing hunting, which, you know,
31
     everybody's entitled to but you got to look forward to
32
    the future and a lot of the game, you know, is -- you
33
    got to let it mature and grow up and a lot of the game
34
    that I pass by most people shoot so it doesn't seem
35
    like a lot of the game is going to be maturing at a
36
    rate to reproduce and look for the future generations.
37
38
                     So that's one of my concerns. And just
39
     that, you know, we have no grocery store, along the
     same lines as Celeste. So that's pretty much what I
40
41
     got to say.
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thanks,
44
    Mike. Any questions for Mr. Allard.
45
46
                     (No comments)
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think
49
    we're getting a good picture here, but if you've got
50
```

```
0192
     other people that want to add, put the next person on.
 2
 3
                     MAYOR WELLER: Okay. Yeah, this is
 4
    Mayor Weller over here in Pelican, can you hear me?
 5
 6
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 7
 8
                     MAYOR WELLER: Okay. Yeah, so I'm
 9
    monitoring the situation, is what I'm concerned about
10
     and the concern I share with the community is the
11
     obvious growth in the sportfishing and now people are
12
     talking about obvious growth in the deer harvesting.
13
    And there's been a -- not to keep reusing the same word
14
    but a clear and obvious increase in the last 10 years,
15
     and we'd like to see exactly what routes we could take,
16
    if there are any, to limit these sport activities where
17
    people who live here are used to being able to
18
    subsistence hunt and fish. And like I said my main
19
    interest is seeing whether people are able to put any
20
    limitations on this and if any other localities are
21
    moving forward with that.
22
23
                     And that's all I had for right now.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right, thank you.
26
    Any questions for Mr. Weller from the Council.
27
28
                     MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, this is Ian.
29
30
                     MS. NEEDHAM:
                                  Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.
31
32
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I hear two people,
33
    Cathy and somebody else.
34
35
                     MR. JOHNSON: Ian.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Ian. Go ahead,
38
     Ian.
39
40
                     MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I just want to
41
     clarify, so like we talked about both affect to coho,
42
     deer, and ground fish, in regards to establishing a
43
     subsistence only kind of area, are folks in Pelican
44
     thinking about addressing all those resources or are
45
     they focusing primarily on deer?
46
47
                     MR. ALLARD: All the resources.
48
49
                     MR. WELLER: I -- the people that live
50
```

here are focused on addressing some kind of control or the options of control over all of those resources, once, again, because of the -- of the large amount of growth we've seen in people coming in from the outside utilizing those resources.

MR. SLATER: This is Jim Slater. I'm helping to organize this, specifically though we know that this is a wildlife year so I think the focus for right now is the deer hunting issue that we've seen.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you. I was also curious if -- it's certainly troubling to hear Celeste talk about not being able to get any deer this year and honestly I was kind of in the same boat here in Hoonah, I didn't shoot my deer until January 23rd. I just -- yeah, has that been a -- is that this year only or has it been -- can you talk just a little bit more -- give a little more historical context on the deer hunting situation.

MR. ALLARD: This is Mike Allard. And, you know, every year varies. So, you know, you got good years, you've got open winters, the deer feed, the survival of the beaches need kelp, and some years, you know, you get lots of snow and it just takes a toll on all the animals and sometimes if you don't have snow you need snow to drive them out of the big valleys. So they're pretty easy pickins on the lower countries, you know, the flats and heavy timber. Yeah, every year varies. And, you know, I'm also a local trapper so I trap all of Lisianski Inlet and Straits and when I'm trapping there's years I see winter kill every 50 yards, you know, and what martin's going to want to go to some scent box and not get caught when he's got a fresh dead deer there to eat so, you know, there's variables. But when we got years like that it's hard to harvest animals, you know, and as we see there's lots of big numbers of people coming out and last year we seen, for the commercial king salmon -- or not commercial king salmon, but the sport king salmon an influx of people from Juneau coming out, which is kind of unrealistic for me, it's surprising that they'd want to come out for the weekend to catch king salmon and halibut, you know, so obviously resources are hard over there, too, you know, they're limited so I don't know what else you want to know from me, but, yeah, it could be hard. I shot one deer last year and that was it.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Cathy, did} % \end{substitute} %$

MS. NEEDHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Cathy. I am curious if there is -- if you guys know whether or not there is a local group that intends to put forward a proposal or a few proposals during this wildlife cycle or if you are thinking that you'd like to ask the Council to put together and forward a proposal on this specific issue. Like many times if there's an organization, a local organization that puts in a proposal then we would, you know, to support that effort but if you don't know that anybody's going to be putting in a proposal then we could potentially put one in on this issue if the Council worked towards that.

Thank you.

MR. SLATER: Cathy, I can address that. This is Jim Slater. I'm a new Council appointee. I, working together with the individuals testifying I was planning to discuss submitting a proposal this afternoon and get feedback from the Council on that.

MS. NEEDHAM: Great, thank you, Mr. Slater. And, Mr. Chair, I appreciate that, and I'm really glad that the folks that called in today to testify were able to help provide background and understanding for the Council to know that this local issue is, you know, coming from a variety of different folks. So I appreciate that and all of your time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, it's really important that we hear from folks when we have a situation like this. Is there anybody else there that wants to testify this morning.

MR. WIRTA: Yeah, I'm Terry Wirta, Pelican.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. WIRTA: Yeah, I've lived here all my life, I'm 65 years old but I've been hunting for 50 years and this is a -- this past year has been the first year that I haven't even gotten a deer. I am

getting old enough where I don't climb up to the tops of mountains like I used to all the time but I have subsistence fished off the lower part of the hills there -- I mean hunted, and I haven't had any luck this year. So I'm not sure if it was because of the lack of 5 snow this year or what but I sure did not see any deer 6 7 around, and I do see that there's a lot of extra hunters coming in nowadays. And, yeah, I'm for 9 subsistence. I would like to see things change there 10 to help the residences of Pelican out a little more 11 from the 15th of October to the end of January, is that 12 was subsistence that would be a real benefit for us, I 13 believe.

14 15

So, anyway, that's what I've got to

16 17 18

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Any other questions come to mind from Council members.

19 20 21

 $\operatorname{MR.\ HOWARD:\ Mr.\ Chairman,\ this\ is\ }$ Albert.

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,

Albert.

say.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We deal with the same situation in Angoon and I've talked about it several different meetings but I've often thought that maybe if the State decided to divvy up -- say they give me six tags every year but I'm only allowed to use them in the Chatham Strait area, that makes sense to me. You know, the same thing if you live -- as an example, in Juneau, that they give you tags and you're only allowed to use them in the Juneau area, that would prevent, and I totally get it because it happens here in Angoon as well, you see a big boat towing several other boats and they're just out having a good time after they load it up on groceries from Costco to go hunting on Admiralty Island, and that -that's one of the unintended consequences on a lot of things that happens in Chatham with bear hunting and everything else that goes on in Chatham, we seem to see more and more pressure on the resource that has taken care of us for generations.

45 46 47

48

It isn't we don't do it for fun, like the person said, we -- everything goes in our freezer so -- and the weather in Chatham has been less than

reasonable for the guys running around in their Lunds. So it's a thought. Maybe try to ask them to start -- when they hand out hunting tags make it specific to the area they live in.

I thought about that for the same thing with sockeye. We get pressure on -- well, last year, I saw a big fancy yacht, probably 100 foot yacht coming out of Sitka and they were in Hanus Bay with their nets out, it must be nice, but you can't fault them for that but they probably worked for all they have, but that's kind of what we're dealing with. There's a lot of pressure on resources. I know there's -- I've heard about a lot of streams out on the outside that they could go to but maybe that's not comfortable for them. Just like it's not comfortable for me to have to run across in an 18 foot boat in sometimes six foot seas, but we've got to eat here and that's what we do.

So it's something to think about. Maybe ask the State if they can start doing permits and hunting tags specific to certain areas.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, thank you, Albert. Any other questions from the Council, and is there anybody else.....

MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair, Mike

31 Douville.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead Mike.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, I'm kind of getting a picture of what the issue is and I guess my question would be -- I missed a little bit of the conversation, my question would be do those in Pelican that are affected, did they offer a solution or are they going to offer a solution that they have thought of.

MR. SLATER: Yeah, this is Jim Slater. I'm a new Council member. I think we have a proposal, or at least a draft of a proposal that I would like to discuss later today when we have the call for proposals in the afternoon.

MR. DOUVILLE: Okay, Mike Douville

```
0197
 1
    here. Okay, thank you, that would be great if you'd
 2
     come up with a proposal that you think might help the
     situation, would be great, okay.
 4
 5
                     MR. SLATER: Okay.
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, oh,
 8
     sorry, Mike. I was just going to say, you know, to the
 9
     folks that are there, you know, we can devote Staff
10
     time at some point, these proposals don't have to be
11
     finished until sometime later this spring and so the
12
     Council can devote Staff time to doing some research
13
     and stuff, you know, on what options are available. So
14
     come up with a concept of where you want to go and we
15
     can help fill in some specifics later. It doesn't
     necessarily have to be decided right now, so they'll
16
17
    work with you outside, you know, after the meeting to
18
     flesh out, you know, details and stuff so that's
19
    helpful.
20
21
                     Is there anybody else there that wanted
     to testify this morning.
22
23
24
                     MR. SIMMONS: Yes, this is Avery, can
25
     you hear me?
26
27
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep. Go ahead,
28
     Dave [sic].
29
30
                     MR. SIMMONS: Good morning. Good
31
    morning. My wife Edwina is here as well and we're both
32
     residents of the Pelican area for the past 40 years.
33
    And our lifestyle is such that we're very much
34
    dependent upon hunting and our gardening and fishing
35
     and we live a very subsistence lifestyle here in the
36
     Inlet and what we have noticed in the last couple of
37
     years is increased pressure from people that don't live
38
    here. They show up and they compete with us directly
39
     for the resources that we're after and that's one of
40
     our big reasons for living here in Pelican, is that we
41
     can live the subsistence lifestyle and we would like to
42
     continue to make sure that we can continue to do that.
43
    And if it means that we need to go to a subsistence
44
     area then we're totally in favor of that.
45
46
                     MS. SIMMONS: And not open to non-
47
     residents.
48
49
                     MR. SIMMONS: And, yeah, and not open
```

to non-residents that come in here and compete with us for these resources. So that's pretty much it.

We're in favor of subsistence only and whatever form that that final, you know, that it comes to is we're going to be supportive of that.

So that's about all that we have to say at this time, I believe, unless Edwina wants to say something further here.

MS. SIMMONS: Well, I'd just like to say that, you know, we're talking about a fairly -what appears to be a fairly large area of Lisianski Inlet and the Straits and Stag Bay and et cetera. And in reality there's only so many places that you can actually hunt because of the terrain so that limits the places for us locals to hunt. We know where they are, we know where it's safe to hunt, but when you bring people from out of state that have no idea, then you bring in the possibility of them having problems, they're not understanding hunting and killing young ones that should not be killed and et cetera, so we're just asking for some help here in regards to making this a little bit more safer and for your understanding that it's not just walk out in the woods and kill something.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

30 Any other....

MR. SIMMONS: Yeah, this is -- yeah, I do have another thought there, this is Avery again. We're seeing more fishing lodges being created here in the Inlet and we're very concerned that those lodges, as time goes on, that they're going to also revert to hunting lodges as well as fishing lodges and I wanted to make the point that I see this coming down the road and I'm totally against that as well. So anything we can do to keep this more of a subsistence use area, we're totally in favor of, and whatever form that takes we'll probably be supportive of it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Right. And I'd also like to point out that there are proposals before the Board of Fish coming up next year that kind of deal with the increase in non-resident sportfishing

happening throughout the region. So I'm sure Jim will be working with us on those and how they might affect Pelican. Yeah, we've already identified that as a problem and we have proposals in to deal with some of the fishing issues as well. So you want to keep track of that.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you. This is Avery again. I'm signing off, I don't think I have anything else to say if somebody else wants to talk.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thanks for talking to us this morning. Is there anybody else there that wanted to say something.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm George Phillips, resident of Pelican. I was born in Sitka, I'm 74. I've lived up here all my life. Been a hunter all my life, subsistence living most of my life, and I am not going to go into great detail because I think it's been pretty well said. I just want to voice that I am behind the subsistence thoughts and I really can see the impact here throughout the years and definitely it is a problem and it needs to be figured out, some solution has to come up with.

So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yep, thank you, George. Of course I should point out to you folks there, you also have a great resource in your community there in Patty Phillips, she knows the system and the issues better than anybody so I'm sure she hopefully will be helping you out as well. I know she testified yesterday to some of the same situations.

MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Hernandez, this is Patty Phillips.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: There's Patty.} Good morning, Patty.$

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So as a followup, I did help Mr. Slater, I advised him to contact the biologist and to get a proposal form and to put it into a format so I could see what he's asking for. And I did -- you know, he did want the RAC to pass -- to endorse it because it would have greater influence at the Federal Subsistence Board level, but I

did advise him that, you know, we looked it up while we were on the phone and the proposal period closes in May and that at any point in time anyone can submit a proposal, and the RAC will look it over -- the Staff will do an analysis the RAC will look it over at the next meeting, and can endorse it then and give it just as much influence with the Federal Subsistence Board.

So yesterday I asked if we could reduce the harvest of the non-Federally-qualified and, yes, and the RAC, in the past, submitted a proposal and got Unit 2, non-Federally-qualified hunters reduced, you know, down to two deer, I guess. But my question today is can we submit a proposal that eliminates the harvest of non-residents of Alaska. So I'm not willing to completely -- this is my opinion now. I'm not willing to completely shut down those people from Juneau. And the reason I say that is we went from a population of, you know, 400 and we're down to less than 100 in the winter. A lot of those people have moved to Juneau, they have long ties to our community. You know multigenerational families have had to move to Juneau in order to support themselves and their families and they like coming here to deer hunt, and besides that there are people who own property out here who have jobs in Juneau and come out and get a deer for their own, you know, traditional use. So, yes, we should have the priority, we are Federally-qualified, the law gives us that right, but my main question is, can we shut those non-residents out. So that's a question that I would like answered, you know, before May 24th or whenever it is.

So thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Patty. Yeah, that is an important question. I don't think that's something we've dealt with specifically, are we constrained in just, you know, closures to all non-Federally-qualified, or can we be more specific than that. I don't know the answer to that. That would take some research but it's a good point though. And I know the situation -- we have the same situation, you know, a lot of inter-connections between like Ketchikan families and families on Prince of Wales, yeah, same situation that we looked at here.

So, yeah, thanks for that Patty.

```
0201
 1
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair.
 2
 3
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Other Council
 4
    members want to weigh in on that.
 5
 6
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy.
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cathy.
 9
                     MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
10
11
     think it's a really good point what Ms. Phillips has
    brought forward, and I guess my question kind of in
12
13
     followup to that, that would be great to have, if we
14
     could have an answer during this meeting at some point
15
     in time from our biologist or the State biologist, is
16
     whether or not that specific aspect that she's talking
17
     about, if that's a Board of Game action, or if it could
18
    be handled through the Board of Game process for not
19
    having out of state sporthunting. Because anybody
20
     coming from out of Alaska would be under a sporthunting
21
     license.
22
23
                     So, yeah, some clarification on that
24
     sometime during the meeting would be great, thank you.
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Maybe we
27
     can get that answer before we get to the issue this
28
     afternoon. Anybody else on the Council.
29
30
                     MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.
31
32
                     MR. SLATER: Yeah, hi.
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think I hear
35
     Frank.
36
37
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Mr. Chair, thank
38
     you. You know people that come in from -- that don't
39
     reside in the area, are just doing it for fun, don't
40
    have no idea what subsistence is about, you know.
41
    Hoonah, we run into a problem where people from Juneau
42
     come out and then they just take part of the deer and
    not the whole deer, you know, and I always say, well,
43
44
    whenever we strip a deer, we always boil -- even boil
45
    the bones just to -- just for something to eat, gnaw
46
     off the bone, you know, even -- they take the
47
    backstrap, but what we do is we cut into the -- make
48
     deer chops, you know, and then eat the whole thing. So
49
     the subsistence way of life is that's they way it is,
```

you know, use as much as possible.

The issue that Patty brought up about relatives of people that lived in areas, you know, we have the same problem too here in Hoonah, where we have tribal members who got moved to Juneau, all of a sudden they're urban Indians so, you know, we have, you know, we always accept them, you know, Chookaneidi, Kaagwaantaan, Wooshkeetaan, that live in Juneau and so, you know, that issue of generational people that come -- that move because of no jobs, you know, so -- and, you know, how do we keep a culture alive when we deny people that lived in areas for so many years and then had to move because of the jobs and, you know, but their blood is still the subsistence way, that's the reason why they go out and do -- they'll get the foods that they were -- they grew up on. You know, so that's an issue that, you know, the Federal government and the State and all those other people don't understand.

So when you have a cultural way, you know, I always say you diminish the identity of a people.

But, anyways, you know, subsistence is a way of life in the small communities and like I said, you know, I even boil -- I'll tell the guys that when they're stripping the meat off the bone I always tell them, well, give me the bones, I'll boil it and I'll put some potatoes in there and onions in there and gnaw off the bone, it's delicious, you got to try it.

Anyway, these are just, you know, Pelican's got a family there that -- you know, they got family members that are not living there anymore and they got people that are residents that live there and -- used to live there but don't live there anymore but their heart is in a subsistence way of life.

That's just a statement, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Frank. That's a really important issue to consider. And, yeah, whatever proposals come out, kind of tricky to try and come up with but it's a big factor, you're right.

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

0203 1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Somebody else. 2 3 MR. HOWARD: It's Albert. 4 5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Albert. 6 7 MR. HOWARD: I, too, have family that 8 moved from Angoon to Juneau for work and I totally 9 understand that, so maybe there could be a mechanism 10 that shows the history and ties to the land that 11

they've actually lived in Angoon before you issue them tags to hunt here. There's got to be a solution to an

existing problem.

14 15 Angoon has unemployment of 80 percent. 16 I am fortunate to be one of the 20 percent and I'm 17 grateful for that so that allows me to buy gas and go

further than most people. And most people are competing with a vessel that comes in about 58 feet long towing four or five boats up Chatham and just having a good old time. You know try to imagine going to Costco and somebody buying everything there and

leaving and we get nothing. That's kind of how it feels here.

24

25 26

27

28

29

30

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

I remember attending a T&H meeting and some guy was talking about the feeling he gets when he comes home with a bunch of deer or a bunch of fish, you can compare that to going to the store on payday and going home with a bunch of food. That's the same feeling that that person had.

31 32 33

34

35

36 37

38 39

40

41

42

43

So there's got to be a solution to the situation. I totally understand people moving to Juneau, my brother's -- we have conversation and, you know, I didn't tell you to move to Juneau, you know, jokingly we have those conversations, I send him deer, he sends me bullets, I don't send him a lot of deer because he prefers steaks, I guess and he definitely works for it. So I think working together there must be a way we can find -- because we are a subsistence Council, so we're not here to represent people that move to Juneau, we're here to represent the people that live in this situation, and that's kind of my thoughts.

44 45 46

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

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

49 Slater.

1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead,

Jim.

MR. SLATER: I'd like to make a point that pretty much echoed what Albert said. Who do we advocate for, and that's for the subsistence users, not for people who have moved away. We all would love to have enough resources for everyone and there wouldn't be an issue. Unfortunately there's sometimes competition for the resources. And I think our job, as I understand it, is to advocate for the people who are trying to live a subsistence lifestyle and have the constraints and the hardships that come with that.

So as we evaluate this, I think it's unfortunate that we have to advocate for someone and not for someone else but I think in our role we advocate for the subsistence side of things. That's my main comment there.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. I'm going to jump in here because we're kind of getting a little bit away from what we're supposed to be doing here. We're going to have this discussion when a proposal comes forward and there'll be a back and forth and, you know, more of a discussion about the merits of where we want to go. But right now we're, you know, we're supposed to be hearing from the public so I don't want to dominate the conversation here.

I want to ask if there was anybody else in Pelican that had anything to add to this topic.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: It sounds like we got everybody in Pelican so I'm going to wrap this up and say, you know, the situation in Pelican is not unique to Pelican. There's some precedence available to us, it took us a number of different tries and several years to get a proposal through to deal with the situation on Prince of Wales Island, it may take some time and effort to come up with a proposal for Pelican that may actually work for other communities as well. We kind of build on what's been done in the past and try and push it forward. So we will be having that discussion in our call for proposals topic.

So I want to thank all you folks from Pelican for bringing the issue to our attention. I think we got a good understanding of the situation there and as I say it's relevant to a lot of communities. So thank you for your comments this morning.

MS. WELLER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I believe we had some other folks that wanted to comment to the Council this morning from the public.

MS. PERRY: Yes, Mr. Chair. President Lee Wallace from the Organized Village of Saxman I believe is with us to provide some public comment.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Mr. Wallace, if you're still there, you've got the floor.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Chairman Hernandez. Thank you for this time. I just wanted to make a tribal comment on managing the items, and that's the eulachon fishery. U.S. Forest District Ranger Shane Walker issued a limited opening period for Unuk River limited only to Saxman, Metlakatla and that was for Federally-qualified harvesters to participate in in the eulachon fishery.

The District Ranger decided to do something different than what's been done in the past 15 years. In the past 15 years the District Ranger's just put a closure on the fishery, for 15 years. And so I do thank Mr. Walker for at least having a limited opening for Federally-qualified harvesters.

And so both Metlakatla and both Saxman, we both submitted to Mr. Walker that we would like to have a community fishery versus kind of an open fishery. The reason behind that would be less invasive area for the schools of eulachon going up the Unuk River. And for the past years and generations, Metlakatla harvesters have been the prime harvesters of the Unuk River, there traditional and customary gear has been the use of a beach seine. But this particular limited opening was restricted to two types of gear, that was a dipnet and a cast net. Both kind of really untraditional uses of a way of fishing of both users of Saxman and Metlakatla. So we did both, unilaterally,

0206
1 applied and we suggested a community fishery.

After a long 90 minute teleconference with the District Ranger Walker and Terry Suminski, I suggested that MIC submit a special action request for that specific community fishery and the use of a beach seine and I believe they submitted that SAR. And I'm just saying this because I'm suggesting that for the next fishery proposals that you'll probably be seeing something like that from both Saxman and Metlakatla for that type of a fishery.

 $\label{thm:comments} \mbox{ That's all my comments on the eulachon } \mbox{fishery.}$

And then I'll bring up one more item, which is subsistence related. I know probably many of you Council members were tracking NOAA, they had come up with an economic assistance for subsistence fishing, they had went to the Pacific states Marine Fisheries Commission, and most recently in checking the latest from the websites, so the State of Alaska had applications for the commercial fisheries, the sportsfish and charter sector, seafood processors and Alaska Aquaculture. Last on the list, subsistence harvesters. And the word there was no application was available at this time. So out of all those harvester groups, the one group that needs it the most is the subsistence harvesters. We all know from 2020 the salmon sockeye season was 'nil throughout the whole region and there's a lot of empty jars, empty freezers without our sockeye this year in 2020. And here we are into the next year with Covid and looking at the spreadsheet, Alaska was slated for \$50 million and also Federally-recognized tribes in Alaska were slated for \$1 million and I would say that those funds probably would have went to the Federally-recognized tribes and we probably would have assisted our harvesters and all that they provide for and here it is unspent because there is no application available for subsistence harvesters with the State of Alaska.

So being an elected leader, we're dealing with many different things and so this one is just now coming to my forefront to start making those phone calls and contacting Terry Winkle, Office of the Manager Office, with the State of Alaska, Fish and Game, and to start asking questions, why aren't we working on a formula to get these funds out for people

0207 1 that need it. 2 3 That's my comments, thank you for your 4 time. 5 6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, 7 Other questions for Mr. Wallace. 8 9 MR. CASIPIT: Mr. Chair, this is Calvin 10 Casipit. I just had a quick question for Mr. Wallace. 11 12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Cal. 13 14 MR. CASIPIT: Good to hear you, Lee. 15 Good to hear you on the phone. I just had a quick question for you. When I got appointed I started 16 17 getting some emails and stuff and saw some copies of 18 things that I thought I saw a letter from you to the 19 local manager asking for the ability to basically, 20 under the existing regulatory structure now, to 21 basically pool -- you know, be able to send more than a 22 few people together in one boat and be able to harvest 23 more than just the one bucket between all those people. 24 What was the -- what happened with the result of that 25 letter -- that request, did you -- were you -- did you 26 get a satisfactory response or is there anything that 27 the Council can do to help with that. Because I'm 28 really -- I am, personally, really concerned about the 29 Unuk. You know, I was concerned way back when about 30 the conservation issues, they seem to be coming back 31 and it's great that we can provide a little bit of 32 harvest to the customary and traditional users, but if 33 there's a way we could improve that and help, sure 34 would like to help and I know the rest of the Council 35 would like to help provide for that opportunity. 36 37 So anything on that? 38 39 MR. WALLACE: Yeah, thank you for the 40 question. Yeah, again, I was most pleased with Mr. 41 Walker and his approach. We definitely wanted to have 42 that limited opening and so both conversations with MIC 43 and OVS, we were really looking at working together in 44 management and observation of, you know, the biomass. 45 When we were up there fishing, you know, both the U.S. Forest Service and MIC and Saxman harvesters could 46 47 really kind of look at what kind of biomass we're 48 looking for and definitely we don't want to

overharvest. That was my initial response when I

49

received a phone call from the District Ranger, I said, you know, it's been closed and I said here we are with an opening, what we really want to do is not to overfish it and so we're looking at working together as far as seeing what kind of fishery is available up there and, you know, right now looking at keeping it to Federally-qualified harvesters, and that's the key word there. You know, I hear Pelican with their concerns and, again, the key word there is giving an advantage to those Federally-qualified harvesters in any fishery, and if there's a -- there's, you know, stats that say there's a limit on the game or fish, that should definitely keep into account, you know, and giving the nod to Federally-qualified users.

Thank you. I think we're going to be working together on this, so thank you.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Lee. I really appreciate everything you do. I know how hard you've been working, really appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Any other questions from the Council for Mr. Wallace.

MR. KITKA: Don, this is Harvey Kitka.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Harvey.

MR. KITKA: I just had maybe a comment and maybe kind of a question. I don't know what Lee Wallace and his -- I kind of know what he's proposing and I like it, I like the idea, but I was wondering -- really the question for Lee Wallace but also for our Council, is to what we can do about maybe having community permits be handled by the tribal entities in their communities. I really think that we shouldn't have to go through a whole bunch of steps to have our tribal councils handle this part to -- I know we need to work on it, but I was wondering what Lee Wallace would think of that.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:} \mbox{ If you want to respond, Lee.}$

MR. WALLACE: Yeah, thank you, Harvey. Yeah, you know when I initially talked to District Ranger, I said when a harvester goes out whether you're going after game or fish or any other resource, a lot

of times you're actually harvesting for two, up to five different households and so when we talked about the harvest, you know, Shane actually worked with me and he really kind of increased that amount because I told him if anybody was to go out to harvest -- again, we're harvesting for two or up to five households, so we went 6 7 from a five gallon bucket per household to 10 gallons per bucket per household. And, again, I think we're 9 looking at trying to keep a whole bunch of people from 10 going up there and, you know, disturbing the run of the 11 eulachon in the river and people who were quite 12 knowledgeable, that were the main harvesters for years 13 have been the Metlakatla harvesters, they really know 14 that area quite well and so, yeah, thank you for the 15 comment and question, Harvey.

16 17

18

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, is there anybody else on the Council with questions for Mr. \\ \text{Wallace.}$

19 20 21

(No comments)

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, I don't think I'm hearing any. Lee, I just wanted to say that I read those letters that were exchanged between you and Mr. Walker there and I was actually pretty pleased as well to hear his response. It sounded like he was very receptive to what you wanted to do and it also seemed that he couldn't do everything that you requested, he felt he was constrained by what his delegated authority allowed him to do which is something that maybe can be addressed but, no, I was glad to see his willingness to work with you. And also wanted to point out that we've had a good cooperative agreement with the Ketchikan Indian Community on monitoring the Unuk. I can see moving forward, you know, getting more tribal involvement in, you know, if we are going to be able to have some fishing activity up there on the eulachon that, you know, the tribes could certainly aid in the management of that as well so that's something we definitely need to look at.

41 42 43

44

45

So it'll probably fit right in with discussions we're going to have, you know, later on this meeting. So, I don't know, do you have anything else to add.

46 47 48

MR. WALLACE: No, I don't, Don. Thank you for your time.

```
0210
 1
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
 2
    Lee.
 3
 4
                     MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Council.
 5
 6
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: DeAnna, do we have
 7
     somebody else on the line that we know wants to testify
 8
     this morning.
 9
10
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, those were those
11
     folks who identified themselves earlier this morning.
     I don't know if anyone else has joined us since then
12
13
    but those are the folks that I had on an earlier list.
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Is there
16
     anybody else that's come on the phone line that would
17
     like to comment to the Council this morning.
18
19
                     MS. WAGNER: Hi, this is Tezia Wagner.
20
21
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
22
23
                     MS. WAGNER: Metlakatla Indian
24
     Community.
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead,
27
     what was your name again?
28
29
                     MS. WAGNER: Tezia Wagner.
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Tezia, okay,
32
    Wagner, go ahead.
33
34
                     MS. WAGNER: Hi. I was in that meeting
35
    with President Wallace and our MIC members as well as
    Terry and Shane Walker and I've been able to speak with
36
37
     Shane Walker a little bit afterwards when he traveled
38
     last week to our community to issue out the permits for
39
     the eulachon harvest on the Unuk River. My grandfather
40
     is Louie Wagner, Jr., and he has been harvesting
41
    eulachon for communities in Southeast since the '60s
42
    and he was taught by his older brother, Bert May, who
43
    has been harvesting probably before the '60s. So him,
44
    my -- his brother, Bo Wagner, or Walter Wagner, maybe
45
    you know of him as, and my uncle Louie Wagner, III.,
46
    and as many of you know Louie Wagner is the grandson of
47
    the (In Native). His family has been harvesting on
48
     that river since time and immemorial and usually we are
49
     -- our family are the ones that would harvest eulachon
50
```

and bring it back for everyone and we only took as much as we needed and as much as our communities needed. We never overharvested or anything. And I thought it was —— like President Wallace said, it was a great meeting and Shane Walker is wanting to work closely with Metlakatla Indian Community as well as Saxman and it's made us all hopeful here in Metlakatla because we have so many elders that have gone without eating their last meal of eulachon from the Unuk River and we would like to bring that back to our people again, and this is a great first step on opening it back up the first time in 15 years and seeing the hopeful faces when they signed up for their permits.

And I just wanted to make a suggestion that I completely agree with President Wallace to do a community harvest and have only a few boats up there to not disturb the ecosystem or the run. They're crafty fish. Like he said dipnet and cast net, it's very difficult, they're quick, the water's clear up there and so beach seine is the easiest way and most effective way to do it and you won't disturb them. Because you have to run after them with the dipnet in order to get what you need so community harvest would be the best way. And my suggestion is to do what Shane Walker did last week and have our community members sign up for these permits and have a boat or a fisher or a few fishers be able to proxy for more than just one household, to do it for a whole community or two, that way it's all done in one trip, there's less money spent, there's less safety hazards, that is a very dangerous river and we now it very well.

That's all I have to say, thank you.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Wagner.$

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, not hearing any questions. But I just want to say, you know, for the Council, I know I came on the Council right about the time that the Unuk River stocks collapsed and like you say that was some time ago now. Your grandfather, Mr. Louie Wagner, Sr., has come before the Council many times, you know, informing us about the history of the Unuk and the fishery and he's always been extremely helpful and I think for those of us who have been on

```
0212
     the Council for awhile, you know, we're pretty well
     aware of the situation there although nobody's every
    figured out why those stocks collapsed which is kind of
    unfortunate. I don't think it had anything to do with
    the fishing effort up there, it's factors probably
 5
 6
    beyond our control but fortunately they do seem to be
 7
    building back slowly.
 8
 9
                     So I think we need to be able to move
10
     forward after this 15 year closure and if there's some
11
     opportunity for harvest I'm sure the Council would
12
     support that.
13
14
                     So good hearing from you on this issue.
15
    Like I say we know there's the vast amount of knowledge
16
     and experience coming from Metlakatla on this. So we
17
     probably will be working with you in the future, so
18
     thank you Tezia for testifying this morning.
19
20
                     MS. HERNANDEZ BURKE: Mr. Chair, this
21
     is Melinda Hernandez Burke from the Forest Service.
22
23
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Melinda.
24
25
                     MS. HERNANDEZ BURKE: Hi. Good
26
              (In Tlingit) everybody. I just want to share
    morning.
27
    how happy my heart is to hear the story of
28
     collaboration and communication between the tribes and
29
     new Ranger Walker in the Ketchikan area. I am just so
30
    pleased to see somebody new come in and immediately
31
    build relationships, think outside the box and I'm just
32
     want to give kudos, gunalcheesh, haw'aa, thank you to
33
     everybody. This is just a great story and I think one
34
     that we can continue to build on and is a great model.
35
36
                     I just want to express my appreciation
37
     for the tribes and for Ranger Walker and everybody
38
     involved.
39
40
                     Gunalcheesh.
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you,
43
    Melinda.
44
45
                     MR. WALLACE: Chairman Hernandez.
```

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Excuse me.

MR. WALLACE: Chairman, this is

46 47

48 49

```
0213
    President Wallace, if I could make one more comment
 2
     after hearing from....
 3
 4
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Sure, go ahead,
 5
    Lee.
 6
 7
                     MR. WALLACE: Yeah, just last night MIC
 8
    sent me an addendum to their special action request for
 9
    me to review it and I'm sure they probably need to edit
10
    and they probably sent it in to Chairman Tony
11
    Christianson and maybe I could request Southeast RAC to
12
    touch in -- touch base with Tony on this and possibly
13
    give the Southeast RAC's viewpoint on what has been
14
    submitted by Metlakatla Indian Community.
15
16
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, yeah,
17
     thanks, Lee. If there's anything new that's happening,
18
    yeah, we should be informed of that and we may be able
19
     to have some input into it. So, yeah, we'll check into
20
    that.
21
22
                     MR. WALLACE: Thank you.
23
24
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Anybody else on
25
     the Council....
26
27
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair.
28
29
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead.
30
31
                     MS. PERRY: Pardon me. This is DeAnna.
32
     I just wanted to give folks a head's up, it looks like
33
     our Teams meeting was disconnected so if folks were on
34
    Teams and got an error message or got kicked off I'm
35
    not quite sure why that happened but if you'll go
36
    around and click the link again and get back in the
37
    meeting is still there. I'm not quite sure what
38
    happened, but I did want to bring that to people's
     attention, just go ahead and click the link again and
39
40
     you should be able to get back in.
41
42
                     Thank you.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thanks,
45
     DeAnna. Was anybody else on the Council who wanted to
     add to the discussion on Unuk River eulachons.
46
47
48
                     (No comments)
49
```

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. DeAnna, do we have anybody else on the line, or maybe I should just ask is there anybody else on the line.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think that concludes our public testimony for the morning. Thank you all for calling in, very helpful, good discussion. So next up will be -- we're going to go back to the Board of Fish proposals and Cathy Needham was very helpful last night, she kind of organized what we need to do to get this accomplished and DeAnna, has everybody on the Council gotten the prioritization list, I guess, that Cathy put together last night.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, I believe we were going to show that on Teams. I can share that, maybe I missed that, but I know we were going to have that available to show visually. Do you want me to send that out to folks, I think it was just a....

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. I see it up on the Teams. If all the Council members can access that, that's fine. But, anyhow, what Cathy did was she kind of organized the, what is it, the 21 proposals before us and prioritized them and there was, oh, almost half of them that the Council had taken action on last fall and then there's a few proposals that we started to work on but asked for some more information and then there's a number of proposals, it looks like eight proposals that we haven't done any work on at all. So what we're proposing to do is to go through these in a prioritized fashion. We'll start with the ones that we haven't addressed much before and try and work on those and then we'll go back and look at the few that we talked about previously and might have more discussion on. And then the ones that we've already come to a decision on last fall, I'm going to ask any of the Council members who weren't on last fall to maybe take a look at those and if there's anything about those decisions that we made last fall that you want to question or bring back to the Council you can do that. If we're all in agreement of what we did last fall is done then we don't really need to address those again. So....

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

0215 1 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, go ahead. 2 3 MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 4 actually do need to vote to finalize the work that the 5 Council did. The vote that we took at the last Council 6 meeting was to adopt the preliminary comments for the 7 next meeting so we do need a vote to finalize those and it could be as short as, you know, finalize the work of 9 the last meeting, but that does need to be part of the 10 record. 11 12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, 13 DeAnna, that sounds easy to do. So I guess also, you 14 know, for the more recent Council members if there were 15 any other proposals that you saw in the book that you 16 wanted to bring to our attention that we did not 17 identify yet, do that as well this morning. So I'd 18 like to take a 15 minute break and give everybody a 19 chance to stretch your legs and maybe review some of 20 these again, make sure we know what we're going to do 21 and we'll come back at 10:45 and start up with those. 22 My goal is to try and have these done this morning so 23 we can move on to our wildlife proposals this 24 afternoon. I think I'm going to leave it at the end of 25 the morning this morning, even if we haven't completed 26 them, and move on, and we'll have to come back to it, 27 but that's our goal. Try and wrap up the Board of Fish 28 proposals by noon today. So let's keep that in mind. 29 30 Okay, we'll recess until 10:45. 31 32 (Off record) 33 34 (On record) 35 36 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: DeAnna, could you 37 do a quick roll call and see if the Council's back. 38 39 MS. PERRY: Alrighty. Okay, good 40 morning, it's almost 10:45 and the Council will be back 41 in session after their break and I just want to 42 doublecheck which Council members we have back on. 43 44 Cathy Needham. 45 46 MS. NEEDHAM: I'm back. 47 48 Larry Bemis, Jr. 49 50

0216	
1	(No comments)
2	MC DEDDY. Larry are you hack with us
4	MS. PERRY: Larry are you back with us, I see that you sent me an email and I will send you
5	that information shortly. Are you online, Larry.
6	
7 8	(No comments)
9	MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
10	
11	MR. KITKA: I'm back.
12 13	MS. PERRY: Thanks, Harvey.
14	no. IENNI. Inanko, narvey.
15	Harold Robbins.
16 17	MR. ROBBINS: I'm here.
18	MR. ROBBINS. I III Hele.
19	MS. PERRY: Thank you.
20	T T. l
21 22	Ian Johnson.
23	(No comments)
24	
25 26	MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
27	MR. CASIPIT: Here.
28	
29 30	MS. PERRY: Thank you, Cal.
31	Mike Douville.
32	
33	MR. DOUVILLE: Here.
34 35	MS. PERRY: Thank you.
36	no. Ilimi. Inank you.
37	Jim Slater.
38 39	(No comments)
39 40	(No comments)
41	MS. PERRY: Robert Schroeder.
42	
43 44	MR. SCHROEDER: Standing by.
45	MS. PERRY: Thanks, Bob.
46	
47	Albert Howard.
48 49	MR. HOWARD: Here.
50	int. nomino. noit.

```
0217
 1
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Albert.
 2
 3
                     Larry Bemis, are you back with us.
 4
 5
                     (No comments)
 6
 7
                     MS. PERRY: I'm not sure if perhaps
 8
     you're on mute.
 9
10
                     (No comments)
11
12
                     MS. PERRY: Ian Johnson.
13
14
                     (No comments)
15
16
                     MS. PERRY: Frank. Frank Wright, have
17
     you rejoined us.
18
19
                     (No comments)
20
21
                     MS. PERRY: Okay. Currently, and, Don,
22
     I just heard you, so currently we have 8 of our 12
23
     members online, you do have a quorum if you'd like to
     go ahead, Mr. Chair.
24
25
26
                     MR. BEMIS: Excuse me, this is Larry.
27
28
                     MS. PERRY: Oh, hi, Larry.
29
30
                     MR. BEMIS:
                                 I'm checking in.
31
32
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you.
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: There's nine.
35
     Okay, we'll probably get everybody back here very
     shortly. Like I said, Cathy organized things for us
36
37
     last night a little better, and, Cathy, I just thought
     I might check with you, I don't know if you would like
38
39
     to lead us through this discussion. It kind of
40
     occurred to me that when I didn't really think I was
41
     going to be on the Council for this meeting I really
42
     didn't do as much homework looking into these as I
43
     probably should have, I don't know if you feel if
44
     you're better prepared, I'd be glad to turn it over to
45
     you at this time. I don't want to put you on the spot,
46
     though, I'm glad to do it, I'm wondering if you had
47
     planned on doing it and were a little better prepared
48
     than I was -- am.
49
50
```

MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, this is Cathy. I don't know that I am any more prepared than you are but if you would like for me to do it because I organized this and I have it in my head of how to go through these maybe a little quicker I'm happy to do it for you, no problem.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, if you would want to do that I'd be glad to let you lead the discussion so, yeah, go ahead.

 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Chairman. For Council members, I'm hoping that you all have the road map of potential Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council comments for the Board of Fish proposals before you, that's in your supplemental handout materials we started working through them yesterday. And I think that road map and guide is a good synthesis so you don't have to flip through the Board of Fish proposal book.

And, again, the Council did a lot of work at the last meeting on proposals that are in this and so I just want to make sure that everyone understands that the ones that — that the spreadsheet that I put together that's on the Teams board is not in the same order as the one of the road map but you should be able to flip through this a little bit quicker to get to the proposal when we discuss them. I'd like to start off with the ones that we didn't finish, and do our due diligence on, and maybe that would begin with finishing up — we did hear from Hydaburg Cooperative Association yesterday, that might be fresh in everybody's mind, Proposal 210, which was submitted by the Hydaburg Cooperative Association regarding a closure for crab fishery.

Someone needs to make a motion to support this and then we can have our discussion on if the Council would like to provide comment to the Board of Fish on that.

MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is Albert.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ HOWARD: I had thought we did the motion to support that yesterday already or was that

```
0219
 1
     something else.
 2
 3
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
 4
     Howard. What we actually did was move to support the
 5
     proposal that was just before it, I believe it was No.
     177 and that was for the closure on shrimp fisheries,
 7
     there were two separate proposals that were prepared,
     so we didn't actually do anything by motion on Proposal
 9
     210 yesterday.
10
11
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, I move to
12
     support 210.
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
15
     there a second.
16
17
                     MR. KITKA: Second it.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you.
20
     Does the Council wish to have any discussion regarding
21
     this proposal.
22
23
                     MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Calvin
24
     Casipit. I don't really need to discuss this anymore,
25
     I heard plenty enough from Mr. Christianson yesterday.
26
    I think, again, similar to rationale for the previous
27
     one, 177, I think the area that's requesting to be
28
     closed to commercial harvest is fairly small. It's
29
     smaller compared to the area open to the entire
30
    commercial crab fishery and that this is needed to
31
    preserve the customary and traditional uses for the
32
    people of Hydaburg. I support and will be voting in
33
     support of this.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for
36
     providing that justification for the record, Mr.
37
     Casipit. Is there any other discussion or comments
38
     from the Council.
39
40
                     MR. HOWARD: Just a thought, Madame
41
    Chair, this is Albert.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.
44
45
                     MR. HOWARD: Thanks, Madame Chair.
46
    Maybe in the future we may consider, as an example,
47
     Angoon, pick a bay or two you'd like to see
48
     specifically for subsistence that not -- doesn't
49
     necessarily impact commercial. Because there's a
50
```

```
0220
     couple of places here that -- there is a lodge in town
     that's required to have a commercial crab permit so
 2
     they'll run up to the place and set their pots all over
    the bay and then that takes away from us when they
 5
     could go a little -- another 10 miles and set somewhere
     else but they choose to set where we set. So just a
 6
 7
     thought, maybe we can try to designate subsistence
     areas for each community that's Federally-qualified and
 9
     see if we can do one proposal that designates an area
10
     for each community.
11
12
                     That's just a thought.
13
14
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
17
    Howard. Are there any other Council members that would
18
     like to speak towards the proposal.
19
20
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, this is
21
     Don. I would vote to support this proposal. I think
22
     Cal laid out the reasons I'm in support of it quite
23
     well. I would agree with everything that he said.
24
25
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
26
    Hernandez. Does any other Council members have
27
    comments.
28
29
                     MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair, this is
30
    Frank.
31
32
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Wright.
33
34
                     MR. WRIGHT: You know like I said
35
     yesterday that closure in this area behind the island
36
     over here really benefitted the community since the
37
     commercial can't go in there so like I said I lost pots
38
     every time when the commercial opened. But I would
39
     speaker in favor of this motion.
40
41
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
44
     Wright. Any other comments from Council members
45
     regarding Proposal 210.
46
47
                     (No comments)
48
49
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'd like to call
```

```
0221
 1
     for the question.
 2
 3
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. The
     question's been called. Mr. Wright, would you please
 4
 5
     do a roll call vote.
 6
 7
                     (No comments)
 8
 9
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright, are
     you on mute, would you please do a roll call vote.
10
11
12
                     MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Cal.
13
14
                     MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
15
16
                     MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
17
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
18
19
20
                     MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.
21
22
                     MR. SLATER: Yes.
23
                     MR. WRIGHT: Robert Schroeder.
24
25
26
                     MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.
27
                     MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
28
29
30
                     MR. HOWARD: Yes.
31
32
                     MR. WRIGHT: Donald Hernandez.
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
35
36
                     MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.
37
38
                     MR. ROBBINS: Yes.
39
40
                     MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
41
42
                     MR. KITKA: Yes.
43
44
                     MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
45
46
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes.
47
48
                     MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.
49
```

```
0222
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
 2
 3
                     MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.
 4
 5
                     (No comments)
 6
 7
                     MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.
 8
 9
                     (No comments)
10
11
                     MR. WRIGHT: Frank votes yes. Motion
12
     passes.
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
15
     you, Mr. Wright. The next.....
16
17
                     MS. PERRY: Madame Chair.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Ms. Perry.
20
21
                     MS. PERRY:
                                 Thank you.
                                             Sorry to
22
     interrupt but I just wanted to confirm, was that Cal
23
     who seconded that motion?
24
25
                     MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka.
26
27
                     MS. PERRY: Harvey. Thank you, Harvey.
28
     It was hard to figure out who was speaking, I
29
     appreciate that, thanks.
30
31
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. All
32
     right, the next proposal is Proposal 127. It was
33
     submitted by the Yakutat Tlingit Tribe. We did have
34
     some discussion on this proposal at our last Council
35
    meeting, however, the Regional Advisory Council was
36
     interested in knowing -- was seeking more advice from
37
     the Yakutat AC. I'm unsure if any representatives from
38
     the AC are available if there are specific questions,
39
     however, potentially the Alaska Department of Fish and
40
     Game, if they're on, might be able to help clear up any
41
     questions that we had.
42
43
                     This proposal has to do with repealing
44
     the net tending requirement in Yakutat Bay and I'm not
45
     sure if there's one of our Council members from Yakutat
46
     Tlingit Tribe, if Mr. Bemis wants to talk a little bit
47
    more about that, and I would invite him to do so.
48
     Otherwise Staff might be able to remind us what the
49
     issue was from -- why we didn't take action on this
```

from our last meeting and what we were needing advice from the AC from but I'll call on Mr. Bemis, if he's interested in speaking towards the proposal at this time.

MR. BEMIS: Yes, Cathy, this is Larry. It was a representative — the Yakutat Tlingit Tribe didn't exactly, along with Yakutat Kwaan, 126 and 127, those are individual — the tribe itself didn't — it was a position put in by an individual and they used the tribe as a backing of it. It didn't come from any fisheries — directly from the tribe itself.

Our problem is, is that we are unable to have an AC quorum because of Covid and the State didn't set anything up, we haven't had any meetings. We don't have -- our Board has run out of the time served, we've got to have new Board members voted in, so without having a meeting and without having anything set up like doing a virtual or a call in or any of this, we've been just on hold.

Now, I talked to the local Fish and Game manager here in Yakutat and he said that these proposals are going to stay in limbo until November. He said everything will stay the same because there'll be nothing put in. We would like to have this represented and I'm not really sure where the AC sits on this. We're the ones that kind of set that up in 2008 and they want to rescind it based on -- because the fish that have returned that -- the rivers that have been in question, like the Situk River and the Alsek, now they're escapement on the kings have returned, but whether that's going to happen this next year we're not really sure but this wasn't really a total intention to make this into law, it was -- we were going to see at the time we were in crises mode, we were doing everything we could to make sure that the fish got to the stream. So there was no intention of keeping this as a law. This was just a preservation act.

And what now is happening is the people are saying you guys have got your kings, we would like to be able to get our rights back of the original fishery. And I'm not really sure where the AC sits on this. These letters have been put out and I don't think the AC has put anything on as far as the AC Board itself. There might be individuals, and I'm thinking

that this was an individual that wrote through Yakutat Kwaan on 126 and 127. Because I'm on the fisheries board for the Yakutat Tlingit Tribes and I did not see this -- I did not have a meeting and I did not see this letter that was put out.

So I would say more this is an individual group that is tribal members and the same with the Kwaan, those are Kwaan members. So we're kind of at a standstill of what the local Fish and Game manager's saying and what the AC was. So until we get a Board, my understanding is from the local manager is that this is going to sit in limbo until November, in other words this law cannot be changed. So at this time maybe by come this fall that we'll have a little more refined direction of where the AC's going to be and where they stand with this.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{So}}$$ these two proposals basically are in limbo right now.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Bemis, and thank you for pointing out that the proposals were sort of addressing, it looks like the same issue, Proposal 126 and 127.

MR. BEMIS: Correct.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: And just to remind the Council members and for the benefit of the new Council members, what we're doing is trying to determine whether or not this body, the Regional Advisory Council, would like to make comments regarding proposals. At our last meeting these were proposals that were brought forward to us as potential proposals that we could support, we also have the option to take no action if we did not want to take a position on these proposals. And I just wanted to -- I meant to say that in the beginning so I'm saying it now.

Is there any other clarifications that need to be made regarding these two proposals and if not I would entertain the wish of the Council.

MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.

```
0225
                     MR. KITKA: Yes, hi, I'm a little --
 1
    maybe I need to ask a question first before I recommend
 2
    something. I'm a little unclear about what this
    proposal is. Is this subsistence for sockeye that they
 5
    got there that the permits are saying that we can get
    incidental catches on coho and king but I'm not sure.
 6
 7
    I read it and reread it and I just can't see it.
 8
 9
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
10
    Kitka. When I look at it, I see them as net tending --
11
    repealing net tending requirements. But maybe we can
12
     ask, if there is a Staff person that can give us a
13
     concise explanation of what these two proposals are
14
     addressing.
15
16
                     MR. SUMINSKI: This is Terry Suminski,
17
    Madame Chair.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
20
     Suminski.
21
22
                     MR. SUMINSKI: I think Harvey may be
23
     looking -- sorry.
24
25
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I just said thank
26
     you, Mr. Suminski.
27
28
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Oh. I think Harvey may
29
    be looking at Proposal 125 from what he described.
30
    That was the one that involved allowing the issuance of
31
    permits for king salmon for Southeast. These two
32
    proposals deal specifically with Yakutat and net
33
     tending.
34
35
                     (Teleconference interference - beeping)
36
37
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
38
     Suminski. I hear that noise and I automatically.....
39
40
                     MR. SUMINSKI: So I'm not sure
     what....
41
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....think fire.
44
45
                     (Laughter)
46
47
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, I was wondering if
48
     that was me. But I know -- my recollection of the last
49
     meeting, that we weren't sure about these proposals --
50
```

or the Council was not sure about these proposals because of the -- it was enacted during the last Board of Fish cycle and I think at that time it was supported by the Advisory Committee, if I'm not mistaken, and then this time these -- it's trying to repeal it during this next Board of Fish cycle, and it appears they're from the Yakutat Tlingit Tribe but it sounds like Mr. Bemis had different ideas about that.

But the -- and I remember that Harold Robbins had some comments on these as well. But we were kind of about in the same spot as we are right now as far as we didn't know -- the Council didn't know which way to go. So maybe Mr. Robbins has some comments as well.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Suminski. I do want to check back with Mr. Kitka to make sure that Terry is correct in that he might have been referring to Proposal 125.

MR. KITKA: Yeah, I guess I was looking at 125 and looking at all of them and trying to figure out where I was on this, and so I guess we're on 126 and 127.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Correct. We're kind of discussing those two similar proposals in tandem to decide if we want to include them in our letter of support with comments. We skipped over 125 because the Council spent a lot of time on that proposal, not to mention it was a proposal that was submitted by the Council. We did do a lot of due diligence work on that proposal at our last Regional Advisory Council meeting, Harvey. So we're trying to put in the work on proposals that we haven't spent much time on yet and that, right now, includes 126 and 127.

MR. KITKA: Okay, thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Robbins, did you -- yep, no problem, thank you. Mr. Robbins, did you want to add any comments at this time.

MR. ROBBINS: Yes, thank you, Madame Chair. Yeah, what the idea was was there was a couple of subsistence nets that seem to get set and weren't

tended very closely and it caused some dissention in the community and so I think that's kind of where this was going with this and the AC had kind of picked it up and run with it. I wasn't on the AC but that's my best recollection of it and they were trying to get it rescinded.

And if you look at the regulations for the Yakutat area, if you get your permit, in it, is condition No. 5, is Yakutat Bay subsistence permitholder must attend their set gillnet at all times, April 1st through May 31. Item No. 6, the Situk River, each permitholder must attend their net at all times when it's being used for taking of salmon. So it's not just bay specific, but -- so consequently that's kind of where that's at.

So, personally, I kind of think it's reasonable but there's others that don't agree with that so that's kind of where we're at with this.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Robbins. At this time I would ask if the Council would like to take a position on these, one or both of these proposals.

 MR. CASIPIT: Well, Mrs. Chair -- Ms. Chair, this is Cal Casipit again. I had a quick question, maybe Staff can answer it. For the commercial users, are they required to attend their nets in the same way?

 $$\operatorname{VICE}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Casipit. Do we have a Staff member that can answer that question for us.

MR. BEMIS: This is Larry.

 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, this is DeAnna. I don't know if Mr. Chadwick or another State biologist has joined us today. I know Mr. Chadwick was on earlier.

MR. BEMIS: Mr. Chair, this is Larry. I commercial fish the Yakutat area and, no, there is no attending a commercial net. In fact, this proposal that both 126 and 7 only participates to the Yakutat Bay area, which before 2018, you were allowed to set the net and fish it without tending it 24/7. It was

only until we had a little bit of a crises on a fish return, which now the fish have returned and the people want to have their rights back. Because this is a subsistence issue. And it was never originally intended to become law.

Now, the Situk River is a law because they have the kings, are having problems, other fisheries been having problems so they adopted tend your net in the Situk River. No other rivers do you have to tend your net or any of -- other than the Yakutat Bay and the Situk River that I know of. I am not positive what other rivers have but I know that those two rivers are the only ones that had -- put this into law. Now, what the subsistence users are asking is to rescind the law for the net only in Yakutat Bay for the harvest of the spring king salmon from the April 1 through the May 31, I think it is. I'm not really sure what those dates are.

So my feeling on this situation is that we never did have the AC bring in their recommendation in order to follow through with this because this is kind of an individual request coming from the Kwaan and Yakutat Tlingit Tribe, and we never did have a recommendation come from the AC. And I kind of feel until we have an AC support, where this started, we're kind of in a holding pattern right now.

 $$\operatorname{VICE}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Bemis. Mr. Casipit, did you have a followup to your question.

MR. CASIPIT: Well, I don't really have a followup but I guess I got to make an observation.

You know, I understand what the proponents are asking for here. I understand how that reg -- how the net tending regulation got put in place, it was concern of conservation for chinook salmon. But I have a problem and it seems that whenever there's a conservation issue the first people to get restricted are the subsistence users. And I can't, for my life, understand why we would put a net tending restriction on subsistence users who are catching one king salmon when we don't have the same -- when there's not the same net tending requirement for the commercial fishery which is taking a lot more. I just -- you know, I understand we want the ACs input and all but just from

```
0229
     a -- just in my gut I'm feeling that this isn't fair
    what happened. And that it seems like the subsistence
    users are taking the restrictions and taking the brunt
    of the conservation measures that need to happen. And
    it always seems that way. To me, it always seemed that
 6
    way, that whenever there was a conservation issue the
 7
    first people to take the action and the first people to
     suffer are the subsistence users and that's backwards.
 9
10
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you remember
11
    him.
12
13
                     (Teleconference interference -
14
    participants not muted - cross talk - typing)
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
17
    Casipit. Are there other Council members.
18
19
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair.
20
21
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. I didn't --
22
    there was some typing so could you identify yourself
23
    please.
24
25
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is
26
    Albert.
27
28
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
29
    Howard, you have the floor.
30
31
                     MR. HOWARD: I move to support Proposal
32
     127.
33
34
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a second.
35
36
                     MR. SLATER: This is Jim Slater, I
37
    second it.
38
39
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
40
     Slater. Seconded by Mr. Slater. Is there any Council
41
    discussion.
42
43
                     (No comments)
44
45
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I would recommend
46
    Council, now that we're in sort of deliberation or
47
     justification of supporting this Proposal No. 127,
48
     which is to repeal the net tending requirement, that we
49
     add a little bit of rationale so that can be captured
50
```

0230 and put into the Board of Fish. 2 3 MR. ROBBINS: Madame Chairman, this is 4 Harold. 5 6 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 7 Robbins, you have the floor. 8 9 MR. ROBBINS: Yes, one thing maybe we 10 ought to consider is that often times, at least 11 personally where I subsistence fish, if you don't tend 12 the net quite closely it soon becomes a feeding trough, 13 or a bait station for all the sea lions and the seals 14 within a very large radius. And I generally end up 15 with nothing except heads and pieces if I don't tend the net very closely. I haven't never subsistence 16 17 fished in Yakutat Bay but I've fished in the Alsek 18 River for nearly 50 years that way. So anyway that's 19 my personal observation and maybe just a note that 20 everybody needs to take into account for. 21 22 Thank you. 23 24 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 25 Robbins. Are there other Council members with 26 comments. 27 28 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka. 29 30 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 31 Kitka. 32 33 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair. I feel that 34 there's no conservation concern with this proposal. I 35 feel that it's detrimental to the subsistence person. 36 I feel that the State of Alaska has got the subsistence 37 priorities backwards for a long time so I will support 38 this. 39 40 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 41 Kitka. Are there other Council comments. 42 43 MR. BEMIS: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is 44 It is the wish of the people of Yakutat Larry Bemis. 45 to rescind this because it was never intended to be 46 law. So the thing is is that everybody in Yakutat, 47 this is why these were personally put in and 48 represented by the different Yakutat Tribe and the 49 Kwaan is for reasons that they've taken upon themselves

```
0231
     because they're the ones that are being affected and it
     seemed like to me that it would be the wishes of the
     people to have back what they had before. And all I
     was saying is that when I talked to Fish and Game we
 5
     got held up on it because the AC didn't weigh in.
 6
 7
                     But as far as the subsistence users,
 8
     which, who we represent, we don't represent the AC, the
 9
     Yakutat people have spoke and these are their wishes.
10
     And as an AC member, as a Tlingit Tribe member and a
11
     Kwaan member, I agree to rescind this because it's the
12
     wishes of the users. So that's my part in this.
13
14
                     Thank you.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
17
     Bemis. Are there other Council comments.
18
19
                     MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Cal
20
     Casipit, I've heard enough I'm ready for the question.
21
22
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the
23
     question's been called. Mr. Wright, would you do a
24
     roll call vote, please.
25
26
                     MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair.
27
                     Cal Casipit -- I'm have a hard time
28
29
     with your name, Casipit.
30
31
                     MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
32
33
                     MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
34
35
                     (No comments)
36
37
                     MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
38
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Votes yes.
39
40
41
                     MR. WRIGHT: James Slater.
42
43
                     MR. SLATER: Yes.
44
45
                     MR. WRIGHT: Robert Schroeder.
46
47
                     (No comments)
48
49
                     MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
```

```
0232
 1
                     MR. HOWARD: Yes.
 2
                     MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.
 3
 4
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
 5
 6
                     MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.
 7
 8
                     MR. ROBBINS: Yes.
 9
10
                     MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
11
12
                     MR. KITKA: Yes.
13
14
                     MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
15
16
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes.
17
18
                     MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.
19
20
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
21
22
                     MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.
23
24
                     (No comments)
25
26
                     MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.
27
28
                     MR. JOHNSON: I apologize I was -- I
29
    had to do a previous engagement during most of the
     discussions so since it doesn't sound like it will sway
30
31
     the vote I will abstain from this one.
32
33
                     MR. WRIGHT: So is that a no or yes or
34
    abstain.
35
36
                     MR. JOHNSON: I believe it's a -- yeah,
37
    yes then.
38
39
                     MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Frank votes yes.
    Motion passes, Madame Chair.
40
41
42
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
43
     Wright. So we will include support for Proposal 127 in
44
     our letter with the rationale that we laid out.
45
46
                     The next proposal is Proposal 126,
47
    which I'll remind everyone that Mr. Bemis let us know
48
     that this one is related and similar to 127, we could
49
     simply roll them together with our support if the
50
```

```
0233
    Council would like to provide comments for the Board of
     Fish on that proposal, or we could take no action.
    What is the wish of the Council.
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this
 6
    is Don.
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'm going to make
11
     a motion that we take no action on 126, I think
12
     Proposal 127 is adequate support.
13
14
                     MR. KITKA: I'll second that. Harvey
15
    Kitka here.
16
17
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. It's
18
    been moved and seconded to take no action, is there any
19
     comments or questions from the Council.
20
21
                     MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Cal
     Casipit, I move that we have a unanimous consent to
22
23
     take no action on that proposal, 126.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'll second that.
26
27
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
    Casipit and Mr. Hernandez. So hearing no objection, we
28
29
    can move on to the next one.
30
31
                     (No objection)
32
33
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is that correct,
34
    we can move on to the next one at this point.
35
36
                     MR. WRIGHT: If there's no
37
     objection....
38
39
                     MS. PERRY: Madame Chair.
40
                     MR. WRIGHT: .....yes we can move on.
41
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
44
     Wright. So hearing no objection we will move on to the
45
     next one. The next proposal that we need to do our due
46
     diligence on is Proposal 130. It actually starts on
47
     the back side of the third page on your road map.
48
49
                     Proposal 130 was submitted by the
```

Klawock AC. The Council did discuss this a little bit at our last meeting, however, we were unclear on what the proposal is asking for and we hoped to hear more from either the representatives from the Klawock or the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The proposal is to modify fishing times and locations for the subsistence salmon fishery in the Klawock River and Lake.

So I would like to ask whether or not if there's any -- if the proponent is on the line, the proponent for this proposal, is the Klawock AC, if they're on the line at this time.

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, not hearing from them. I'd like to ask if there is any representatives from Alaska Department of Fish and Game on the line that might be able to help us with questions regarding this proposal.

MR. THYNES: Yeah, Madame Chair, this is Troy Thynes with Fish and Game here. I'm prepared to answer any questions you may have.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Thynes. All right, so Council members Proposal 130, modifying fishing times and locations for subsistence salmon fishery in the Klawock River and Lake as follows:

From July 10th through July 31st annually, sockeye salmon may be taken in the waters of Klawock Harbor enclosed by a line from the northernmost tip of Klawock Island, the Klawock River and Klawock Lake only from 12:01 a.m., Monday until 11:59 p.m., Friday.

Is there any Council members that remember from the last meeting what questions that we had regarding this particular proposal -- well, actually I will add -- before I do that I will add, you'll note in our road map the Council was unclear what is being asked for and how this relates to the Klawock Management Plan. Is there specific questions from the Council for Mr. Thynes on this proposal.

MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Cal Casipit. I have a question for Mr. Thynes. It's been

awhile since I've -- and I don't have all the papers in front of me but what is the current regulation there for the take of sockeye in terms of fishing schedule and these July 10 to 31 dates?

MR. THYNES: Sure. The current regulations allow subsistence and personal use fishing for salmon in Klawock Inlet and the estuary down stream of the Klawock River bridge from July 7th through August 7th on a weekly fishing period from 8:00 a.m., until 5:00 p.m., on Friday, Monday through Friday.

MR. CASIPIT: So basically this cuts off some time for subsistence fishing basically.

MR. THYNES: What this proposal would do is it would do two things. It would extend the area allowed to fish and it would also reduce the fishing time by one week from August 7th to July 31st.

MR. CASIPIT: Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions regarding this proposal that Mr. Thynes might be able to help us through.

MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Madame Chair. I know that -- maybe Staff can answer this, would this be detrimental to any of the other subsistence users down stream because of the shortened time limit?

MR. THYNES: Madame Chair, this is Troy Thynes here again. I'm not sure if I'm supposed to respond to questions for Staff or in particular from the Fish and Game so -- and so I'm not sure how you want me to proceed there.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Thynes, if you have an answer to the question we'd like to hear it, otherwise we can see if there's anyone else on our Staff that might be able to help us with that.

MR. THYNES: Okay. So if I understand the question correctly, was, if other subsistence users would be affected down stream; and that is a difficult question to answer. Certainly, reducing the time period could affect people who want to -- who would

rather fish in that first week of August period, but, then again increasing the area in particular to an area that has shown in the past to be where sockeye are more susceptible to harvest could increase harvest. There could be, you know, a net increase in harvest, or a net loss in harvest, you know, based on the increase in area versus reduction of time. Hard to say on that.

I will say that, you know, this particular area has been an area that has been a concern of users in the past, the area above the bridge as far as opening up the harvest. And to address these concerns, and based on proposals from the local Advisory Committees and the Southeast Subsistence Regional Advisory Committee the Board established regulations that closed to fishing on the weekends and closed waters above the Klawock River bridge in 2015. So the weekend closures occurred in 1986 and then the closed waters above the bridge occurred in 2015. So this is something that both your body and the Board of Fisheries has addressed before.

 $$\operatorname{VICE}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Thynes. Mr. Kitka, did you have any followup to your question.

MR. KITKA: I have to think about that for awhile. I still didn't get an answer whether it would be detrimental but would -- was there any conservation concerns with the sockeye returns in the lake?

MR. THYNES: Through the Chair. Mr. Kitka. Yes, there has been conservation concerns for Klawock River sockeye and, you know, concerns continue. In recent years sockeye stocks throughout Southeast have been on a decline in general, there certainly are some sockeye stocks that have done better than others. But -- and in this particular system, I believe, in recent years it's been showing a decline. So these regulations that have been, again, like I said, addressed by local Advisory Committees, the RAC, and as well as the Board of Fisheries have been in response to conservation concerns from those bodies.

MR. KITKA: Thank you.

MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.

0237 1 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr. 2 Douville. 3 4 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you. The Council 5 supported the closure from above the bridge a few years 6 back for conservation purposes. Those fish were 7 getting hammered up in the mouth of the creek, and, you know, the runs have been severely depressed there so in 8 9 any case I'm not sure about the other parts, why they 10 would want to reduce the time. Anyway, I would not be 11 in favor of supporting this one as it opens up more 12 area, which we're trying to conserve -- during the 13 sockeye run, in any case, trying to conserve sockeyes. 14 But there's nothing wrong with opening it after the 15 sockeyes have passed for cohos. But that's my 16 thoughts. 17 18 Thank you. 19 20 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 21 Douville. Are there other questions or would someone 22 on the Council like to put forward a motion to support 23 this or take no action. 24 25 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, I move to 26 support Proposal 131. 27 28 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, the 29 proposal we're discussing right now is 130, did you 30 mean 130 -- did you say 130 or 131, I thought I heard 31 131. 32 33 MR. HOWARD: Excuse me, that's 130, 34 you're correct. 35 36 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a second. 37 38 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: This is Don, I'll 39 second. 40 41 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 42 Hernandez. The Council moved to support Proposal 130 43 so we're now in Council discussion on what we would like to include in our comments to the Board of Fish 44 45 regarding this proposal. 46 47 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is 48 Albert. 49

```
0238
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.
 2
 3
                     MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.
 4
    We heard the reason we closed it was a conservation
     concern, but what we didn't hear is what they've done
 5
    to other user groups to address this concern. This
 6
 7
    demonstrates what they've done to subsistence users,
    but there's no demonstration of what was done to other
 8
 9
    user groups to address the same concern. It was just
10
    put squarely on the shoulders of the subsistence user
11
    and that's what they have demonstrated to me. So
12
    that's why I'm supporting this.
13
14
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
17
    Howard. Are there other Council comments.
18
19
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka.
20
21
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.
22
23
                     MR. KITKA: I had one more question,
24
    maybe of Staff. When is the biggest run of the
25
     sockeyes that go to the lake, what time periods, what
26
    months and what days?
27
28
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Ms. Needham, this is
29
    Terry Suminski.
30
31
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Suminski.
32
33
                     MR. SUMINSKI: I don't have the run
34
    timing information in front of me, maybe Mr. Thynes
35
     does, but I could maybe add to Mr. Kitka's earlier
     question. This proposal is outside of Federal
36
37
     jurisdiction and really wouldn't have any effect on
38
     Federally-qualified users. So people fishing up in the
39
     river under Federal rules, this would not change
40
     anything.
41
42
                     Thank you.
43
44
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
45
     Suminski. Harvey, were you still looking for an answer
46
     to your question regarding run timing?
47
48
                     MR. KITKA: Basically it would probably
49
    go to the State.
```

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr. 2 Thynes, do you happen to have that information available?

MR. THYNES: Yeah, so I don't have the specific run timings for that stock at my ready disposal right here, right now, but generally speaking from what I understand of it, it is typical run timing for that area, where the fish start coming in in June and July, and are going to peak out coming through the salt water sometime in late July and early August. And I should add that there's -- you know, for the Klawock Lake, it's a fairly short distance between the salt water and the lake itself.

MR. KITKA: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Are there other Council comments.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this is Don.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez, you have the floor.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you. I'm going to tend to support this proposal even though it's -- there is some disagreement, I guess, on what the benefits would be versus the possible impacts. I know that we do like to support local Advisory Committees when they put in a proposal, and they are obviously the people closest to the fishery and probably know it best. I'm looking on our Council book where we have some information on Klawock Lake escapement, I believe we had a weir in place there for a number of years. It's in our book on Page -- oh, these pages -- I don't see numbers on them, it's a harvest report -- it might be Page 38. I don't know, there's a Prince of Wales section on the information we have on harvest and escapements for the area. And it shows for Klawock Lake, while it was being monitored, there was a drastic decline in escapement, oh, approximately 10 years ago now. It kind of shows that the stocks may have been rebuilding somewhat in the recent years, although we don't have any information for the past couple of years, unfortunately, but I think what this proposal is seeking is to increase some opportunity for harvest for subsistence users. It

sounds like they're trying to balance that somewhat with decreasing the time that is available to harvest, but increasing the area for harvest and I'm sure that's something they've given some careful consideration to.

So I would tend to support their proposal based on the fact that we may be seeing some indications of some improvement in the escapement in recent years and they may see an opportunity to increase subsistence harvest, so, yes, I'm going to support the proposal.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez. Are there other comments from the Council.

 MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Calvin Casipit. I think Mr. Hernandez has done an excellent job outlining the issues and, you know, I am kind of torn between giving up time for area. I think, personally, I'd rather have the time. But since this is coming from local users I have the tendency to go with what the local folks want. So, you know, my personal preference doesn't really matter. So, yeah, I have a tendency to support this. I plan to support this, and it's because the local people have asked for it, and like Mr. Hernandez said it looks like there is some recovering escapement. So if the runs are improving then I think it's right that the subsistence users have a little bit of an extra shot if that's what they think is going to get them that.

So I'm ready to support this.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Casipit. Are there other comments from Council members regarding Proposal 130.

MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: I will not support this proposal because it opens that area which is critical, it's like shooting fish in a barrel. The reason that we have slightly increased runs is because that area has been closed. There's adequate opportunity below the bridge to intercept those fish, but once they get past there, they school up at high water and you can virtually wipe the runs out. So it's really a

dangerous thing to do.

While you might see a slight increase in the runs, this system historically had runs that were in the near 100,000 or better, consistently. The canneries in the old days used to take 40,000 fish and run them into the cannery and there was still enough escapement to maintain that level of harvest for quite some time. The run is getting later in that system. As a teenager, we used to go up there and fish and it closed by the Fourth of July, when the seining season opened it was closed, like all other streams were at that time because there was fear that some of those fish would go into the commercial market, so all of our fish were caught in June but now it's caught in July and later July.

So I think it's too much risk to the resource to open it up until, you know, we see significant -- significantly healthy returns there which we are not. Last year was a scratch year. You're not seeing it on your graph but last summer was not very good.

Anyway, thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Douville. Are there other comments from Council.

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to ask a question of Mr. Thynes so that I can make sure I understand this in light of Mr. Douville's comments. Essentially the effects of this proposal, would that open up the State waters above the bridge, under State jurisdiction? I noticed in the -- it looks like it's modified fishing times and locations, and then they talk about locations, it has the line, which is northernmost tip of Klawock Island, the Klawock River and Klawock Lake and this proposal before the Board of Fish, in my understanding, is the River and the Lake would be under Federal jurisdiction. So I'm wondering if you can clarify that for me?

(No comments)

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{VICE}}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: Or is there anyone besides Mr. Thynes that might be able to address that

0242 1 question. 2 3 MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair. 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. 6 7 MR. DOUVILLE: Were you asking where 8 the Federal water starts? 9 10 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm asking --11 yeah, I know where the Federal waters start but this proposal is a Board of Fish proposal, and it's to 12 13 modify fishing times and locations and it looks like it 14 is to open up harvest in -- under the State 15 jurisdiction, which is above the bridge to the mouth of 16 the river, and then it also would open up the river and 17 the lake, which would be Federal, and I was asking for 18 clarification of the Department's interpretation of 19 what the intent of this proposal is. 20 21 MR. THYNES: Madame Chair, this is Troy 22 Thynes, I'm back on the line here again. I apologize, 23 I hit the wrong button on my phone and hung up instead of hitting the mute button. So was that your previous 24 25 question, on what exactly this proposal would open up? 26 27 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, essentially, 28 what are the local aspects of this proposal. 29 30 MR. THYNES: So the -- it would open up 31 waters up stream of the bridge and, you know, in 32 regards to what you're saying was State jurisdiction or 33 Federal jurisdiction, so all waters, marine and fresh 34 water still within the State jurisdiction, the Federal 35 jurisdiction ends at essentially salt water. So it 36 would open up the State fishery up stream of the 37 bridge. 38 39 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: And then it would 40 include -- and that would be for net fishing, like 41 beach seine fishing? 42 43 MR. THYNES: That's correct. There's 44 no -- just your typical gear that are allowed in the 45 State fisheries. 46 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 47 48 you for that clarification for me. I think in light of 49 the comments that Mr. Douville provided and recalling

back to this Council's work and talking about that pinch point, I now remember that this Council did -- it was a hard closure to make but we did make this closure for the conservation concern for sockeye in Klawock Lake and I'm in agreement with Mr. Douville, in that, that there is still a conservation concern and that potentially reopening that previous closure that the State implemented and then the Federal system kind of followed suit to make sure that we closed off the quote/unquote, donut hole, at the mouth of the river there, I would tend to not support this proposal.

All right. Are there other Council comments.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is Albert.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Sitting here listening to -- so in your mind this was originally closed for a conservation concern. Also on your mind there's still a conservation concern. Even with it closed. That's kind of like a -- Angoon has a history of closing Kanalku to tribal members and if you go up there, well, everyone just kind of looks down on you for the rest of the year for doing that. So we hold our ownselves accountable when we decide to close an area for conservation concerns. So when I think about the word, conservation concern, and the context you're using it, this doesn't address the conservation concern keeping it closed if there's still a conservation concern. Something else is affecting this system, besides the subsistence user. So when you address the conservation concern on the backs of the subsistence, like it's being done here, we're not meeting our requirement of subsistence priority under Federal law.

I get it.

State law has jurisdiction. State law doesn't give anyone a priority. I understand all of that. But we have to look at it from -- and I guess my question would be is there anyone from Klawock on here? I would never -- as much as I fish around Chatham, I would never close down an area around Tenakee because I think it's important, to me, if it hurts Tenakee. So I think this coming from Klawock Cooperative Association,

they seem to think they have the problem addressed. They may be opening more area but they're also closing it a week sooner. I know we talked about the coho and the concern there. Here, the cohos don't show up until August so maybe it's the same there, I don't know. But it seems like as a subsistence Council, we should ask for other user groups to make sacrifices as well, not just the subsistence user if the conservation concern still exists after we already restricted the subsistence user.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Howard. I would provide one clarification, this proposal was put forward by the Klawock Fish and Game Advisory Committee and not the Klawock Cooperative Association, which is the Federally-recognized tribe. I don't know whether the Klawock Cooperative Association supports or opposes this proposal, but that is a point of clarification.

Are there other comments from the

Council.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this is Don again.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I did speak in support of this proposal but, yeah, after hearing Mr. Douville, who, I know is very familiar with that fishery, I think I'm going to tend to defer to his opinion on this. And I do recall discussions that we've had in the past on, you know, the impacts that opening up, you know, certain specific areas could have on that fishery just the vulnerability of the fish. do recall those discussions. We obviously have had conservation concerns, probably still do, with that Klawock sockeye run. The problems probably lie elsewhere, but if I'm not hearing any solutions to solving those problems elsewhere, I guess what I have to consider is if those stocks are depressed and, you know, they become vulnerable to overfishing by the subsistence fishery because of, you know, the factors Mr. Douville expressed, you know, we could do further damage. I'm not saying that's the cause of the problem, but we certainly don't want to exacerbate the

problem by, you know, overfishing. The problem needs to be solved elsewhere but without anything before us 2 now to solve that problem, I don't think that we want 4 to exacerbate it. 5 6 So I'm going to change my opinion on 7 this and note support it. 8 9 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair. 10 11 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 12 Hernandez. Yes, Mr. Wright. 13 14 MR. WRIGHT: You know, we're here to 15 take care of the resource for the subsistence users. And I recall a few years back when the deer were really 16 17 depressed here because of the big snowfall we had and 18 we had shut down the hunting season early and people 19 were getting upset with me, I says, we're trying to 20 protect what we have, what's left, you know, and I was glad that Mr. Douville had spoken because I was sitting 21 22 here not knowing what the river was about and when he 23 told me about the way it came out, the river got 24 smaller and became an easy catch and, you know, if you 25 depress your resource then you can't, you know, cry 26 about it after because it's going to be gone. 27 28 So I would be probably voting against 29 this proposal. And, because we're here to take care of 30 our resources, that's what we're about. 31 32 So, thank you, Madame Chair. 33 34 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 35 Wright. Are there other Council comments. 36 37 MR. HOWARD: Last one, this is Albert. 38 39 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard. 40 41 MR. HOWARD: The reason I didn't offer 42 a solution of other user groups, it isn't our 43 responsibility to, you know, as an example, tell the 44 seiners you can't catch anymore of this systems 45 sockeye. Our responsibility is to the subsistence user 46 and make sure they have enough of a resource to meet 47 their needs. You know, so by allowing them to do this, 48 maybe if the system reaches -- so we're again we're

restricting subsistence users to the resource they've

0245

49

always used for generations. And we are the -restricting only them on this resource is my point. I
totally get it. I totally understand trying to save
the system, but it shouldn't only be on the back of the
subsistence user. By allowing this to happen we're
saying, oh, yeah, we don't care that other user groups
are affecting this system because we have control of
the subsistence users and we can tell them to no longer
use this system without addressing other user groups
and the impact they are having on the system.

So there needs to be something done to restrict other user groups from catching this systems sockeye. Otherwise you're only hurting the subsistence user by restricting only them, and that's what this is doing when you vote no on this, is you're only restricting them with no answer.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.} \\ \text{Howard. Other....}$

MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: There are several things we think that are affecting this system. It was logged completely around the lake which affected the streams. It made good beaver habitat which blocked many of the streams and it's still an issue today. We have global warming. The other thing is the seining here does not open on the outside of Noise Island for the month of July, maybe one nine hour opening to conserve Canadian sockeyes but at the same time it conserves our sockeye also. However, these sockeyes are protected in the stream itself. There's the no sportfish retention in Klawock on sockeye. However, you can get a Federal permit and the bag limit changes, you can still --Federally-qualified users can get a Federal permit and use a dipnet or a spear but there is no sportfishing s it is protected in that sense.

What it -- it's still a very depressed run and until we get it up to significant numbers, our charge is not only to help subsistence users but it is also to maintain the resources. So while the subsistence user, rural users are the last ones to be

0247 1 cut, our job is also to be responsible with the 2 resources. 3 4 Thank you. 5 6 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 7 Douville. Are there other comments from Council 8 members at this time. 9 10 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka. 11 12 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka. 13 14 Thank you, Madame Chair. MR. KITKA: 15 Being on the Council when some of this took place for the Klawock River, had concerns back then about what 16 17 effect it would have on the users but also conservation 18 concerns. I realize that the area has been heavily 19 logged. I've seen what it did to other lakes that got 20 logged and sockeye runs dropped considerably. And 21 since that's been logged we also have some other concerns that are happening in the ocean that cause --22 23 that are causing considerable concerns across the state 24 and it has to do with zooplankton and global warming, 25 the food that they eat, causing diminishment of our 26 salmon within the ocean, it's also causing some 27 problems with the forage fish. 28 29 So I'm pretty much inclined to not 30 support this proposal. 31 32 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 33 Kitka. Are there any other comments at this time. 34 35 (No comments) 36 37 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing 38 none and before we come to the question, I have a 39 procedural question for Ms. Perry. The motion on the floor is to support this proposal, and really what the 40 41 Council's work is here is to provide comments to the 42 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And in the 43 discussion, I'm not sure if we're still split or if 44 most of the Council wants to oppose this -- like 45 provide comment to the Fish and Game that we oppose 46 this proposal, so if we get to a vote to not support 47 this -- basically if we turn this motion on the floor

down, will we need to take subsequent action to make

sure that we all agree that we're providing comment to

48

49

0248 1 oppose the proposal in our response to the Board of 2 Fish. 3 4 MS. PERRY: Thanks for the question, 5 Madame Chair. I think it would be cleaner to go ahead and vote on the current motion that you have regarding 6 7 whether this Council wants to put in a comment to support the proposal. And if you find, through that vote, that the Council majority is to oppose the 9 10 proposal, then you could follow that up with a motion 11 to make a comment the same way. Again, this is just 12 voting to make comment. 13 14 So that's my suggestion going forward, 15 to go ahead and proceed with the current motion you 16 have on the table. If you see that the majority is in 17 opposition, then the Council, if they so choose, can 18 make a motion to send a comment to the Board of Fish 19 opposing this proposal. 20 21 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 22 you for that clarification. I just want to make sure 23 that we all understood what we were doing as we 24 potentially come to a vote on this proposal. 25 26 At this time I'd ask if there's any 27 other Council comments. 28 29 MR. HOWARD: One last one, Madame 30 Chair. 31 32 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 33 Howard. 34 35 MR. HOWARD: It's Albert. 36 37 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard, 38 you have the floor. 39 40 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. 41 Based on Mr. Douville's comments that there is no other 42 impact by any other subsistence user -- or any other 43 user of the resource and also based on what you said, 44 that this doesn't come from Klawock Cooperative 45 Association, I'm going to have to agree with Mr. 46 Douville and yourself, and Mr. Kitka, and not support 47 this based on the conservation concern. 48

So, thank you, Madame Chair.

49

0249	
1	Call for the question.
2	outi for the question.
3	VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the
4	question's been called. Mr. Wright, I think we're
5	probably going to need a roll call vote on this.
6	Again, for the Council, understanding the motion on the
7	floor is to support to provide comments to support
8	this proposal so by voting yes you are voting that you
9	would like for us to support it, and by voting nay you
10	would be voting that we would not support it and we may
11	need subsequent action after that.
12	
13	Mr. Wright.
14	
15	MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madame Chair.
16	
17	Cal Casipit.
18	ND CLOTHER W
19	MR. CASIPIT: No.
20 21	MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
22	MR. WRIGHT. MICHAEL DOUVILLE.
23	MR. DOUVILLE: No.
24	FIX. DOOVIEED. NO.
25	MR. WRIGHT: James Slater.
26	
27	MR. SLATER: No.
28	
29	MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.
30	
31	(No comments)
32	MD MDTCHE. Albert Hererd
33 34	MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
35	MR. HOWARD: No.
36	inc. noming. No.
37	MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.
38	
39	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: No.
40	
41	MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.
42	
43	MR. ROBBINS: No.
44	MD WDICHT. Hawrey Vitto
45 46	MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
47	MR. KITKA: No.
48	FII(. I(LII(1). IVO.
49	MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
50	

```
0250
 1
                     (No comments)
 2
 3
                     MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
 4
 5
                     (No comments)
 6
 7
                     MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.
 8
 9
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: No.
10
11
                     MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.
12
13
                     MR. JOHNSON: No.
14
15
                     MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes no.
    Motion carries, Madame Chair, to object.
16
17
18
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
19
     Wright. Essentially the motion failed. So does the
20
     Council wish to take any other action on Proposal 130.
21
22
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair, request we
23
    break for lunch.
24
25
                     MR. HOWARD: Second.
26
27
                     (Laughter)
28
29
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: That is not a
30
     formal motion, it was a request. I would like to break
31
     for lunch. I think we can quickly decide if we want to
32
     take action -- if we want to provide comment to oppose
33
     this. Somebody could simply make a motion that we
34
    provide an opposition to this proposal to the Board of
35
     Fish in our letter based -- and we could base it on all
    of our previous discussion, from the previous action,
36
37
     and we could get this one ticked off really quick if
38
     you wanted to do that.
39
40
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this
41
    is Don.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr.
44
     Hernandez.
45
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, I think I
46
47
     don't know if it requires a motion but I think we
48
     should include in our letter to the Board of Fish that,
49
     you know, pointing out that the Council did oppose this
```

0251 proposal and if the letter could include a summary of some of the reasons that were given, I think that would 2 be appropriate. 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 6 you, Mr. Hernandez. Ms. Perry, would that suffice for 7 drafting of our letter that we're going to actually 8 pass later? 9 10 MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, I would 11 suggest that it be a motion and a vote just to keep the 12 record clean because we are making motions for 13 supportive comments, so I think any comment, again, for 14 a clear record, we should just go ahead and have a 15 quick vote. And the motion would be, you know, a 16 motion to have a comment in opposition to Proposal 130. 17 That would be my suggestion. 18 19 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair. 20 21 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard. 22 23 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. 24 Has this Council ever opposed anyone's proposal in the 25 past? 26 27 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, if you 28 look on the -- or actually I guess it's not up on Teams 29 anymore but we did work last meeting on a number of 30 these Board of Fish proposals and it looks like we did 31 oppose Proposal 134 and we provided comments to oppose 32 134 and 161 of those so we did do it this last meeting, 33 basically we -- and we provided a rationale of why we 34 opposed the proposal. 35 36 MR. HOWARD: So, Madame Chair, do you 37 need a motion to write a letter in opposition? 38 39 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. What we 40 would need is a motion to provide a comment in 41 opposition to Proposal 130 to the Board of Fish. 42 43 MR. HOWARD: I'll make that motion, 44 Madame Chair. 45 46 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a second. 47

MR. ROBBINS: Second.

48

0252 1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second. 2 3 MR. JOHNSON: This is Ian, I second. 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: So there were a 6 number of a seconds in there. 7 8 MS. PERRY: I believe I heard Harold 9 first. 10 11 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr. 12 Robbins seconded the motion. We've had quite a bit of 13 discussion, I think that we can just guide -- when we 14 write this letter that we use all of the discussion of 15 why we're opposed to this when we were discussing the previous motion that was on the floor. Unless anybody 16 17 else has anything they would like to add to the 18 conversation, otherwise, I would entertain the question 19 to the motion. 20 21 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'll call for the 22 question. 23 24 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 25 Hernandez. I would -- since the vote before on 26 supporting it was -- everybody was in agreement I would 27 recommend that we do this vote by unanimous consent, 28 and I'll ask if there's any opposition for a unanimous 29 consent on this motion. 30 31 (No opposition) 32 33 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Hearing none, the 34 Regional Advisory Council will provide comments in 35 opposition to Proposal 130 in our comments to the Board 36 of Fish. And now I'd like to entertain Mr. Douville's 37 request for us to break for lunch. I know Chairman 38 Hernandez did want to try to get through all of these 39 proposals before lunch. We have three more left that we haven't put much work into or made decisions on, and 40 41 then ones that we put some work into but might need to 42 do some housekeeping on before we have done all of our 43 due diligence for providing comments to the Board of 44 Fish on proposals. So I just want to throw that out 45 there that we didn't meet his objective of finishing

46

47

48 49

50

to cleaning this up.

And so if everyone is okay maybe taking

before lunch but I think that we're really on our way

```
0253
    a shortened lunch hour like we did yesterday of 45
    minutes and reconvening at 1:00 o'clock, I'd like to
    recess until then.
 4
 5
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair.
 6
 7
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
 8
 9
                     (Laughter)
10
11
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Two folks at once.
12
     Was that Mr. Howard or Mr. Douville.
13
14
                     MR. HOWARD: Both. Just real quick
15
     though. I know I talked about getting king salmon
     recognized as a subsistence use fishery and I don't see
16
17
     that proposal, maybe I missed it. I think that's
     something important to the community members of Angoon
18
19
    because it's been no consideration to the subsistence
20
    users.
21
22
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, is
23
     there a proposal in the Board of Fish proposal book
24
     that addresses that, do you know?
25
26
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, I didn't see
27
     one.
28
29
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.
30
    don't have a fisheries proposal book before me so.....
31
32
                     MS. KENNER: Madame Chair, this is
33
     Pippa.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Pippa.
36
     Please.
37
38
                     MS. KENNER: For the record this is
39
     Pippa Kenner. It's Proposal 125 and it's at the bottom
40
     of your list because it had already been processed and
41
     submitted and commented on by the Council.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
44
     Kenner. So that and Mr. Howard, when we go back to
     Board of Fish comments, if you would like to bring that
45
46
    particular proposal back to the table to talk about it,
47
     even though we voted to support it and provided a
48
     rationale, you can do so at that time.
```

```
0254
 1
                     Mr. Douville, did you have a comment,
 2
     or question.
 3
 4
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I think we have until
 5
     December sometime to make comments on these Board of
 6
     Fish proposals, it was rescheduled until 2022, you
 7
     know, so if I'm correct, it doesn't mean that we have
 8
     to scramble to get through these.
 9
10
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
11
     Douville. That is a good point. I know when we
     planned this meeting we wanted to try to wrap up
12
     comments at this meeting if we could in anticipation
13
14
     that there might be a lot of wildlife proposals at that
15
     meeting, but I think after lunch we can tackle whether
16
     or not we want to table the last three or four until
17
     the next meeting so that we can use our time this
18
     meeting on other actions that we need to take, but also
19
     maintain some efficiency so we don't take up too much
20
     time at the next meeting. So I appreciate you bringing
21
     that back to our attention.
22
23
                     And, again, I'd like to recess until
24
     1:00 o'clock for lunch.
25
26
                     (Off record)
27
28
                     (On record)
29
30
                     MS. PERRY: Albert Howard.
31
32
                     (No comments)
33
34
                     MS. PERRY: Albert Howard have you
35
     rejoined us?
36
37
                     (No comments)
38
39
                     MS. PERRY: Okay.
                                        Harold Robbins.
40
41
                     MR. ROBBINS: I'm here.
42
43
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Harold.
44
45
                     Harvey Kitka.
46
47
                     MR. KITKA: I'm here but I got to leave
48
     at 4:30.
49
50
```

```
0255
 1
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thanks, Harvey.
 2
 3
                     Larry, I just heard you and Don I just
 4
     heard you. Cathy I just heard you.
 5
 6
                     Ian Johnson.
 7
 8
                     (No comments)
 9
10
                     MS. PERRY: Frank Wright.
11
12
                     (No comments)
13
14
                     MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
15
16
                     MR. CASIPIT: I'm here.
17
18
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Cal.
19
20
                     Mike Douville.
21
22
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Mike Douville's here.
23
24
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mike.
25
26
                     Jim Slater.
27
28
                     MR. SLATER: Hi DeAnna, I'm here.
29
30
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you. And I believe
     Bob Schroeder is still out this afternoon.
31
32
33
                     (No comments)
34
35
                     MS. PERRY: I'll check once more for
36
     Albert Howard.
37
38
                     MR. WRIGHT: Frank's here.
39
40
                     MS. PERRY: Albert was that you?
41
42
                     MR. WRIGHT: Frank.
43
44
                     MS. PERRY: Oh, Frank. Thank you,
     Frank. And, Ian Johnson. I know Ian was kind of back
45
46
     and forth today. Ian, are you with us at present.
47
48
                     MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I am present.
49
50
```

0256 1 MS. PERRY: Thank you. All right, Madame Chair. We have 10 of your 12 seated Council 2 members, you have a quorum. 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, DeAnna, 6 for doing that roll call. 7 8 Mr. Douville, I have a question for 9 you. One of our potential actions was to address the 10 proposal that's going before the Board of Game 11 tomorrow, the special action proposal. Do you think 12 that a half an hour is enough time to actually just 13 talk about that specific proposal before we have a time 14 certain for Mr. Stewart at 1:30? 15 16 (No comments)

17 18

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville, are

you online?

MR. DOUVILLE: I don't -- I suppose it I don't know how to respond really. I do have my statement on the proposal.

23 24 25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Given that it has the potential for being a longer discussion, I mean I was just trying to gage whether or not we could formulate or give guidance on what comments we think we're going to come forward with for that Board of Game proposal, just the one proposal, not the wolf issue as a broader issue. But if it's going to be more than a half an hour, then maybe we will try to clean up comments for Board of Fish proposals before Mr. Stewart's time certain at 1:30.

34 35 36

If there's any opposition to that plan now is the time to speak.

37 38 39

(No opposition)

40 41

42

44

45

46

47

48

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing no opposition. The Council -- we have three more proposals that need for us to decide if we want to take a position. These three are Proposals 131, 132 and 133 in our road map and they start on the back side of the third page of that map. They're not -- they're only similar in that they all deal with a regulation that has to do with the Redoubt Bay Lake Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management Plan. Two of them, Proposal 131

```
0257
     and 132 were both submitted by the Sitka Tribe of
     Alaska. And the Council did have a little bit of
     discussion on this -- on these two proposals but we
     didn't establish a position. At that time we did not
 5
    have a representative from Sitka Tribe on our Council
 6
     to provide local input back to us.
 7
 8
                     Actually I'm mistaken, only 131 was by
 9
     Sitka Tribe of Alaska.
10
11
                     So would anybody like to make a motion
     about whether or not we want to provide comments to
12
13
     Board of Fish for Proposal 131 which is Redoubt Bay
14
     Sockeye Salmon Fisheries Management Plan. It would be
15
     to modify the fishing area and hand purse seine as
16
     legal gear for the Redoubt Bay and Lake subsistence
17
     salmon fishery.
18
19
20
                     (No comments)
21
22
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.
23
24
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, this is
25
     Harvey Kitka.
26
27
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM:
                                          Thank you,
28
    Mr.Kitka.
29
30
                     MR. KITKA:
                                 I move that we support
31
     Proposal 131.
32
33
                     MR. HOWARD: Second. Albert Howard.
34
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
35
36
     Kitka and Mr. Howard. Mr. Kitka, I'd like to call on
37
     you, this was provided by the Sitka Tribe and I was
38
     wondering if you could refresh the Council on what the
39
     intent of this proposal is, if you know.
40
41
                     MR. KITKA: I'll do my best. I sat and
42
     talked with them about this and the tribe wants a
43
     community seine permit for inside a closed area of one
44
     of the commercial fishery we don't get to really
45
     because -- when they went out with a community harvest
46
    permit they weren't allowed to go inside so after about
47
     three days of catching just two fish out there, it
48
     wasn't worth the wait, even though there's access
49
     (indiscernible - muffled) escapement, they're still
```

having a commercial fishery out in front but it's impossible for them to spend the whole day and catch only one or two fish so it wasn't a conservation concern that they decided to ask — to see if they could do a seine fishery in a little closer and modify where they could go and where they couldn't go. They were going to stay outside the snagging zone, which is closer to the stream. They figured it'd be okay for a seine but out where the snaggers don't — don't try to fish because you can't anchor and snag at the same place. It drops off pretty fast when it gets in there.

So -- but this is -- there's a lot of things -- we thought that eventually they'd just work on and basically it was just for a purse seine because the beaches aren't really great for beach seine, most of the beach is straight up and down. So there were things that needed to be worked out but they wanted to try to see if the State would consider it.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Kitka.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ KITKA: If there's any questions. Any questions.

(Laughter)

 $$\operatorname{VICE}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any questions for Mr. Kitka or any Council that have comments on the proposal.

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

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Yeah, Harvey. So there's no conservation concern at all on the return, like you said this is only a tactical issue, not a conservation issue.

MR. KITKA: Yes. This is not a conservation concern here. They have an excessive amount for their escapement but the problem is is that the fish, they don't go back out past the marker, it's a long ways out of the bay and the fish stay fairly close to the stream. Once they make it past everybody out there they -- they don't go back out past the line.

```
0259
     I think they can read the signs.
 2
 3
                     (Laughter)
 4
 5
                     MR. SLATER: Okay. All, right, well,
 6
     thank you.
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are
 9
     there any other comments from Council.
10
11
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: This is Don -- go
14
     ahead, Mike.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, Mr.
17
     Douville.
18
19
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I have a question for
20
     Harvey.
21
22
                     MR. KITKA: Go ahead, Mike.
23
24
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Harvey, I guess the
25
    beach seine, the ones we use have a purse line on them,
     we can purse them, we don't have to get on the beach,
26
27
     I'm sure if you're talking about using a more
     commercial type of seine or what your restrictions are,
28
29
    but evidently there's a line you can't fish inside of,
30
    or is a beach seine traditional gear for there, or
31
    maybe you could clarify some of what goes on there,
32
     okay.
33
34
                     MR. KITKA: Okay. A beach seine, yeah,
35
     the traditional one wouldn't have a purse line on it.
36
     This is where you pull it up on the beach. The purse
37
     seine is -- and the same as a beach seine, except it's
38
     got a purse seine on them and you can purse it up,
39
     they're both about the same length. The commercial
40
     zone is quite a ways out. The tribe is proposing that
41
     we don't go into the area where the personal use people
42
     are snagging for sockeyes, we're proposing to have that
43
     area and not bother it but to stay outside that line.
44
45
                     Does that help you Mike.
46
47
                     MR. DOUVILLE: No, not really. I was
48
     wondering, have you used beach seines there in the past
49
     or was there a restriction, it sounds like there's an
50
```

area where the snagging goes on, but is it otherwise restricted. It sounds like you're restricted to a line that the commercial boats use.

MR. KITKA: We're restricted to the line the commercial boats use. We're not allowed up in the bay for a seine or for anything other than dipnetting and snagging.

MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah.

MR. THYNES: Madame Chair, this is Troy Thynes with Fish and Game, if I can try to help provide some clarification with this proposal.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, Mr. Thynes.

MR. THYNES: Just to let you know, so this proposal is specifically to do with community permit. There's two different types of permits, one is just your standard household subsistence personal use permit, and then the other is the community permit. The community permit is allowed when the escapement is projected to be greater than 40,000 fish. So if the sockeye escapement at Redoubt Lake is greater than 40,000 fish then community permits are allowed. So there's no conservation concern with community permits. And what this proposal would do is just increase that area and make it similar, not exactly the same as the individual permits, but make it similar and certainly bring those boundaries much further up in the bay as it signifies, within 100 years of the falls so the area would be increased, and then again it would allow hand purse seines. So the difference between a hand purse seine and a beach seine, by Fish and Game definitions, is the beach seine is deployed from the beach and pulled back from the beach, whereas a hand purse seine can be in open water, it doesn't necessarily need to be deployed from the beach but certainly different from the commercial users, the pursing would be done by hand.

So I don't know if that helps at all.

So this proposal would essentially more align the fishing area and techniques with the regular individual household permit.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank

0261 you for that Mr. Thynes. Mr. Douville, does that clarify for you? 2 4 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, I was just 5 curious. I know they use beach seines but, you know, whether it has purse strings or not you can still purse 6 7 the lead line, I mean we used to do that too. So I was just trying to understand what the net restriction was, 9 so it sounds like it's different for a community 10 permit. So that's all I had. 11 12 Thank you. 13 14 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Mr. 15 Thynes, I appreciate that clarification. Could you answer a quick question about how Proposal 131 may be 16 17 -- is it because it's a community use permit and 18 Proposal 133 is not the community use permit, is that 19 -- are those the main differences between those two 20 proposals? 21 22 MR. THYNES: That's correct. Proposal 23 131 is specific to the community permit, whereas 133 is 24 specific to the gear allowed in the household, or 25 individual permit. 26 27 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 28 you for that. Are there any other comments or 29 questions from the Council regarding Proposal 131. 30 31 MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Calvin 32 Casipit. 33 34 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Go ahead, Mr. 35 Casipit. 36 37 MR. CASIPIT: I don't have any 38 questions for Staff, I just have an observation for 39 Proposal 131. I would like to thank Mr. Thynes for his summary of what 131 does, I understand what's going on 40 there. I don't think there's a conservation concern 41 42 because this only kicks in when there's more than 40,000 fish in the projected escapement. This is 44 basically, the way I read it is basically an amendment 45 to the Redoubt Bay Sockeye Management Plan and, you 46 know, that had a lot of input in the beginning and a 47 lot of work and, you know, I know the Council back then

supported that kind of work. This seems like a -- it's

just a way to make it easier for people to use the

48

49

```
0262
     community harvest permit. Like I said there's no
     conservation issues because it's only operating when
     there's more than 40,000 fish escapement and, you know,
     it helps subsistence users meet their needs.
 5
 6
                     So I'm in support of this and I'm going
 7
     to support this when I vote on it. So I just thought
     I'd lay that out there. I don't see a big problem with
 8
 9
     this.
10
11
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
12
    Casipit. Are there other comments from the Council.
13
14
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
15
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville.
16
17
18
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I just had to get real
19
     good clarification so if there's 40,000 fish up there,
20
     I'm going to be up there helping Harvey, I'll run up in
21
    my speedboat.
22
23
                     (Laughter)
24
25
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Understood. Are
26
    there other comments from the Council.
27
28
                     MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, Jim Slater.
29
30
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair. Excuse me
31
    if I'm out of line but this is Terry Suminski.
32
33
                     MR. SLATER: Go ahead, Terry.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, Mr.
36
     Douville, were you saying something or is that feedback
37
     that I'm getting.
38
39
                     (No comments)
40
41
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Mr.
42
     Suminski, you have the floor.
43
44
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you, Madame Chair.
45
     I know you're asking for Council comments but I just
46
     wanted to point out that in the road map, the
47
     rationale, that was not rationale from the Council,
48
     that was just some notes that I put in there to think
49
     about and remind, you know, maybe want to talk about.
```

I don't think there's a big problem with this proposal.

 The original management plan was created because of gear type conflict. So having a seine fishery butt right up to the snagging line where people are parking their boats and anchoring and all that kind of stuff could be a bit of a problem, but I think it could be easily solved by just moving that —you know the community harvest line out just a little bit, you know, just give some space between the two fisheries. But that's — I'm sure that'll all be talked about at the Board of Fish meeting.

So thank you for allowing me to put that on. And you may want to, you know, just give a new rationale there.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim Slater.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for that clarification Mr. Suminski. So for Council members that are reading this proposal, just understand that that rationale is a note from Staff so we do need to establish our position on this and make sure we have covered it. And somebody else, another Council member had a comment.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ \operatorname{SLATER}:\ \operatorname{Yeah},\ \operatorname{hi},\ \operatorname{Madame}\ \operatorname{Chair}.$ Madame Chair, this is Jim Slater.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Basically a question, as we weigh in on these different proposals, I'm wondering, if we make a decision for a specific area or support a position for a certain area, do we have to consider the effects on setting a precedent for other areas or can each individual area be viewed independently?

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Slater. So we aren't -- we are only working on whether or not this Council would like to provide comment on proposals for -- to the Board of Fish. The Board of Fish still makes the decision, based on everything they hear from the public and local ACs, but they also would take public comment from this body, so the discussion can talk about precedence but I don't think that it

influences -- the proposal doesn't get changed or anything at this time, necessarily, it just establishes a record for us so that we know whether or not we have enough support to provide comment back to the Board of Fish.

MR. SLATER: And I guess what I was trying to determine if they -- maybe not exactly for this proposal, but as we consider something and it's kind of changing a regulation in a certain area, do we expect that that then will be applied to other areas as well, or is that just something that's totally up to the Board of Fish and that we would leave it up to them and just kind of have to interpret what they do based on our experience.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I think it would be totally up to the Board of Fish and whatever input that they receive and their discussion as well. It wouldn't automatically apply to other areas outside of what's covered in the actual proposal itself. But if I'm wrong on that Staff can correct me.

MR. SLATER: Okay.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Did I answer your

question?

MR. SLATER: Yes, that's fine.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay.

MR. SLATER: Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Uh-huh. Are there other comments from the Council on Proposal 131, keeping in mind that we need to establish a rationale as we.....

MR. KITKA: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: Yes. Part of the rationale is that there is no conservation concern. This is designed for community type permits and not for individuals. This is also a safety concern. The run to Redoubt from Sitka is considerably shorter than trying to run through Hanus Bay or Klag Bay or Redfish

```
0265
     Bay, either one of those are close to 70 miles away and
     this is -- this would be in times of conservation as
    part of how much fuel costs is important. This would
    have no real direct effect on other users as we see it.
 5
 6
                     Thank you.
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for that
 9
    Mr. Kitka. Other comments from Council.
10
11
                     (No comments)
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'd like to call
14
     for the question.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, the
17
     question's been called. The motion on the floor is to
18
     provide support -- provide comment to the Board of Fish
19
     in support of Proposal 131. Mr. Wright, would you
20
    please do a roll call vote.
21
22
                     MR. WRIGHT: Can you hear me?
23
24
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
25
26
                     MR. WRIGHT: Okay, I thought I had it
27
    muted. Okay.
28
29
                     Ian Johnson.
30
31
                     MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
32
33
                     MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
36
37
                     MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
38
39
                     MR. BEMIS: Yes.
40
41
                     MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
42
43
                     MR. KITKA: Yes.
44
45
                     MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.
46
47
                     MR. ROBBINS: Yes.
48
49
                     MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.
```

0266	
1 2	CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
3	MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
5 6	MR. HOWARD: Yes.
7 8	Bob Schroeder.
9 10	(No comments)
11 12	MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.
13 14	MR. SLATER: Yes.
15 16	MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
17 18	MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
19 20	MR. WRIGHT: Calvin Casipit.
21 22	MR. CASIPIT: Yeah.
23 24	MR. WRIGHT: Frank votes yes. Motion passed.
25	passea.
26 27 28	VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Wright. Ms. Perry, do you know if Mr. Stewart is available?
29	
30 31 32	MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, I don't see him on Teams but we should check on the phone, Forest Supervisor Earl Stewart, have you dialed in yet.
33	
	MR. STEWART: Yes, ma'am, I have. I am available for Madame Chair and the Committee.
36 37	MS. PERRY: Thank you.
38 39	VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
40	you very much, Mr. Stewart, for joining us. I
41	understand that you've asked for this time certain spot
42	to discuss some of the Forest Service updates and so
43	the floor is yours.
44	MD CHEMADH. Madows Chair and marks
45 46	MR. STEWART: Madame Chair and members of the Southeast Subsistence RAC, thank you for
47	allowing me time on your schedule today. I think that
48	I had several topics to cover that were requested from
49	several of the Forest management projects to a minerals
50	

project, can provide additional information above and beyond on other projects as we move forward.

2 3 4

Do appreciate -- there's a few of the members that I'm going to have to ask for assistance with as we go through -- if we get into questions and answers, because I'm not on Teams, I'm only on the phone, so it's going to be a little hard to track with that, so any assistance there would be sincerely appreciated in transferring the question to the proper party there.

In the U.S. Forest Service, we're an executive branch agency under the Department of Agriculture. It's important as I start off today to recognize that with the change of Administrations there are changes in actions. In this particular case, the suspension of certain actions pending National review. This does happen with pretty much any Administration change and in this particular case, it's so that the Presidential appointees will have time both to take their seats in the new Administration, but also review things to assure they're aligned with the Administration's National objectives. As we work through that there are several projects on the Tongass National Forest that are under such review to make sure that they align with the Agency -- with the Administration's executive -- President Executive Orders and the Administration's efforts toward climate change and then concur with past Administration issues on items such as the 2013 Secretary of Agriculture's letter to transfer from old growth to young growth.

As I go into these projects on Forest Management it's important to realize that there is no decision at this time. I'm simply trying to work forward and share with you all that the timing of the National review may have an impact on some of the time schedules, but that as would be expected and certainly could impact both South Revillagigedo, Twin Mountain II, and the Central Tongass Project.

My name is Earl Stewart, I'm the Forest Supervisor for the Tongass National Forest. As I indicated, I sincerely appreciate your time today. And I'll go through and try to provide you an update on each of those projects as we go forward.

For South Revillagigedo, the first one,

which is on the Ketchikan Misty Ranger District, the final environmental impact statement and Draft Record of Decision are pending, possibly to be released during 2021. At this point in time I don't know what that 5 date will be following the Administration change and 6 the National review. But once it is released it will 7 trigger the 45 day objection period. South Revillagigedo is an integrated resource project to 8 9 improve Forest health, support community resilience and 10 provide for economic development. It is set up in a 11 range to cover a 15 year period from timber harvest to 12 restoring water sheds to enhancing and restoring 13 habitat and developing recreation opportunities.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

Since the initial scoping period and comments, there have been several refinements produced and the refinements include a reduction in the harvest acreage and volume and new road construction and temporary road construction reductions as well. addition to that, a more detailed review of the timber harvest design that helps clarify both how the habitat and the wildlife travel corridors could be affected by that and how the proposed scenery management amendment would apply. The project seeks to help restore and enhance habitat for fish and wildlife through in-stream wood placement, riparian thinning, blasting partial fish barriers, culvert replacement, and/or removal, and then to enhance the recreational access to Shelter Cove and Saddle Lakes area. At this point in time it's projected to initially yield about 68 million board feet in timber and cover roughly 6,100 acres, so it'll be different varieties of (indiscernible) cultural treatments and it'd be hosted over an entire 44,000 acre analysis area on the district there.

343536

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

The next project I'll update you on would be the Twin Mountain II. This location is on Prince of Wales Island. Currently, the next step in this process is the draft environmental impact statement for Twin Mountain II being released. I don't have a date, once, again, for this one being released but upon release it would trigger, also, a 45 day public comment period. Twin Mountain II timber sale project is intended to provide resources and support the viable timber industry in Southeast Alaska and provide jobs and opportunities for Southeast Alaska residents, while also maintaining the expertise and the infrastructure of the existing timber industry during transition from old growth to young growth. It does

2

4

follow the multiple use mandate of the National Forest. And at this point in time it's projected to provide approximately 30 million board feet covering about 1,800 acres on Prince of Wales. It does involve both conventional and helicopter units.

5 6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

The third project of Forest Management is Central Tongass. And at this point in time a supplemental draft environment impact statement is being prepared and will be provided once it's cleared at the -- once it's cleared it'll also then be responsive to public feedback that we've already received. It's intended to support jobs and local economy and the regional -- local and regional economies and contribute to improve terrestrial and aquatic conditions and support viable subsistence resources and provide safe access for users. At this point in time it's proposed to currently provide 67 miles of in-stream restoration along with 25 fisheries improvements, new cabin construction and trail improvements and approximately 45,000 acres of young growth, pre-commercial and wildlife thinning treatments in addition to trail construction and maintenance. Projection on this one is just over 100 million board feet for the entire project over 15 years.

252627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

The next project that I was asked to provide the subcommittee -- the Committee with, an update on was Hecla Greens Creek and the expansion there. At this point in time it's planned to be completed from the scoping that was received from last year and then move forward toward a draft environmental impact statement. Hecla Greens Creek and the Tongass National Forest entered into an MOU to conduct a thirdparty environmental analysis on the north extension project. The project is to provide additional estimated 4 to 5 million cubic yards of tailings and waste rock storage while allowing for mineral production at the mine site to continue well into 2030. The Forest Service recognizes the importance of the mineral resources to the well being of the national and encourages bonafide mineral operations and exploration and development as part of a multiple use mandate. At this time our experts are also working towards minimizing the impacts of the mining activities on other resources.

46 47 48

That's the four projects, Madame Chair, that were specifically identified. I can provide

```
0270
     updates on other projects of if the Committee prefers
     we can go to an Q and A session and project it that
 2
     way.
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
 6
    you, Mr. Stewart, for that synopsis of projects
 7
     occurring in the Forest Service. I would like to find
    out if any Council members have any specific questions
 9
     for Mr. Stewart on the projects that he covered.
10
11
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this
12
    is Don.
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.
15
16
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you,
17
    Cathy. Thank you, Earl, for giving us the update. I
18
    did miss there at the start you said that existing -- {\tt I}
19
    believe that you said existing projects would be under
20
    review, was that the South Revillagigedo, Twin Mountain
21
    and Central Tongass Plans, are they all under review by
    this new Administration?
22
23
24
                     MR. STEWART: Yes, sir, that is
25
    correct, Mr. Herna -- or excuse me, through the Chair.
26
    Yes, sir, Mr. Hernandez, that is correct. South
27
    Revillagigedo, Twin Mountain II, and Central Tongass
28
    are all currently under review in the new
29
    Administration.
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
32
     Just one followup. I believe Dave Schmid told us
33
     yesterday that the review of the Roadless Rule, I
34
    think, was supposed to be concluded by the end of
35
    March, is that the same for these other projects or do
36
    they have a different timeframe?
37
38
                     MR. STEWART: Through the Chair for Mr.
39
    Hernandez. I don't actually have a date or a timeline
    that's been given to me so I unfortunately can't give
40
41
    any detail. It's my understanding that the typical
42
    review is a few months and so I just don't know what
43
    that time clock started or when that time would end,
44
    but I could certainly project that something towards
45
    the end of March or April might be reasonable. I just
46
    don't know how -- I don't have a specific answer for
47
     you, sir.
48
49
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. That's
```

```
0271
     probably close enough. Yeah, thank you very much.
 2
 3
                     MR. STEWART: Thank you, sir.
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, are
 6
     there other comments from Council members for Mr.
 7
     Stewart.
 8
 9
                     (No comments)
10
11
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: At this time I'd
12
     ask if there's any other comments from Council members
13
     regarding other Forest Service activities that might
14
     not include these projects.
15
16
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Cathy, this is Don
17
     again.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr.
20
     Hernandez.
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I'd like to
23
     ask Mr. Stewart about the progress of this transition
24
     to young growth management that he mentioned. I
25
    believe you said that that was an initiative that was
26
     announced back in 2013, and it sounds like we're
27
     getting about eight years into that and I don't know if
28
     there's any -- you know, what kind of progress has been
29
    made towards this transition to young growth
30
    management. And given, you know, in light of you just
31
    kind of outlined some timber projects that are in the
32
    works that extend, you know, 15 years into the future
33
     and it seems like that kind of goes well beyond when
34
    this transition was supposed to take place. I'm kind
35
     of wondering what the plan is here, what's the -- you
36
     know, what's the progress, what's the outlook?
37
38
                     MR. STEWART: In response through the
39
     Chair, Mr. Hernandez. That's a wonderful question,
40
     sir, thank you for bringing it up. For edification of
41
     the entire Committee, the 2013 date is referencing the
42
     2013 Secretary's Memo. Secretary Vilsack, and prior
43
    Administration, in 2013 issued a memo to the Forest
44
     Service to look at an opportunity to transition from
45
     old growth to young growth. The expectations of that
46
    were to meet the social, economic and ecological needs
47
    of the communities in Southeast Alaska in
48
     transitioning from old growth to young growth and
```

recognizing that would work through the Tongass

49

Advisory Committee, another Federal Advisory Committee. In working through that, that's what led to the 2016 Forest Plan Amendment that was signed in December 2016 that set out for a path of transition, recognizing that it's not a complete transition from old growth to young growth because there was the recognition throughout that about 5 million board feet was needed on an annual basis for small operators and value added products and principally that would be represented by music would and possibly other elements. And then, in addition to that, the recognition that there should be a timeline necessary to allow the young growth both to grow and develop to where it was sufficient size and also for the operations to actually be able to build a business that could then operate off of young growth. And so all of that compiled together came to the acknowledgement and the recognition in the 2016 Plan Amendment that that timeline was roughly 16 years out. So as Mr. Hernandez notes the 2013 wasn't really the starting point for that, it really became the Forest Plan Amendment 2016 that recognized about a 16 year transition to where old growth volumes would continue to reduce and young growth volumes would increase until a point in time that young growth became the predominant use.

Right now we're about roughly five years into that, or close to five years into that, and so we're in the process now of doing what's referred to as a five year review of the Forest Plan Amendment from 2016. That'll be conducted probably later this calendar year and then that'll set the phase up -- the next phase up about a pre-assessment, or an assessment to determine if any additional work needs to be done, if new information is available or if a change in that Forest Plan Amendment would be necessary.

I hope that helps, Mr. Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, very much so. I wasn't aware that there was a five year review of that Forest Plan. So I guess that leads to the question of does that review involve public participation or is that strictly within the agency?

MR. STEWART: It's a multi-phased process but effectively the five year review would be an internal review to determine where the -- is there additional scientific information, or the expectations

that were issued, or the determinations that were made, were they (indiscernible - muffled) were they completed, or is there additional information that's necessary. So for the most part, the work in the five year review toward the end of this calendar year would be an internal operation. But as I progress from that, then you get into a pre-assessment and an assessment that could then lead into a public process, it would be outgoing years and so very likely a year or two down the line there would be a much more public process that would then take in the new information and try to incorporate the public interest, which could ultimately lead to a Forest Plan revision or amendment.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you, very much. That's new information to us and could be of some interest so thank you very much.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STEWART: Truly an honor, sir, thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there other Council comments regarding the young growth transition.

MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Kitka.

MR. KITKA: I guess I have one question. Are they going to provide a buffer between the old growth and the next cutting, is there going to be enough of a buffer there for wildlife to survive and have winter protection and how long a period between the cuttings?

MR. STEWART: Through the Chair. Mr. Kitka, thank you for that question. I'm not able to give you a very specific or detailed answer because every project is independent and individual. Generally speaking, there is a significant interest in providing for winter habitat for deer and other species, specifically winter habitat, and the need from that, to be able to move forward productively. And so as we go through project by project, they could provide a much more detailed analysis on expectations, but generally speaking at a larger scale, there is a continued interest in providing wintering habitat and corridors for travel along with the separating out areas, if you will, into unique habitat components.

1 So I don't have a detailed answer based on a specific project but generally speaking, sir, 2 that's true. 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 6 Harvey, did you have any followup or is that Stewart. 7 sufficient? 8 9 MR. KITKA: That was sufficient. 10 11 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are 12 there any other comments or questions from the Council 13 regarding the 2016 Forest Plan Amendment and young 14 growth transition. 15 16 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair. 17 18 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright. 19 20 MR. WRIGHT: Excuse my ignorance, but 21 under review means what, does it mean that they start from the beginning and -- since a new Administration 22 23 came in you start from the beginning and throw out the 24 plan, or do you just review the plan and I was 25 wondering about when kind of exactly do we get involved 26 in making comments about it after the review is up 27 because, you know, it seems like we always get left behind and then we're trying to do catch up so I'm just 28 29 curious what that entails, what that means, because 30 when you say under review, it means the new 31 Administration's looking it over and then what? 32 33 Thank you, Madame Chair. 34 35 MR. STEWART: Through the Chair. Mr. 36 Wright, thank you for the question, sir. And it really 37 depends, if it pleases the Committee, it's kind of two 38 different processes that happen to be intertwined. 39 With an Administration change, the new Administration 40 wants to make sure that any projects that are going 41 forward meet the Administration's National interest or 42 objectives. In this particular case the Tongass has 43 several projects that we've mentioned as it relates to 44 current Executive Orders and making sure they're 45 aligned with the Administration, President's Executive 46 Orders, or climate change, or even a connectivity to 47 the 2013 Secretary of Agriculture's memo.

0274

48 49

50

As to -- once that is done, there will

either be, as I understand it, I'm not in a specialist in this by any means, the projects will either by authorized to go forward, they could be directed to change or to reroute some aspect of it, or some 5 provision, or they could be held. I don't know what the right answer is right now. But for each of those 7 three projects, if they were allowed to go forward, as we indicated, like South Revillagigedo going to a draft 9 ROD standpoint, there would be a comment period then, 10 Twin Mountain II as it goes forward with a -- would 11 also have a comment period, and then the SCIS (ph)

12 13 14

15

16 17

18

19

If it pleases the Chair and the Committee, if I learn of what the actions are and what time they're going to go forward with, I would be glad to submit a letter to the Southeast Subsistence RAC in an effort of, I guess, transparency and openness so that you're aware, as soon as I am, of activities proceeding forward, if that's helpful.

would have another scoping period for Central Tongass.

20 21 22

And I yield back.

23 24

25

26

27

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. I think we would like correspondence back on that. It's always good to keep the lines of communication open and attempt to have more transparency as we go through these things.

28 29 30

Mr. Wright, did you have a followup.

31 32

MR. WRIGHT: No, I don't. Thank you,

Madame Chair.

33 34 35

36

37

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are there any other Council members who have comment or questions regarding the 2016 Forest Plan Amendment and/or young growth transition.

38 39 40

MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chair, this is Ian.

41 42

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Johnson.

43 44 45

46

47

48

MR. JOHNSON: Hello. I guess I'm kind of aligned with Frank on just asking for some clarification out of my own ignorance. But could you review for us what has been done for South Revillagigedo, Twin Mountain and Central Tongass, what

has been done on evaluating subsistence effects within those projects?

2 3 4

MR. STEWART: Yes, Mr. Johnson, thank you for the question. I don't know that I can get very much more detailed than what you've already heard at this point in time. As I indicated like on South Revillagigedo, still looking at integrated resource project and waiting for approval or clearance, is what it's referred to internally, to release the FEIS and the Draft Record of Decision. A lot of the work in recent months has been refining South Revillagigedo to either use new information, such as updated field data or new modeling opportunities or responding to comments that were received. And then there's been some significant efforts to reduce the effects across resource areas from the all alternative side.

That's the one that I probably have the most detail on because it's at a stage that goes to, like I said, the FEIS and Draft ROD.

Twin Mountain II, less detail could I offer on that one because it's still at the draft environmental impact statement stage and we haven't even been authorized or cleared to release that, which would then start another comment period. So I don't have as much detail on that other than Staff, at the local level, have worked really stridently to try to make sure that each of the alternatives could be realistically or operationally applied.

As you transition over to Central Tongass, Central Tongass is literally in a much earlier stage in a supplemental environmental impact statement and so that one has been shifted around quite a bit trying to figure out where areas of action should -are needed and it's a fairly broad area because it involves both the Petersburg Ranger District and the Wrangell Ranger District, and so trying to determine what those represent. As I indicated with the earlier question with Mr. Wright, there could be changes directed toward any of these, or expected, according to the clearance process, that this might need to be modified or this needs to be changed before it's cleared so I'm really hesitant to give much detail because I don't know that we're going to get as we go through that clearance process.

0277 1 And I apologize, Mr. Johnson, I don't have a whole lot more detail at this point in time than 2 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 6 you, Mr. Johnson. 7 8 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you. 9 10 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Did you have any 11 followup that you wanted on specifics. 12 13 MR. JOHNSON: Not at this time, thank 14 you. 15 16 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are 17 there other Council members who have comments or 18 questions for Mr. Stewart. 19 20 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair, this is 21 Frank. 22 23 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Wright. 24 25 MR. WRIGHT: Later on in your 26 presentation you mentioned Greens Creek, so, you know, a lot of this area, we're always wondering about the tailings runoff and stuff and we wonder about the 28 29 wildlife that is out there like seals and other things, 30 whales and all that kind of stuff, so is there any way 31 that, you know, the concern of everything in our 32 ecosystem is important for us, and so I was wondering 33 about, is there any kind of studies or anything like 34 that to determine the effects of all this stuff that's 35 going on in Greens Creek that would -- that we should 36 know about or anything like that? 37 38 Thank you, Madame Chair. 39 40 MR. STEWART: Through the Chair. Mr. 41 Wright. I don't have a whole lot of detail that I 42 could offer in respect to that. I know there's been a 43 number of efforts thus far and I think it's more 44 specifically the concerns or consternation associated 45 with seals and the condition of seals in that area. 46 need to start off by offering what I would say is honor 47 and respect to those traditional users because of the 48 implications of any actions or any activity to their

food or life resources or cultural resources is

49

significant. I don't -- I'm not aware of any specific studies out there right now. I could certainly ask my Staff if there are things and then I could share them back to the subcommittee if there are elements but I don't have enough detail at this point in time to be able to offer specific studies or research outcomes to be able to offer anything productive to the Committee today other than I recognize that it's important feature, it is critical to those communities that rely on such resources in the area and I recognize that it is a significant issue to the Committee and to those that live in the area. And so I could followup but I don't have any knowledge of specific research or science projects going right now.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. It would be --Madame Chair. Thank you. You know it would be nice to know if there was anything going on or anything affecting it. Right now the seal meat tastes pretty good but I don't know what's in it. But, anyway, thank you.

MR. STEWART: Yes, so I'll be glad to followup with the Chair and provide any additional information that I can associated with scientific research or ongoing projects in that area.

MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is

 Albert.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard, you have the floor.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair. In regards to Green Creek, I know we have it further on the agenda but something that's interesting -- it's interesting that we're looking for a third-party -- requesting for a third-party to look -- third-party review, what does that mean?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ STEWART: Through the Chair, and in response to Mr. Howard's question. A couple of things are intertwined there.

The Forest Service and the -- the Tongass National Forest and Hecla Greens Creek entered into a memorandum of understanding to conduct the environmental analysis using a third-party. In more simplistic terms, it is, instead of Staff on the

Tongass National Forest conducting the environmental analysis there is a contractor that effectively is doing that and then the Forest Service is providing what's referred to, generally speaking, as a shadow organization to make sure it's meeting all the laws, regulations, and policies of the Forest Service. And so that's the third-party component.

I hope that helps clarify. There was another component that you mentioned, but that's what the Hecla Greens Creek Project is, is it just means it's using a contractor to do the environmental analysis and then Forest Service is providing oversight. If that's helpful, sir.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, do you have followup or additional questions.

MR. HOWARD: Well, Madame Chair, it seems like every time I ask a question it leads to another question. So now I'm wondering is the thirdparty going to complicate what the tribe and Angoon Community Association, Council -- the reason I ask, Madame Chair, is according to Monument language, that was created by elders of Angoon, I mean I'm actually old enough to know exactly who the elders are that went to D.C., and talked to Jimmy Carter into signing the proclamation creating Admiralty Island as a National Monument. So I'm old enough to know them by name and face. But it seems like a part of this process needs to involve the community because even if they're not in the National Monument, they're causing irreparable harm to the Monument and the resource that is supposed to be there for the indigenous people of the island. That language is in Monument language.

The Forest Service has set precedence in the past taking ownership of the pollution caused by the (indiscernible) in the bottom of some of our bays because of logging. I've watched the Forest Service say, oh, the water's not our responsibility. The decisions you're making up land and above the water line is affecting what's happening in the bay, as well as the rest of the island. So keep in mind that even though the mine is not in the Monument, you have dust articles blowing on to the Monument, you have them washed on to the Monument, you have them causing irreparable harm to the game and wildlife that are on the Monument. It is the Forest Service's

responsibility to maintain the Monument as it was and people in this community understand the obligation the Forest Service has to the National Monument.

So I'm wondering, is the third-party going to come out here and talk with the tribal council and see what their thoughts are. It seems like we're being left out of the equation where -- I mentioned it the other day, it seems like the Forest Service is now a Greens Creek employee and that's how they're conducting business.

So, thank you, Madame Chair.

MR. STEWART: If I may, Madame Chair. I want to offer to Mr. Howard, community engagement is something that I take very seriously so that is something that occurs by the Forest Service from the local line officer, generally speaking that would be District Ranger Basia Trout. I was aware of the topic coming up from yesterday, I have reached out to Ranger Trout to try to come up with both information on past conferencing with the tribe and also the transcripts associated with those conversations. So I am working to get that for Mr. Howard from the request yesterday.

In addition to that, I would offer that the Forest Service does have a responsibility for the water resources and all resources that occur on those lands and it's another responsibility that we take very seriously. The water quality issue is one that the agency looks at very closely but we also work in concert with the State Department of -- I think it's Environmental Quality, I think that's the right term for the State agency, but there have been a number of efforts to try to make sure that water quality is at or above the conditions necessary in the state of Alaska before any releases occur.

And so I respect Mr. Howard's concern, it's my concern too, and it's one that I take very seriously. And I know that the past rangers have had a lot of conversations with the members in Angoon and recognize the sensitivity of that issue with Hecla Greens Creek and also the honor and respect that they host to the President in signing the Admiralty National Monument.

I yield back.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Mr. Howard, did you have any followups or additional questions.

MR. HOWARD: I'll save it for the agenda item. Thank you, Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Howard. Are there any other comments or questions for Mr. Stewart.

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing none. Mr. Stewart, I really appreciate the time that you came to talk with us today for Forest Service actions. I don't know if you have anything that you would like to add but just to let you know that we're going to be moving on to finish some old business in our agenda and our next topic will be what the Council might be doing -- comments we'd be making on proposals to Board of Game for Unit 2 wolf status, so I know that you had a time certain spot for an hour and I'd encourage you to stick with us for as long as you can.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Madame Chair. I would be honored to stay on as long as I can. There are a host of other topics that I can, or if the Committee decided that they would like to hear from but the three action items that I've heard that I'm responsible for coming from this meeting is to update the Southeast Subsistence RAC on any actions going forward on the Forest Management Projects that we spoke about. I would say I'll add the Hecla Greens Creek project into that also.

Also there was a request for additional information associated with research or studies or scientific efforts associated with the Hecla Greens Creek project. I will also supply that if I can -- whatever I can come up with.

And then the last one that I got was kind of a carryover from yesterday, was the agency's engagement with the community of Angoon.

Can I verify through the Chair that each of those items should come back through the Chair then be distributed to the individual member of

1 interest.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. Yes, through our Council Coordinator, our communications get submitted to her and she distributes it to Regional Advisory Council members as appropriate.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, very much, Madame Chair. And I yield back. And I look forward to hanging on as you talk about GMU2 wolf. And thank you to all the members on the Committee. This is a topic that I take very seriously of trying to be responsive and engaging to the Subsistence Committees and specifically am honored to be able to be able to come before the Southeast Subsistence group today. I know it's a difficult process to try to work through remotely and virtually, yet, I still hold a great deal of honor and respect for the roles that you fill and the representation that you provide and I will continue to seek to do the best that I can each and every day on your behalf as I manage the Tongass National Forest and work with the people in Southeast Alaska, along with the resources for which we're responsible.

And, with that, I yield back, Madame Chair. Thank you, again, for your time, and my appreciation to the Committee.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Stewart. So we are going to move back in the agenda. I feel like it's appropriate that we now take some time to decide if we are going to submit comments on the Board of Game proposal regarding Unit 2 wolves because we do need to have that work completed probably by the end of business today in order to submit it for them -- in order to vote on it and have it submitted to them for their proposal that they'll be discussing tomorrow at their Board meeting.

Ms. Perry, can you guide me to if we have any supplemental resources of what date that might have been sent to us so that the Council members could have that proposal to the Board of Game before them.

MS. PERRY: Yes, thank you, Madame Chair. I am just going to doublecheck, I sent out an agenda with some notes by email the other day and I think everybody might have that but let me just doublecheck which batch that was. Okay. That should

have been by email on I believe March the 12th and I will verify that real quick.

And I would like to let the Council know that Mr. Tom Schumacher, as a follow up from his presentation yesterday, did answer some questions that I believe Mr. Douville had asked from yesterday and I did send that out to the Council at 11:05 today. And I have confirmed that the supplemental materials on wolf did go out Friday the 12th. It was the Council's recommendation back in 2019, our proposed -- or the Board of Game current Proposal 194. Just did a little digging, especially for our new Council members to provide some historical references for them, so, again, from 2019 we've got the proposals for both hunting and trapping that this Council submitted, and then the recommendation. And that was sent at 5:10 p.m., on Friday the 12th, if that helps folks find it.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for that and helping us get organized.

I would like to ask Mr. Douville if he received the email this morning that was in response to some of the questions that he had yesterday and if there was anything he wanted to address on that or if he would like me to put those responses into the record at this point in time.

MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair, I am just going to look at my emails at this time, okay.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Douville. I will just share them in this form. You had some questions yesterday regarding Unit 2 wolves and Mr. Schumacher sent some answers to your question.

I'll just read it so that you have -- so everybody has it and we're all on the same page.

You asked how many of the Unit 2 wolves reported harvested during the 2019/2020 season had also been detected on Fish and Game or HCA's hair boards prior to being harvested. There's some -- actually I'm wondering if Mr. Schumacher would like to just speak to this question specifically.

 $\,$ MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, it looks as though Mr. Schumacher is on the phone and is available

0284 until 3:00 o'clock today. 2 3 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Schumacher, I 4 can either read your email or somebody from the Alaska 5 Department of Fish and Game, if they want to give a 6 more concise answer for whether or not, or how many 7 wolves were detected, I would entertain that at this 8 time. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

MR. SCHUMACHER: Ms. Chairman, I am here looking -- oh, okay, the email that I sent to DeAnna to distribute and I'd be happy to go over it. I went over Mr. Douville's question yesterday, he asked how many of the wolves harvested during the 2019/2020 season in Unit 2 were detected at hair boards. So I went through a little bit of an explanation about that. We had 165 wolves reported harvested in Unit 2 during the 2019/2020 season. We collected tissue samples from all of them. 163 of those had DNA that was sufficient enough to get an individual identification. So two of those wolves we couldn't get an individual identification so we can't really include them in this answer for Mr. Douville. But many of those 163 wolves were reported taken outside of our study area, in other words, they were very unlikely to be detected at hair board stations. So you need to separate out the wolves that were unlikely to be detected, versus wolves that 28 were likely to be detected. We determined the extent 29 of our study area, so the combined Department of Fish 30 and Game and Hydaburg Cooperative Association study 31 area based on the movements of wolves during the fall. 32 We estimate movement by where wolves are detected at 33 hair board stations or where they're harvested for 34 wolves that were previously detected at hair board 35 stations. And then the buffer around -- hair board 36 nodes as they're called, based on those movements, in 37 2019 that buffer was 20 kilometers wide, that's about 38 13 miles, so what that means is beyond that 13 mile 39 limit it's unlikely that any wolf outside that area would be detected at a hair board. So wolves that were 40 41 harvested outside that 20 kilometer buffer were not 42 included in the analysis. We also left out areas from the outer islands because they're also unlikely to be 44 detected at hair boards on Prince of Wales, you know, 45 places like Dall or Suemez, San Fernando, Heceta, you 46 know, it's unlikely that a wolf would swim over to get 47 detected at a hair board. So we looked at that total 48 of 163 wolves we found 68 that were harvested within 49 what we consider to be our study area for the hair 50

boards. And of those 68 wolves, 22 of them had been detected at hair boards before they were harvested. So roughly a third. And just for reference, in a mark/recapture experiment, if you're recapturing a third of animals, just that way, that's pretty good.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Schumacher. Mr. Douville, did you have comments regarding the explanation or additional questions.

MR. DOUVILLE: I do not. It's interesting to look at. So it looks like a third of the population is getting -- giving up DNA samples but I have no questions at this time.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. And thank you, again, Mr. Schumacher, for coming back with information during our meeting.

So just as a reminder for Council members, we have the opportunity to comment on Board of Game Proposal No. 194. For those of you that are on Teams it is up on the screen, and, hopefully for those of you that are not on Teams you were able to find it in your supplemental materials.

At this time, I would ask what the wish of the Council is, would you like to provide comments, and, if so, we would probably need a motion to provide those comments and then have a deliberation of what those comments should be.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Comments. I know I've talked to, you know, Mr. Douville, about what those comments might be but it probably needs a little more discussion.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Should we have a motion to provide comments on Proposal 194 and work through it after that or would you like to have that discussion right now and then decide if we want to take a motion to action?

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, let me ask Mike, you know, some of us have had discussions, and I don't know that we can up with anything concrete yet

unless Mike's given it some more thought but, yeah, if I could kind of defer to Mr. Douville to see where he wants to go with this.

MR. DOUVILLE: Okay.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thanks Mr.

Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: Well, I wouldn't anticipate a season longer than three weeks down the road. And to me wolves are not predictable, so you can't see week by week you're going to get mark/recapture from any given pack. You might get a sample in three weeks and you might get -- you may get a sample in three weeks, it's just how wolves operate.

So the value of sealing these wolves every week in comparison with the hair board hits, which are, as I know, wolves are quite unpredictable at times, it really doesn't have a strong value. I would suggest that -- I don't know where to take it from there other than, you know, I have no problem with sealing wolves within a week of the end of the season, but during the season, while this is a State and private land proposal, on Federal land I would not want to impose this same thing on a subsistence user. So it's kind of two different things we will kind of have to look at.

That's my thoughts at this time.

I know Tom said there was four sealers on the island but the person that sealed my wolves said there was only two last winter. Maybe there's four right now. Or if there was more than that it was unknown to her and I would think that she would understand the system. The Game Troopers really don't want to -- while they're capable and can seal wolves, it's not their first choice of duty so there is the issue of having sealers available for some of the outlying areas too. So like if somebody is trapping in Moreia (ph) Sound and anchors up there for 10 days or somebody in Point Baker got to go way out of their way to get that done but I think probably the information does have some value. Just because it becomes a regulation doesn't mean that everybody is going to comply with it.

0287 1 So I don't know where to go from there, 2 thank you. 3 4 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 5 Douville. One thing that you mentioned that resonates with me is that this is a State proposal and applies to 6 7 State lands, and I think dependent upon the action that the Board of Game takes tomorrow at their meeting, if they pass this proposal for Unit 2 wolves to be sealed 9 10 within seven days of harvest then we would likely see a 11 companion proposal, probably submitted by the 12 Department, I would expect, within the Federal process 13 for subsistence users. So this might be an opportunity 14 for us to provide the Board of Game our concerns with 15 that as they apply towards Federal lands and Federal 16 subsistence users now so that they can consider it in 17 their deliberations as moving forward. 18 19 And so given that, I wanted to task you 20 the question since you're a trapper, user and 21 understand, would you consider providing comment on 22 this proposal saying that we understand the need for 23 the data but that that seven day sealing after seven 24 days of harvest may pose unnecessary burden on 25 subsistence users when the season is only three weeks, 26 and that our discussion would center more around asking 27 the Board of Game to consider modifying it to seven 28 days after the end of the season. 29 30 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair. 31 32 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, that was a question directed..... 33 34 35 MR. DOUVILLE: Are you asking me that 36 question? 37 38 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM:to Mr. 39 Douville and then -- yeah, I am asking you that question and then I'll defer to you, Mr. Wright, after 40 41 that. 42 43 MR. DOUVILLE: Well, that is my 44 thought. I think it's worthwhile to offer that 45 I'm reluctant to take action and vote yea or comment. 46 nay on this proposal at this point because while --47 unless it's modified. I just cannot see the value, 48 particularly because the DNA all goes in at the same

time and with a short season that I predict we'll have,

49

that there's just too much variable in what the wolf does for it to have a tremendous amount of value to impose that sort of thing on a trapper who's, you know, going to have to go out of his way in some cases to comply.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for that Mr. Douville. You have a question, Mr. Wright.$

MR. WRIGHT: Not really, Madame Chair, just a point of order. If we're going to -- it's potentially going to come down to a vote we probably need to have a motion so that -- and it could be defeated or whatever, it doesn't matter, but we need a motion and a second to continue on if this discussion is going to come into a vote.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Wright. I would entertain a motion that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council provides comment in opposition to Proposal 194; that's one way to put a motion forward if somebody wants to make a motion such as that.

MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: I'm not making a motion but I think when we do they're always made in the positive so I'm not sure if Mr. Wright is correct, that we cannot discuss what we may want to do without having a motion on the floor. I mean we have a lot of discussions that aren't necessarily involve a motion.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Douville. I think what I was offering a motion in the positive to provide comment and those comments would be in opposition of this proposal, our body would oppose the Board of Game proposal, that we would offer comments that oppose the Board of Game proposal. So we just took a similar motion on one of the Board of Fish proposals where we put a proposal on the floor that we made it on the -- put a proposal on the floor that we made it in the -- we said to support the proposal and then we had to decline and then go back and re-vote to

0289 offer comments to oppose. So I would think a motion in that respect would be appropriate. 2 4 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair. 5 6 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Wright. 7 8 MR. WRIGHT: Under Robert Rules, you 9 know, a motion can make a motion and then a person can 10 second just for discussion but after discussion it 11 doesn't mean that you have to vote in favor of a motion 12 or against, so all it does is just puts it up for 13 discussion, it doesn't put it in a position where 14 you're in favor of a motion. So I could make a motion 15 and I could turn around after I heard discussion and 16 vote against my motion. 17 18 Thank you, Madame Chair. 19 20 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Sure, thank you, 21 Mr. Wright. Maybe it's clearer if somebody would put a 22 motion on the table to provide comment to the Alaska 23 Board of Game on Proposal 194. 24 25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this 26 is Don. 27 28 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez. 29 30 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I was working up 31 to being able to do that but I do have one 32 clarification. Did I understand that what's before the 33 Board of Game is a special action request and not 34 necessarily a wildlife proposal, is that what we're 35 looking at? 36 37 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 38 Hernandez. I would ask if there's anyone from Alaska 39 Department of Fish and Game online that could answer 40 that question. 41 42 MR. SCHUMACHER: Madame Chair, this is 43 Tom Schumacher, I can answer. 44 45 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Please. 46 47 MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, to Mr. 48 Hernandez' question. The proposal was submitted out of 49 cycle so we had to use what's called the agenda change

request process, that's where we have sort of an emergency situation or something that we feel that the Board needs to hear out of cycle and we submit a proposal and ask them to consider it. The Board either accepts or rejects it. In this case the Board accepted it out of cycle and there hasn't -- you know they're listening to this proposal and a few others at their short meeting tomorrow. So it is a normal Fish and Game proposal to the Board of Game, just how it got there is different.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

13 Schumacher.
14

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thanks for that clarification, I just wanted to be clear when we make the motion what we're dealing with.

So in the case of the proposal, I guess it would be appropriate to make the motion in the affirmative, as Frank pointed out, and then in the course of our discussion if we, you know, decide that we oppose it then that would be the appropriate vote. But I wanted to be clear on that.

And however our vote may go I think, you know, we may also want to provide additional comment of kind of where we see this -- where we'd like to see this go and that might, you know, address whether or not the Council would put in a Federal proposal along the same lines or perhaps something different, so I think all those are possibilities.

So....

MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. Sorry, Donald, go ahead.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, go ahead, DeAnna, I'll standby.

MS. PERRY: I just wanted to followup with what Frank said. This discussion is actually part of an agenda item. The agenda item does allow for discussion of the Council without a motion. This particular agenda item is only an action item if the Council wants it to be. So I just wanted to clarify that it's not an action unless the Council wants it to be so because of that we are able to discuss it without

```
0291
     a motion, but I think we're well on our way to getting
     to a motion. But I just wanted to clarify that for the
     future. It is an agenda item and we can discuss it.
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
 6
     Perry. At this time are there any Council comments
 7
     regarding the agenda item and talking about the Board
     of Game Proposal 194 with respect to changing the
 8
 9
     sealing requirements on Unit 2 wolf.
10
11
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, this is
12
     Harvey Kitka.
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka.
15
16
                     MR. KITKA: Being an agenda item and
17
     things it's still going to become public record as our
18
    recordings go out to the public so I don't know if we
19
    need to vote yea or nay on it or it's just a matter of
20
     people are going to hear our comments and it'll be
21
     decided somewhere down the line.
22
23
                     Thank you.
24
25
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
26
    Kitka. What is the wish of the Council.
27
28
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
29
30
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville.
31
32
                     MR. DOUVILLE: I would take no action
    but I would send comment which would be the course of
33
     action I would take, or I would suggest. We've
34
35
     discussed it. I don't know if a yea or nay on it is
36
     appropriate but I think to make comment on it would be.
37
38
                     Thank you.
39
40
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
     Douville. Again, I would.....
41
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair.
44
45
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr.
46
    Hernandez.
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I think Mike gave
49
    us another alternative there that I hadn't considered.
```

```
0292
     We could potentially make a motion that the Council
     take no action on the proposal, which would essentially
     just allow the Board to make the decision without our
     recommendation, but we would certainly want to add
 5
     comment and I think the comment would be maybe, you
 6
     know, directed towards what our response would be, you
 7
     know, should they implement that perhaps.
 8
 9
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
10
     Hernandez.
11
12
                     MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair.
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Perry, do we
15
     need....
16
17
                     MR. CASIPIT: This is Cal Casipit.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....a -- excuse
20
     me -- Ms. Perry, do we need a motion, or do we have to
21
     vote if we want to provide comments.
22
23
                     MS. PERRY: You are correct, Madame
24
     Chair. Again, I think when we talk about making a
25
     recommendation, again, this is not a Federal proposal
26
     so that word kind of connotes what we do with Federal
27
     proposals. What we're doing today is deciding whether
28
     or not to provide a comment on this proposal and that
29
     comment could, you know, describe the issues that Mr.
30
    Douville has said on the record and some other comments
31
    that we've heard. But it's not necessarily a
32
     recommendation, it would just be a comment in support
33
     or a comment in opposition for these reasons.
34
35
                     So I just wanted to clarify between
36
     like a recommendation that the Council gives during a
37
     Federal proposal process in which the Council has
38
     deference, that's not our role with State comments.
39
     do have some weight with the State as a comment coming
40
     from a Council, but it's not exact -- it's kind of
41
     apples and oranges. So I just wanted to make that
42
     clear.
43
44
                     But, yes, Madame Chair, we would need a
45
     motion, a second, and a vote on whether or not we want
46
     to send any type of comment to the Board of Fish -- or
47
     Board of Game -- sorry, on wolf.
48
```

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.

49

```
0293
     Perry. So, again, for the Council members I did
    mention earlier that I would entertain a motion to
    provide comment to the Alaska Board of Game on Proposal
    194. That was a potential motion that could be covered
 5
    by this.
 6
 7
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is
 8
    Albert.
 9
10
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.
11
12
                     MR. HOWARD: I move the Council sends
13
     -- and then I drew a blank -- a letter supporting or
14
    not supporting Proposal 194.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are you asking a
17
    question or was that a motion?
18
19
                     MR. HOWARD: No, that's a motion,
20
    Madame Chair.
21
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
22
23
    Howard. Is there a second.
24
25
                     (No comments)
26
27
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Not hearing a
28
    second, is there another potential motion that the
29
    Council would like to put forward.
30
31
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair, if Albert
32
     could clarify his motion or reread it so I could listen
33
     again.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
36
     Douville. Mr. Howard, would you restate your motion
37
     for clarity.
38
39
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair. I'd like to
    make a motion that the Council have an official
40
41
    position on Proposal 194.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a second.
44
45
                     (No comments)
46
47
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, not
48
    hearing a second.
49
```

```
0294
 1
                     MR. BEMIS: I'll go ahead.....
 2
 3
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: If somebody could
 6
     put together a motion that states that the Southeast
 7
     Regional Advisory Council to provide comment on the
     Board of Fish Proposal 194. So it don't have to say
 8
 9
     what comments it is, just we'd provide it.
10
11
                     Thank you.
12
13
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
14
15
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville.
16
17
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair, I so move.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, is
20
     there a second.
21
22
                     MR. KITKA:
                                 Second.
                                          Harvey.
23
24
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
25
    Kitka. It's been moved and seconded that the Southeast
26
     Regional Advisory Council provide comment to the Board
27
     of Game on Proposal 194. We've had some discussion so
28
     I would ask our Staff, who is going to help us provide
29
     this comment, the document that we would provide to the
30
    Board of Game, to incorporate some of that discussion
31
     as we move towards a vote. And at this time I would
32
     ask if any other Council members have comments or
33
     questions regarding Proposal 194 and then we should
    probably have a little bit of justification of whether
34
35
    we support or oppose that with what is being proposed
36
    in 194.
37
38
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, this is
     Harvey Kitka.
39
40
41
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Kitka.
42
43
                     MR. KITKA: I will support this motion
44
     with the caveat that it would put an undue burden on
45
     our subsistence users. Beings as they would have to be
46
     taking off from their trapping line to take this in.
47
     If they caught the wolf on the first day of the
48
     trapping season then they would have to go in and get a
49
     tag within seven days, that'd be an undue burden on
```

0295 1 them. 2 3 Thank you. 4 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Kitka. Are there other Council comments. 6 7 8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair. 9 10 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. 11 Hernandez. 12 13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: In addition to 14 what Harvey spoke about, I think I would also include 15 that our Council would be opposed to this proposal if it were implemented in a shortened wolf season that say 16 17 would be perhaps less than a month long. We could also 18 add that, you know, the Council would -- could possibly 19 support a proposal that called for a shorter sealing 20 time if the season length were longer for the reasons 21 that Harvey stated. Just to offer that up as 22 alternatives if they choose to look at alternatives. 23 24 So I would add that. 25 26 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 27 Hernandez. Are there any other Council comments or discussion that you would want to include. 28 29 30 MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Calvin 31 Casipit. I had some additions to that. 32 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr. 33 34 Casipit, please. 35 36 MR. CASIPIT: The other things we 37 should mention to the Board is that for this proposed 38 regulation to be fully affective that we would have to 39 pass a companion proposal under the Federal system and 40 just alert them to that. 41 42 Also one of the things that the Board 43 should consider, and something that I'm going to 44 consider if it does come before the Federal system and 45 this was kind of eluded to by Mr. Hernandez is that I 46 question the need for this weekly sealing if our 47 seasons are only going to last two or three weeks. It 48 just -- I don't see why we put the burden on our users 49 for doing that, and then I don't see how it really

improves the model. I may be wrong. I may be wrong, but I just -- he already said they're already getting a third recapture, that's pretty -- that's getting close to that magic 40 percent that our friend, Ben VanAlen always used to talk about in mark/recaptures.

But anyway that's kind of what I have. It's got to go through our system for it to be fully effective and then I just question the trade-off of weekly sealing with a really short season on our users.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Casipit for those precise summaries of some of our discussion. Are there any other comments from the Council.

MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Douville.

MR. DOUVILLE: For people that trap out of a boat like I do, you know, you have kind of brief little weather windows that you try to work and if those aren't timed correctly you could possibly miss a nice day because you might have to go seal a wolf, then you might not get back out for the next three or four, but it is a burden for somebody that's working out of a boat and working with the kind of weather that you have in the fall and winter. You know unless you're driving on the road it's not near as much of an issue but there is some conflict in that respect.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Douville. Other Council comments.

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: It sounds like we are going to provide comments to the Board of Game regarding this proposal in opposition to the proposal for various reasons stated around if it passes there's probably going to be a companion proposal which would address the subsistence uses and we believe it's an undue burden on subsistence users, so we're providing them that feedback among other things that Council members have discussed.

Is there a call for the question.
CHAIDMAN HEDNANDER. III call for the
CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I'll call for the question.
question.
VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
you, Mr. Hernandez. Again, the motion is to provide
these comments to the Board of Game on Proposal 194.
Mr. Wright, would you please do a roll call vote.
MR. WRIGHT: Okay.
Calvin Casipit.
MD CACIDIE. Voc
MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
III. HILLOHI. HILOHAGI DOUVIIIO.
MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.
MR. SLATER: Yes.
MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.
(No comments)
(NO COMMETICS)
MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
MR. HOWARD: yes.
MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.
CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
MD WDICHE, Harold Dobbins
MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.
MR. ROBBINS: Yes.
111.1.10222110.1.200.
MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
MR. KITKA: Yes.
MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
MD DEMIC. V
MR. BEMIS: Yes.
AND TIDEOUTE COLL NO. 11
MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.

```
0298
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
 2
 3
                     MR. WRIGHT: Ian Johnson.
 4
 5
                     MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
 6
 7
                     MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes yes.
 8
    Motion passed.
 9
10
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
11
     Wright. And for the Council's patience as we moved
12
     through that procedural process.
13
14
                     At this time, Ms. Perry, do we have any
15
     other old business that we need to take care of under
     Old Business A, which was brought before us from the
16
17
    Council last time or are we completely done with that
18
    presentation and that agenda item.
19
20
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair.
21
     just made a few notes for the Council to come back to
22
     regarding some letters that came out of discussions
23
     from yesterday from mostly public comments. So I think
24
     we are through with the old business items.
25
26
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
27
     you very much. On agenda Item 10B, old business, which
28
     is the State Board of Fisheries proposals, we did have
29
     a few proposals left undone, however, in respect to our
30
     time and the rest of our agenda I think the general
31
     idea was to potentially pick up those at our next
32
    meeting and finalize that letter to the Board of
33
     Fisheries that would include all of our positions on
34
    Board of Fish proposals and approve all those comments
35
     at that time so we can check that agenda item off.
36
37
                     I see that under old business we have
38
     agenda Item 10C which is an update from the National
39
     Park system, individual C&T determinations. And it
40
     looks like Mr. Joshua Ream would be available today.
41
     Is he available at this time to address this?
42
43
                     MR. REAM: Yes, Madame Chair, this is
44
     Josh and I am available.
45
46
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr.
47
     Ream.
48
49
                     MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, this is
```

0299 1 DeAnna. 2 3 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. 4 5 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, apologies. 6 was getting some texts from Staff, it looks like Staff 7 has been working on the comment to the Board of Game and before we moved further I just wanted to know if 9 the Council would like for us to type that up and give the Council an opportunity to work at the wording 10 11 before we submit it or if not, that's fine, too. I 12 mean you've already voted to do the comments but I just 13 wanted to extend the courtesy to the Council to see 14 what would go forward if they would like to look it 15 over. 16 17 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms. 18 Perry. And I do believe we would have -- if that was 19 sent to us to look over tonight/first thing in the 20 morning, we would still make the deadline for it to go 21 to the Board of Game to be submitted before they 22 deliberate on their proposal. 23 24 MS. PERRY: I would highly encourage us 25 to finalize that today simply because the Board of Game starts at 9:00 o'clock and I'm not sure when they will 26 27 deliberate that. In their public notice, I know they 28 do have some other matters to discuss but in case they 29 take this proposal first we will have missed our 30 window. We can only submit it up to the time of 31 deliberation. 32 33 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 34 you, Ms. Perry. So I would like to have that letter -it would be great if you could have Staff send that 36 letter to you to send to us by within like a half an 37 hour of 5:00 o'clock, or so, by 4:30 or so that we 38 could have a quick peak at it before we adjourn for the 39 day. 40 41 MS. PERRY: Great. 42 43 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Understanding --44 just so that we can take a look at the finalized work 45 that we're submitting before the Board of Game. 46 47 Thank you.

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair.

48 49

0300 1 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: With that.... 2 3 MS. PERRY: Sorry for the interruption, 4 Joshua. 5 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: No problem, thanks 6 7 for keeping us on track, Ms. Perry. Mr. Ream, I would like to call on you to give us our update on the NPS 8 9 individual C&T determinations, please. 10 11 MR. REAM: Thank you, Madame Chair, and 12 13 my name is Joshua Ream, and I am the Regional 14 Subsistence Program Manager for the National Park 15

good afternoon members of the Council. For the record Service based out of the Anchorage Regional Office but working from my home in Eagle River. I am also the Park Service's representative to the InterAgency Staff Committee.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

16

17

Today I just want to report to you on recent decisions that were made by the Federal Subsistence Board at their regulatory meeting back in January of this year and they did make some changes to the process used for customary and traditional use determinations for individuals.

25 26 27

28

29

30 31

To start, I want to remind everyone that individual customary and traditional use determinations are nothing new, you might not be as familiar with them because they are quite rare. We've had less than 10 people apply for them in the past 40 years.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

The Federal Subsistence Board adopted a revised version of the process for these in January. And I will explain the adopted process to you here following a very short introduction. No action on your end is required at this time but if you ever have feedback on the process we can definitely make sure to deliver that back to the Board.

44

45

46

47

48

You might recall that Park Service Staff, I believe it was me, offered a lengthy presentation on this issue at your fall meeting. Eligibility to hunt and trap in National Parks and National Monuments is rather complex compared to other Federal public lands. And almost all customary and traditional use determinations across the state are for communities and areas and not for individuals.

In the fall we did ask all 10 of the Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils and the seven Park Subsistence Resource Commissions for feedback. We incorporated this feedback into our proposed process to the Board and this is what was adopted by the Board in January.

The revised process includes two critical recommendations made by the RACs and the Subsistence Resource Commissions.

First, that there is no delegation of authority to the Park Service. The Federal Subsistence Board will retain the final decisionmaking authority.

Second, the process now includes a formal recommendation from both the affected Regional Advisory Councils and from the affected Subsistence Resource Commission.

Previously it was just from the RACs.

Perhaps the biggest change is that the process is no longer tied to the lengthy biennial regulatory proposal cycle, instead the application window is open continuously and once the RACs and the Subsistence Resource Commissions have weighed in the Board will take action on the request at its next public meeting. This accomplishes an important goal of being able to process applications in a more timely manner.

 Many of the RACS and the Subsistence Resource Commissions voted to defer action until they had more time to study the issue. While the Federal Subsistence Board already took action to help improve the process, the Board still welcomes any feedback that you might have for further improvement, either now or at any point in the future. Ultimately, the National Park Service and the Federal Subsistence Board want this process to be as streamlined and responsive as possible.

Thank you for your time. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have. And if you do have feedback for the Board I'm happy to deliver that as well.

Thank you.

```
0302
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
 2
     Ream. Are there any questions from the Council for Mr.
     Ream.
 4
 5
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka.
 6
 7
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Kitka.
 8
 9
                     MR. KITKA: I have one question in
10
     listening to this presentation. I didn't hear any talk
11
     of consultation with the tribes, is there a reason for
12
     that?
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
15
     Ream, do you have a response to the question.
16
17
                     MR. REAM: Thank you for the question.
18
    Yes, I do. We do consider consultation in each of the
19
     Parks when an action affects a local tribe, will
20
     consult with the tribe on individual C&T request that
21
    is made. We do have one before us and it's not in a
22
    region that is considered to affect the Southeast
23
    Council but it is the reason we started looking at this
24
     process more critically. It is for the Mayo family out
25
    of Healy. And they are requesting an individual C&T
26
    for a family, each member of the family, there's five
27
    people in the household for moose in Unit 13E in
28
     Denali. And so Denali Park Staff are working through
29
    that process and we did already get recommendations
30
    from the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council,
31
     the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council, and the
32
     Denali SRC.
33
34
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
35
     Ream. Mr. Kitka, do you have a followup.
36
37
                     MR. KITKA: Yes. I was just curious do
38
     you have any requests from the Hoonah Indian Community
39
     realizing they had ties to the Glacier Bay area?
40
41
                     MR. REAM: Thank you for the question.
42
    Through the Chair. This is Josh. And in response.
43
     Individual C&Ts only apply in Parks and Monuments
44
    managed by the Park Service where subsistence is
45
     authorized. So the process would not be used for C&Ts
46
     in Glacier Bay. And we have not received any requests
47
     for such from anyone in Hoonah.
48
49
                     MR. KITKA: Thank you.
```

```
0303
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
 2
     Ream and Mr. Kitka. Are there any other comments or
     questions for Mr. Ream.
 4
 5
                     MR. KITKA: None at this time, thank
 6
     you.
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
 9
     you. Any other comments or questions from other
10
    Council members for Mr. Ream.
11
12
                     MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chair, this is
13
     Ian, just a quick question.
14
15
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Go ahead.
16
17
                     MR. JOHNSON: Could you -- I'm sorry,
18
     just for my own notes, I live in Hoonah and I just --
19
     could you repeat what hasn't been received from Hoonah
20
     in regards to consultation with the Park just so I have
21
     that for my own notes?
22
                     MR. REAM: Sure, I'd be happy to.
23
24
     Through the Chair. So this process and individual
25
    C&Ts, in general, only apply to Parks where subsistence
26
     is authorized under ANILCA and thus it does not apply
27
     to Glacier Bay. So there are no individual C&Ts in
     Glacier Bay and the Board would not consider a request
28
29
    for such, and we have not received a request from
30
     anyone out of Hoonah either. I hope that helps.
31
32
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
33
     Johnson, does that help.
34
35
                     MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.
36
37
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any
38
     other comments or questions from Council members for
39
    Mr. Ream.
40
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing
44
     none, thank you, Mr. Ream, for providing that feedback
45
     from -- the update, especially regarding the Federal
46
     Subsistence Board actions on this. As you remember
47
     from our last meeting we had some pretty hearty and
48
    healthy discussions on the C&T determinations in Parks
```

in general and so we appreciate your time.

49

```
0304
 1
                     With that, I do not believe we have any
     other old business. So I think we can now move into
 2
     our new business.
 4
 5
                     MS. PERRY: Madame Chair.
 6
 7
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Ms. Perry.
 8
 9
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you, Madame Chair.
10
    This is DeAnna. And in the interest of time, I know
11
    usually we get a status of fish and wildlife right
12
    before the Council discusses the current call, whether
13
    it be for wildlife or fish so that they have a good
14
    indication of what's going on throughout the region
15
    before they put together proposals. However, I know
    that we are fastly approaching the end of the day and I
16
17
    wondered if maybe we could condense that particular
18
    presentation and start with the wildlife harvest
19
    summary and then go into the call for proposals because
20
    that is an action item, and then if we have time later,
21
    and Mr. Cross is available we could also hear about the
22
    fisheries status. We do not have an action item on the
23
    fisheries status. So, again, I'm just thinking of in
24
     the interest of time.
25
26
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Ms.
27
     Perry. We are running quite a bit behind it feels like
     so I would like to ask Mr. Cross if that is doable for
28
29
    his presentation, if Mr. Cross is on the line.
30
31
                     MR. CROSS: Yes, I'm here, Madame
32
     Chair. That would be acceptable for me.
33
34
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
35
     you. And Mr. Cross are you providing the wildlife
36
     harvest update for us?
37
38
                     MR. CROSS: Madame Chair, yes, that's
39
     correct.
40
41
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. That
42
     would be great if you could do so.
43
44
                     MR. CROSS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
45
     For the record my name is Rob Cross and I'm a Fisheries
46
     Biologist for the Forest Service on the Tongass
47
    National Forest. And this presentation will be on
48
     Teams, it's already up on Teams, and it's also on Page
49
     44 of your meeting materials.
50
```

So this presentation is an overview of wildlife harvest on the Southeast region through 2019. The first several slides display harvest reported to the State and then I'll discuss harvest under Federal permits.

So on Page 45 we see the Sitka blacktailed deer harvest. These harvest tables are set up chronologically. So the average harvest from 2000 to 2011 is on the top row followed by annual harvest from 2012 to 2019. And then the average harvest for 2012 to 2019 is on the bottom row. So you can compare the bottom row with the top row to get an idea of long-term changes in harvest. And there will be several of these charts and they're all set up the same way. The bold numbers are the highest harvest in each unit from 2012 to 2019. On average, Units 1, 2, and 4 harvest have increased. Unit 3 lengthened its seasons so it's hard to determine. And Unit 5 harvest has decreased. Although Unit 2 average deer harvest has increased in 2012 and 2015, it has declined considerably since 2017.

The next slide on Page 46 shows the same thing for black bear harvest from 2013 to 2019. If you compare the averages between time periods you'll see that the average for the last seven years is far lower than the 13 years before that. This drop in harvest is related to changes in regulatory mechanisms, like the non-resident hunt becoming a registration or draw hunt in many areas. So black bear harvest in Unit 2 peaked in 2006 and 2007 and was changed to a registration hunt for non-resident hunters. Black bear populations are thought to be healthy in all units.

 If you go to the next slide, or Page 47 of your books, is for brown bear harvest, which is down from previous years. This is not an indication of conservation issues but rather the result of a drop in participating hunters and a reduction of permitted guides in Unit 4. Unit 3 is not a typical brown bear hunt unit and bears are taken primarily by chance in this unit.

On the next slide you can see that moose harvest has increased in Units 3 and 5 and decreased in Unit 1. Increases in Unit 3 and 5 seem to suggest improved population of moose in these areas. The number of hunters and success rate has remained stable in the last five years. In Unit 1 average has

dropped but moose numbers in the area are thought to be stable. Harvest numbers include sub-legal harvest and moose harvest occurs primarily under registration permits with draw permits in a few areas. Most hunts fall under the spike-fork 50 rules except Unit 1A, portions of 1C and Unit 5.

The next slide is on Page 49, it's mountain goat harvest. Most goats are harvested under registration permits. There's also a few draw permits available. Harvest in Unit 1 has been fairly consistent with a slight increase in annual harvest. Average annual harvest in Unit 4 is considerably lower recently but we're starting to see an increase. The population decreased substantially about 10 years ago and is currently at an all time high. So we expect to see increase opportunity and harvest. Unit 5 numbers are a result of low hunter effort. There is a conservation concern in a small area of Unit 5.

The next slide is wolf harvest and it's been stable in Units 3 and 5 and harvest has increased in Units 1 and 2. Wolf harvest in Unit 2 increased dramatically in 2019 due to changes to the harvest management system. Unit 4 harvest occurs on Pleasant Island just south of Gustavus.

The next slide on Page 51 shows elk harvest from Etolin Island. They're harvested primarily on draw permits with the hunt limited to a bull only. Access is difficult, often limiting harvest.

The next slide. Wolverine harvest occurs primarily on the main lands with some taken from Unit 3. More than 95 percent are taken under trapping regulations.

The next slide on Page 53 lists a few Federal subsistence permits available. The designated hunting permit is the most popular in the Southeast region. It allows qualified harvesters to harvest game for other qualified harvesters. A Federal draw permit for Unit 1C, Berners Bay moose was initiated in 2019. This is a drawing for 25 percent of the annual moose quota in Berners Bay. And on the slide is a photo of the first moose harvested under the Berners Bay Federal draw.

So the next two slides show the same chart over two different time periods. So it shows the total percentage of permits issued by community. This first slide shows permits from 2000 to 2012 and Wrangell, Petersburg and Sitka are the predominant communities where designated hunting permits are issued, about 80 percent overall. And then the next slide shows the same thing for 2013 to 2020. And we see about the same results, Wrangell, Petersburg, and Sitka are issued the most permits.

The next slide on Page 56. The Unit 1A moose permit allows for an earlier opportunity to harvest moose. Because of the remoteness of Burrows Bay very few permits are issued and hunting effort is often limited to property owners on the river.

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MR. CROSS: Okay.

MS. PERRY: I'd like to remind everybody to mute their phones. Star six to please mute your phones. Thank you.

MR. CROSS: Okay. So on the next slide for goats. Federal mountain goat harvest, let's see, the Unit 1 goat permit allows for the harvest of a second goat after a goat is harvested on a State permit. And it's on the upper right, the chart on the upper right. There have been a few permits issued but no harvest. The Unit 5 goat permit are also seldom used. There have been two goats harvested in Unit 5A since 2018 and that's the chart on the bottom left.

On the next slide, on Page 58, you can see the Unit 5 brown bear permits issued and -- or you can see the permits that have been issued and the hunting has remained consistently low.

On the next slide on Page 59 shows the number of designated hunting permits issued annually. A number of those permittees reporting deer or moose hunting effort and the number of deer and moose reported harvested. The highest numbers during this period are in bold. The top row is the average from 2003 to 2012 and the bottom row is the average from 2013 to 2019. The 2020 season has 220 permits issued

but harvest reporting is not completed yet. You'll notice that there were less permits used to hunt deer but more deer harvested. This is because designated hunters are harvesting more deer per permit than they used to.

Okay. And I'll end with Federal designated hunter deer harvest by community on the next slide. And you can compare the 2003 to 2012 average with the 2013 to 2019 average. And those are on the left and the right side of the chart, respectively. Both of those columns are in bold. For instance, the fourth row from the bottom is the Sitka harvest, and you can see that the average annual harvest increased from 78 to 120. The increase in harvest is mostly attributed to much higher abundance of deer in Unit 4. The population declined substantially during the winters of 2006 to 2009 and then has since rebounded. The only other notable changes from Klawock where the average went from six to 19.

That concludes my presentation, Madame

Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Cross. At this time I would ask if any Council members have any specific questions regarding wildlife harvest for Mr. Cross.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim Slater.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Mr. Cross, hi, thank you for coming today. A question for you regarding the designated hunting permits. You apply on a per community basis but then you can travel anywhere in Southeast Alaska and hunt that permit, is that the way it is, or do you have to apply for a permit in the area you're going to be hunting?

 MR. CROSS: Thank you. Through the Chair. Mr. Slater. Yeah, so you apply for a designated harvest permit personally and then you are qualified in Units 1 through 5.

48 MR. SLATER: Okay. Thank you, very

49 much.

```
0309
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are
 2
     there any other questions for Mr. Cross regarding
     wildlife harvest in the region.
 4
 5
                     MR. HOWARD: This is Albert.
 6
 7
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.
 8
 9
                     MR. HOWARD: When is there going to be
10
     an update for Unit 4 bears for 2020?
11
12
                     MR. CROSS: Through the Chair. Mr.
13
     Howard, I'm actually not sure of the answer to that.
14
     Possibly Mr. Suminski would have a better answer for
15
     that.
16
17
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Suminski,
18
    would you like to tackle the question.
19
20
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Yes, through the Chair.
21
    Mr. Howard.
                  The spring bear hunt, I believe, just
22
    ended. And I'm not sure when those hunt reports are
23
    due. But I would suspect by your next meeting those
    would be available.
24
25
26
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
27
    you.
28
29
                     (Teleconference interference -
30
    participants not muted)
31
32
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Are there any
33
     other questions for Mr. Cross or Staff regarding
34
    wildlife harvest.
35
36
                     MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chair, this is
37
    Ian, I had a couple questions.
38
39
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Johnson.
40
41
                     MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, so these are great
42
    to look at. I mean I'm immediately struck by, you
    know, wanting to leverage them in a way that allows us
43
44
     to answer some of these persistent questions that have
45
    been in discussion about user groups and out of town
46
    pressure. So do we have the ability to look at this
47
    harvest data more related to user groups, whether, I
48
     quess local or non-local or resident and non-resident?
```

```
0310
 1
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair, this
 2
     is Terry Suminski. I didn't catch -- was that Mr.
     Slater?
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Johnson.
 6
 7
                     MR. JOHNSON: No, this is Ian Johnson.
 8
 9
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Johnson. Of course
10
    everyone's required to report deer harvest and those
11
     can be sorted out by community and, you know, as we're
12
     discussing these -- you know, there's the potential to
13
    put in some proposals and we will look at that much
14
     closure when we analyze any proposals that are
15
     submitted but we don't have.....
16
17
                     (Teleconference interference -
18
    participants not muted)
19
20
                     REPORTER: I'm getting some really bad
21
     feedback, I can't hear anybody.
22
23
                     MR. SUMINSKI: ....there's a lot
24
     of....
25
26
                     REPORTER: Can you remember to put your
27
    phones on mute please.
28
29
                     MS. PERRY: Sorry, Terry, if I could
30
    interrupt I'm sorry. We're getting a lot of noise and
31
    we cannot hear the speakers nor can the court reporter
32
     capture this. So if we could just take a moment and
33
    make sure that our phones are on mute if you're not
34
    speaking. Again, if you don't have a mute button just
35
    press star six.
36
37
                     Thank you.
38
39
                     Sorry to interrupt Terry.
40
41
                     MR. SUMINSKI: That was the end of my
42
     comment, Madame Chair.
43
44
                     REPORTER: I didn't get any of the last
45
    bit you said though, can you repeat it.
46
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah. Mr. Johnson, the
47
48
     deer number or deer harvest data can be sorted out,
49
     especially by community, somewhat by location and
50
```

that's something that we would analyze in the event that we receive proposals but I don't have any sort of detail at my fingertips right now.

Thank you.

 $\mbox{VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.} \\ \mbox{Suminski. Mr. Johnson, you indicated you might have} \\ \mbox{had more than one question.} \\$

 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I was also curious if, I guess, you know, it's great looking at like gross harvest numbers but I was also just interested in linking that to effort some way and maybe standardizing harvest more from per user standpoint. So that was just a comment, or like a way that -- just like I'm hesitant to look at the numbers just on a raw basis without understanding effort more.

And then, yeah, I guess just as a comment when numbers are compiled, not just for the 2020 one, not just for bears, but for deer, I guess, I would definitely be thinking about the effect of decreased ferry service on the harvest numbers because I guess I'm expecting to see a pretty drastic change based on the lack of access to some of these rural areas.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions from Council members for Mr. Cross or Mr. Suminski regarding wildlife harvest.

MR. HOWARD: This is Albert.

 $$\operatorname{\text{VICE}}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: You have the floor, Mr. Howard.

MR. HOWARD: Is there a place I can go and research how much deer is taken out of the Chatham Strait area by non-residents? I'm asking the question because I know when we you go in salt water you have to document everything and how much you caught and where you caught it, and I'm wondering if there's a mechanism like that for non-resident hunters that are allowed to take deer out of Chatham Strait and if there's information somewhere I can look to see if, in fact, they are having an impact.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

```
0312
 1
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr.
    Howard. This is Terry Suminski again. Yes, there is
 2
     some information available on the ADF&G website. And
     if you'd like you could contact, you know, myself or
 5
    others and we can help you determine some of that
 6
    information as well.
 7
 8
                     Thank you.
 9
10
                     MR. HOWARD: Thank you.
11
12
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
13
     you. Any other questions regarding wildlife harvest.
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I have a question,
16
    Cathy.
17
18
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Hernandez.
19
20
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, with regard
21
    to the elk harvest, and there is reported harvest for
22
    Etolin Island but nowhere else. Is there harvest that
23
     comes off of other islands. I know Zarembo has an elk
24
     population and it seems like there's some hunter effort
25
     there, is there no harvest or is there no information,
26
     do you know?
27
28
                     MR. CROSS: Through the Chair.
29
     Hernandez. I don't have any information on elk harvest
30
     outside of Etolin Island. I know that Zarembo is
31
     currently closed to elk harvest though.
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah, I know
34
     it's been open in the past though, I believe, so okay
35
     we'll figure that out later.
36
37
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any
38
     other questions for Staff regarding wildlife harvest.
39
40
                     MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair, this is
41
     Frank.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright.
44
45
                     MR. WRIGHT: Do you know -- Madame
46
     Chair, I was just wondering if they know of any moose
47
     that's on Chichagof Island because some people have
48
     said they've seen some. I've never seen them. But I
49
     know there was one down by the cannery and some out the
```

road but -- and moose droppings and stuff like that. So do these wildlife people know of any moose on the island because I know they could swim across.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr. Wright. This is Terry Suminski. There have been reports of moose, especially bulls, of single bulls on Chichagof. I know I've seen pictures of them in Hoonah Sound. But as far as I know they have not established any sort of population on Chichagof. I think they just come and go or come and disappear. I'm not sure what happens to them.

Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you. I was just wondering if you guys had any studies -- yes, Madame Chairman, had any kind of idea what was going on on Chichagof because -- but anyway, thank you.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yep. Any other questions for Staff regarding wildlife harvest.

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing none, I think I'd like to take a break, but before we do that I just want to alert the Council to our next agenda item. It is an action item. It would be a call for Federal wildlife proposals. We will have a brief introduction from Staff regarding this and right after that I would like for us to make a semi-quick laundry list of how many proposals we expect to potentially put forward for the Federal subsistence wildlife cycle. I'd like to get an idea of how many proposals we might do so that we can determine whether or not we need to do the actual work in developing those problems by work group if there's a number of them, or if we can handle them all sort of together on the record.

So with that, let's break until 3:30 and we'll come back and hear from Mr. Suminski and Ms. Pippa Kenner on the presentation for the call for wildlife proposals.

(Off record)

```
0314
 1
                      (On record)
 2
 3
                     MS. PERRY: Frank Wright.
 4
 5
                     (No comments)
 6
 7
                     MS. PERRY: Cal Casipit.
 8
 9
                     (No comments)
10
11
                     MS. PERRY: Mike Douville.
12
13
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Here.
14
15
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you.
16
                     Jim Slater, I heard you just a moment
17
18
     ago.
19
20
                     MR. SLATER: Yes, I'm here.
21
                     MS. PERRY: Bob Schroeder, did you ever
22
23
     join us this afternoon.
24
25
                      (No comments)
26
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, just checking.
27
28
29
                     Albert Howard.
30
31
                     MR. HOWARD: Here.
32
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you.
33
34
35
                     Don, I just heard you.
36
37
                     Harold Robbins.
38
39
                     MR. ROBBINS: Here.
40
                     MS. PERRY: Harvey Kitka.
41
42
43
                     MR. KITKA: Here.
44
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks, Harvey.
45
46
47
                     Larry Bemis.
48
49
                     MR. BEMIS: Here.
50
```

```
0315
 1
                     MS. PERRY: Thank you.
 2
 3
                     Cathy, I just heard you so I'm going to
 4
    go back -- Frank, did you join back with us.
 5
 6
                     (No comments)
 7
 8
                     MS. PERRY: And Cal Casipit, did you
 9
     call back in or rejoin us?
10
11
                     (No comments)
12
13
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, Madame Chair, we have
14
     9 of your 12 Council members currently online, you do
15
     have a quorum.
16
17
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
18
     you, Ms. Perry. As I stated before the break we're
19
     going to move into the next agenda item which is the
20
     call for Federal subsistence proposals. I'm going to
21
     ask Staff to give their brief presentation and
22
    hopefully Council members can then give us a quick list
23
     of potential proposals that we might want to consider
24
     to put forward so that we can build a list and decide
25
     how we want to proceed from there.
26
27
                     With that I'd like to ask Pippa Kenner
28
     and Terry Suminski if they are ready to present.
29
30
                     MR. VICKERS: Well, yes, hello, my name
31
     is -- hello, Ms. Chair. My name is Brent Vickers and I
32
     will be speaking for Pippa Kenner. Can everyone hear
33
     me?
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thanks.
36
     Yep.
37
38
                     MR. VICKERS: Great.
39
40
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: My apologies, I
41
     was reading from the agenda so I appreciate your time.
42
43
                     MR. VICKERS: No, that's fine. Pippa
44
     just got pulled aside so I'm going to be speaking on
45
     her behalf. I'm the Supervisor Anthropologist at the
46
     Office of Subsistence Management.
47
48
                     REPORTER: Could you please spell your
49
     name.
```

```
0316
 1
                     MR. VICKERS: My name is spelled B-R-E-
 2
    N-T V as in Victory, I-C-K-E-R-S.
 4
                     REPORTER:
                               Thank you.
 5
 6
                     MR. VICKERS: I'm listed as Jonathan
 7
    Vickers which is on my Federal account so you might
     want to make a note of that.
 8
 9
10
                     REPORTER: Thank you.
11
12
                     MR. VICKERS: Are you ready?
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: We are ready,
15
     thank you.
16
17
                     MR. VICKERS: Okay, thank you. The
18
    materials for this presentation begin on Page 61 of
19
     your Council books.
20
21
                     The call for proposals is now open to
22
     change Federal subsistence wildlife regulations. You
23
     may propose changes to Federal subsistence season
24
     dates, harvest limits, methods and means of harvest and
25
     customary and traditional use determinations. For the
26
    public, the call for proposals will close on May 24th.
27
    Proposals must be submitted in writing to the Office of
28
     Subsistence Management on or before May 24th. There's
29
    no form to submit your proposal. Proposals can be
30
     submitted in writing, by mail, or hand delivery on the
31
    web. Because this Council meeting is being
32
     teleconferenced, we cannot accept proposals from the
33
     public at this meeting. Any member of the public
34
    wishing to submit a proposal or needing more
35
    information please call me, or Pippa Kenner, at the
36
    Office of Subsistence Management at (907) 786-3883.
37
    would be happy to discuss your proposal with you and
38
    help you submit it.
39
40
                     For the Council, this meeting is your
41
     opportunity to submit proposals. This is an action
42
     item on your agenda if the Council wishes to submit a
43
    proposal.
44
45
                     Thank you, Ms. Chair, and Council
46
    members.
               Staff are on hand to answer your questions.
47
48
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
49
     you, Mr. Vickers. Are there any questions regarding
```

```
0317
    how to submit proposals for Mr. Vickers.
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
 6
    noticed that Mr. Suminski was on the agenda, does that
 7
     conclude the actual presentation for the call or does
    Mr. Suminski have something to add.
 8
 9
10
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you, Madame Chair.
11
     This is Terry Suminski. I'm just available to help you
12
     work through any proposals that you might choose to
13
     submit.
14
15
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
16
     you. All right, so are there Council members who are
17
     interested in having the Southeast Regional Advisory
18
     Council potentially submit a proposal to the Federal
19
     Subsistence Program.
20
21
                     MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim
22
     Slater.
23
24
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater.
25
26
                     MR. SLATER: Pursuant to the testimony
27
    we heard today from the Pelican and Lisianski Inlet
     area there is a desire by the community to provide some
28
29
     subsistence protection in Unit 4. I'm interested in
30
    pursuing some sort of proposal that would accomplish
31
    that for the members of that community in that area.
32
33
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
34
    you, Mr. Slater. And that is Unit 4 deer, correct?
35
36
                     MR. SLATER: That's correct.
37
38
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.
39
     there any other Council members that have thought about
40
     potential proposals to put before the Federal
41
     Subsistence Program.
42
43
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this
44
     is Don.
45
46
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM:
                                          Yes, Mr.
47
    Hernandez.
48
49
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I would like to
```

```
0318
     submit one possibly, two proposals that would be for
     subsistence elk hunting.
 2
 4
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
 5
     you, Mr. Hernandez. Other -- is there a particular
 6
     unit or do you want to hash that out at the table?
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: We're going to
 9
    have to hash that out.
10
11
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Are
12
    there other Council members that -- or are there other
13
    proposals that the Council wishes for this Council to
14
    deliberate on for reading the Federal Subsistence
15
     Program.
16
17
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka.
18
19
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Kitka.
20
21
                     MR. KITKA: I know a few years back
22
     there was a subsistence permit for the artists in Sitka
23
     to harvest goats but the harvest time was in the
24
     falltime, so actually they'd be better off, according
25
     to the artisans, it would be better to harvest them in
26
     the spring when the fur that they use for their art
27
    work is loose. When they hunt them in the fall they
28
    have a hard time getting the fur off.
                                           So I was
29
    wondering if there would be a possibility of changing
30
    that time designation to the -- to add the spring time
31
     to it.
32
33
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. For Unit 4,
34
    is that right, yeah?
35
36
                     MR. KITKA: Yes, Unit 4 goat.
37
38
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Others.
39
40
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair, would it
41
    be appropriate to comment now or -- this is Terry
42
     Suminski.
43
44
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Sure. If it's not
45
     something -- especially if we might need to take it off
46
     our list because it's not appropriate or if we just --
47
     yes, sure, please, Mr. Suminski.
48
49
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, the cultural and
```

0319 educational permit that Mr. Kitka mentioned is still available for the spring hunt of goats for wool. And that's a different process than this process even if you did want to do that. So I -- yes, I think it's 5 still available and, again, this isn't the process, that's the cultural and educational permit process. 6 7 8 Thank you. 9 10 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Terry. 11 12 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Any 13 other potential proposals for the Federal Subsistence 14 Program for wildlife. 15 16 MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair. 17 18 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Wright. 19 20 MR. WRIGHT: I was wondering about a 21 proposal to limit the hunters that are coming in to Hoonah from Juneau so it's -- it's pretty wild out 22 23 there. 24 25 Thank you, Madame Chair. 26 27 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, Mr. 28 Wright, and that would be for deer? 29 30 MR. WRIGHT: Yes. 31 32 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any other potential proposals that might be submitted by 33 34 this Council for the Federal Wildlife Subsistence 35 Program. 36 37 MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair. 38 39 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Douville. 40 41 MR. DOUVILLE: The tribe was working on 42 a proposal for a Federal subsistence hunt for moose in Unit 3. I'm not sure if that would -- how that would 43 44 all work. Similar to Berners Bay maybe. So a Federal 45 draw hunt. And they were talking a certain number, any 46 bull. So I don't know if that's something we could 47 take up or they should go ahead and submit that on 48 their own.

0320 1 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. I added it to the list so that we can decide if we want to take 2 that up. Are there any other potential proposals that 4 we can add to the list. 5 6 MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is 7 Albert. 8 9 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard. 10 11 MR. HOWARD: Sitka black-tailed deer on 12 Admiralty Island for -- we want to say not to allow 13 non-resident hunters to take any off the island, and 14 they're going to use the argument that the State has 15 jurisdiction but you could also use the argument that 16 Admiralty Island is a National Monument which makes it 17 Federal land. So it's for the Council to consider. 18 19 Thank you, Madame Chair. 20 21 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 22 you, Mr. Howard. Any other potential proposals. 23 24 (No comments) 25 26 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: At this time I'm 27 seeing five potential proposals we might discuss whether or not the Council should put forward. 28 29 30 Unit 4 deer. 31 32 Mr. Wright's limit deer, I believe that's on Unit 4 as well for Hoonah. 33 34 35 Deer on Admiralty Island. 36 37 And then elk. 38 39 And potentially moose in Unit 3. 40 41 Any other proposals. 42 43 (No comments) 44 45 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. It's 46 not a huge list which might make it a little more 47 feasible to go through these one by one and kind of 48 discuss them if we want to try to put together a 49 proposal. I think what we have to -- since this work

needs to be done, the call for proposal deadline is in May, by this meeting we have to decide if we want to put the proposals forward as the Southeast Regional Advisory Council and then we need to provide the actual proposals in proposal format so that we can have that submitted for us after some tweaking.

So does anyone object to going through each of these one by one as a Council as a whole, the alternative being we break into subgroups.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SLATER: No objection from me -- from here, Jim Slater speaking.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{VICE}}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing no other objection.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Excuse me, Cathy. I was just going to -- this is Don, I think it's worthwhile going through them as an entire group. There's a fair amount of overlap on what we're looking for here so a lot of what one area decides kind of relates to other areas so I think that'd be appropriate.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. I don't hear any objections so we'll go ahead and take these. It sounds like maybe we need to have a broader discussion about deer overall. There's potentially three different deer things so I'd like to try to tackle that first while we're on this topic fresh and with the goal of hopefully getting these kind of established before we adjourn today.

MS. PERRY: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Ms. Perry.

MS. PERRY: Sorry to interrupt. But before we get into this discussion I know we were going to come back to the Board of Game comment and it's almost 4:00 o'clock, so before we started the wildlife proposals in earnest I just wanted to see if the Council would like to look at the proposed language before we move forward. Again, just a check in.

 $$\operatorname{VICE}$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, is that language -- or is that letter comments complete, and ready to go?

MS. PERRY: It is. And I can -- I'm sending this to -- actually to Greg to put on Teams, and I can read it into the records for those folks who aren't on Teams. Gosh, bear with me just a second. Let me make sure that Greg has this so that he can put that up.

(Pause)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Would you be able to send it to the whole Council in case there are members of the Council that are not on Teams.

MS. PERRY: Yeah, and I was going to read it into the record too. And for most of the Staff, I know I have to kind of pick and choose from the distrib list so if you'll just bear with me and I'll read it and then can send it to you in just a second. I just don't want to hold up the meeting.

So reading this into the record, proposed language based on the conversation and the vote the Council took. It's on the Alaska Board of Game Proposal 194.

The Council opposes Board of Fish Proposal 194 if implemented in a shortened wolf season (less than one month). The Council anticipates shorter seasons in the immediate future and feels that this proposal designed to improve the population estimate for Unit 2 wolves would provide limited value for the population model and that the benefit would not outweigh the burden placed on subsistence users.

The Council would support a sealing requirement of seven days after the end of the season if the season is longer than one month.

Additionally, there are not enough sealers in Unit 2 and this would place a hardship on trappers to find a sealer. For those trappers working out of a boat, access and safety may be issue in bad weather. This could affect the trappers ability to harvest while meeting a weekly sealing requirement.

For this regulation to be effective, a comparison Federal proposal should be submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board and the Council would suggest the Alaska Department of Fish and Game consider an

0323 alternative that does not require a regulation change. And that would be to encourage trappers to report sooner on a voluntary basis. 4 5 That's the end of our drafted language 6 and we're standing by to make any edits. 7 8 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank 9 you, Ms. Perry. Are there any Council members that 10 have edits or want to see changes to the comments that 11 we would forward to the Alaska Board of Game on 12 Proposal 194. 13 14 MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair, Mike 15 Douville. 16 17 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville. 18 19 MR. DOUVILLE: There was one towards 20 the end, there was one sentence where DeAnna said 21 report, I think that could be changed to seal earlier 22 on a voluntary basis, or anyway included somehow. 23 24 MS. PERRY: I can make that change Mr. 25 Douville. So that would say encourage trappers to seal 26 sooner on a voluntary basis, correct? 27 28 MR. DOUVILLE: That's correct. 29 30 MS. PERRY: Done. 31 32 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any 33 other comments on the language put forward to Alaska 34 Board of Game Proposal 194. 35 36 (No comments) 37 38 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing 39 none we did already vote on this so I appreciate the 40 Staff that put the language together and summarized our 41 comments and it would be great if you could forward 42 that on to the Board of Game so they can consider our comments when they deliberate that proposal tomorrow at 44 their Board of Game meeting. 45 46 MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chair, this is 47 Ian. Can I just jump in really quick, sorry, for 48 coming in a little late.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: I feel like the first sentence doesn't quite accurately represent what was discussed. I feel like maybe the word, if, should be changed to especially if implemented in a shortened wolf season. I know we discussed the dichotomy but I feel like right now they're very directly linked. Anyway, just a small change, but especially if implemented in a shortened wolf season.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know what level to wordsmith it to exactly. I feel like there are some other changes if we wanted to get a little nitty-gritty that I might do, but that's the only one I see that maybe didn't, in my opinion, completely reflect what was discussed.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for that. If nobody opposes the additional comment or edit on that we can ask Ms. Perry to make that change.

MS. PERRY: Okay.

MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Cal again. I don't have an objection to that change to especially, that's a really good catch, it's a really good edit, I like it.

I am concerned about putting the period of one month in there. You know I don't know what a normal season should be, and I think Mike might be able to chime in on that. But can we just not say a month, just say, especially the shortened season like we have now or something like that. Because, you know, I'm not sure the cut off to me is a month, to tell you the truth. You know if the season went six weeks, I'm not sure I'd be okay with weekly sealing. So I'd prefer we just don't even have a period of time in there just say, especially during the shortened seasons that are occurring now or something like that.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Casipit. I think that's a really good point. I think even just leaving this sentence that says, the Council would support the sealing requirement of seven days

0325 after the end of the season, period, might be more what was reflected in Mr. Douville's comments when he spoke to the matter, rather than having it after harvested, having it after the season. 5 6 Is there any objection to taking out 7 the second half of that sentence regarding the 8 sentence, if the season is longer than one month. 9 10 MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair, I'm fine 11 with that. And a normal season used to be November 12 15th to March 15th. 13 14 MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, that seals the 15 deal for me for sure, yeah, we need to -- yeah, just take out that whole thing. I'm where Mike is, a normal 16 17 season is three or four months long so. 18 19 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. So Ms. 20 Perry if you can strike the second half of that 21 sentence that says, if the season is longer than one 22 month. 23 24 MS. PERRY: Yes, Madame Chair. And I 25 believe we would also change the wording in the first 26 sentence, we're taking out less than one month, that 27 was gleaned from Don's testimony. So that first 28 sentence would now read: 29 30 The Council opposes Board of Fish 31 Proposal 194, especially if implemented in a shortened 32 wolf season, period. 33 34 And then the other edit we made is 35 about midway through the paragraph, the sentence now 36 reads: 37 38 The Council would support a sealing 39 requirement of seven days after the end of the season, 40

period.

41 42

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Are we ready to ask Ms. Perry to forward this on.

43 44 45

46

MR. JOHNSON: Sorry, this is Ian, just one correction. I do see there's a typo, after population model there's an extra the in there.

47 48 49

MS. PERRY: Yeah, I saw that too,

0326 1 thanks. 2 3 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Any last second edits. 4 5 6 (No comments) 7 8 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Going once. 9 10 (No comments) 11 12 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Going twice. 13 14 (No comments) 15 16 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Ms. 17 Perry if you could forward that on to the Staff at the 18 Board of Game. I also received -- if you can CC Mr. 19 Schumacher and Mr. Ryan Scott on that, they can also 20 make sure that it gets there but it does need to be 21 sent through the official channels, I understand. And 22 thanks for helping us with that housekeeping. 23 24 Now, back to the call for wildlife 25 proposals under the Federal Subsistence Program. I was 26 suggesting that we have a general broader discussion 27 about deer and start to craft potential proposals to put forward regarding deer in the region. And I know 28 29 that we heard from some subsistence users this morning 30 and the testimony as well as Mr. Slater has indicated 31 that he is interest -- has been working with them and 32 ask this Council to put forward a proposal on their 33 behalf. So I would like to ask Mr. Slater if he would 34 like to lead the discussion, or start a discussion on 35 what you see a potential proposal looking like. 36 37 MR. SLATER: Sure, thank you, Madame 38 Chair. Well, as we tried to develop a way to both 39 protect subsistence users and try to still provide 40 access potentially for non-subsistence users who either 41 had some experience hunting in the areas we're trying 42 to protect or would like to, we -- in talking -- I 43 talked with DeAnna Perry, Terry Suminski and Justin 44 Koller, and there's a couple different dimensions in 45 which you can accomplish that. Some, I guess, prefer, 46 from a regulatory manner -- more preferred than others,

you can essentially change, or restrict a region, you

you can change harvest limits, or some combination of

can restrict a region for a certain period of time, or

47

48

49

all of those. 2 3 What we developed, and talking about, 4 that maybe the best way was to somehow split the 5 season between an open season and a restricted season. And we looked at trying to have the open half of the 7 season be available to anyone, and then as you hit the second half then it would be restricted to subsistence 9 users only. And what we looked at was in the areas of 10 Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski Strait, all the water 11 shed areas that fed into those areas, including Stag 12 Bay. 13 14 So I developed a draft of that and I 15 sent it to Justin Koller and he replied to me with that 16 in more of a general form. I can forward that to DeAnna and she could then, I guess, put it on Teams, or 17 18 she may even have a copy of it right now. 19 20 DeAnna, are you there? 21 MS. PERRY: Yeah. Mr. Slater, is that 22 23 the latest version. 24 25 MR. SLATER: I'll send you the latest 26 version right now. 27 28 MS. PERRY: Okay. I do have the one 29 you sent to Justin, I just wanted to make sure that was 30 the latest version so, yeah, go ahead and send me what 31 you have just to make sure that we've got the latest 32 one and I'll make sure that Greg gets it to share up on 33 Teams and I can also send it out to the rest of the 34 Council as well. 35 36 MR. SLATER: Okay, it's on its way. 37 38 MS. PERRY: Okay. 39 40 MR. SLATER: And this is a -- and just 41 to make sure everyone understands, this is just a 42 draft, it's not -- I'm looking for advice from the rest 43 of the Council on how best to accomplish what we're 44 trying to do here. And so this is by no means 45 something I'm adamant on, this form of it, and I'm very 46 open to hearing everyone's suggestions on how to 47 proceed. 48

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank

0327

49

0328 you, Mr. Slater. Other Council comments or feedback to the potential proposal put forward for in Unit 4, it sounds like it's some specific areas within Unit 4 that you would like the potential regulation to apply to. 5 6 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this 7 is Don. 8 9 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. 10 Hernandez. 11 12 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: While we're 13 waiting for the proposal to come up on the screen I 14 would like to ask Jim, is the intent of this proposal 15 to be restrictive to particularly non-resident hunters or are you looking to restrict, possible restriction 16 17 on, you know, all non-subsistence hunters, which would 18 include, you know, people from Juneau primarily in your 19 20 21 MR. SLATER: Right. 22 23 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: What's the main 24

goal here, I guess.

25 26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

MR. SLATER: I think non-resident hunters would be at the top of the list. But we do see a fair amount of pressure from people coming from instate as well and wouldn't be qualified as Federal subsistence hunters. So I think -- I don't know if there's a good way, you know, from my conversations with Terry and Justin, there really isn't a good way to distinguish between people other than saying are they Federally-qualified or not Federally-qualified. And if someone could either reassert that or correct me if there's another way to do it, another way to classify people.

37 38 39

MS. PERRY: Madame Chair.

40 41

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Ms. Perry.

42 43

44

45

46

47

48

MS. PERRY: Madame Chair. Yes, I would like to address a carryover question from Patty Phillips and it sounds like Mr. Slater has the same question, and this was regarding the authority and what kind of proposals we can submit as a Council. Mr. Brent Vickers from Office of Subsistence Management reached out to the Solicitor for an opinion, and the

```
Solicitor's response to the question on the Board's
     authority to restrict non-Alaska residents is, no, the
 2
     Board can only open, close or restrict non-subsistence
    hunting or fishing. It has no authority to pick and
 5
     choose between non-subsistence hunters, such as
    distinguishing between Alaska residents and non-
 6
 7
     residents. That falls entirely within the State's
     wheelhouse and scope of authority.
 9
10
                     So I just wanted to share that as we
11
    begin the discussion.
12
13
                     Thank you.
14
15
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right,
16
     appreciate that. I am glad that somebody followed that
17
     question through for this discussion. It sounds like
18
     the non-resident aspect of it is off the table for this
19
    potential proposal. So then it sounds like, Mr.
20
     Slater, the next level that you're interested in
21
     pursuing is potentially restricting non-subsistence
22
    users.
23
24
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair.
25
26
                     MR. SLATER: That's correct, Madame
27
     Chair -- oh, is there someone else.
28
29
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Sorry.
                                                  If Mr.
30
     Slater could confirm that and then Mr. Howard after
31
     that.
32
33
                     MR. SLATER: Yes, that's correct,
34
     that's confirmed, Madame Chair.
35
36
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
37
     you, Mr. Slater. Mr. Howard.
38
39
                     MR. HOWARD: You already covered what I
40
     said so that makes sense. Restricting non-Federally-
41
     qualified subsistence users, seems like we would be
42
     allowed to do that, and you eliminate the non-resident.
43
44
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
45
     Howard. I believe we have put proposals forward in Unit
46
     2 to restrict non-Federally-qualified subsistence
47
     users, but I can ask Staff to confirm that.
48
49
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr.
```

0330 Howard. Yes, we do have areas where we've restricted non-Federally-qualified users. 2 4 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. So Mr. 5 Slater has submitted some potential proposal language 6 that should now be in your inbox and up on the screen 7 for Microsoft Teams. 8 9 It looks like the existing regulation 10 is for Unit 4 deer, Units 4, is six deer, however 11 female deer may be taken only from September 15th 12 through January 31st. 13 14 The proposed change that he's 15 suggesting at this time would read: 16 17 Unit 4, six deer, however female deer 18 may be taken only from September 15th through January 19 31st with the added language; Federal public lands 20 draining into Lisianski Inlet, Lisianski Strait and 21 Stag Bay south of a line from Soapstone Point and Collin Point and north of a line from Point Theodore to 22 23 Point Euray are closed to deer hunting October 15th 24 through December 31st except by Federally-qualified 25 subsistence users hunting under these regulations. 26 27 I have a quick question. Is there C&T determination for -- actually the C&T determination is 28 29 for all rural residents in Southeast Alaska for Unit 4, 30 correct? 31 32 MR. SLATER: Sorry, I couldn't 33 understand that. 34 35 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: The question.... 36 37 MR. SLATER: No, you were breaking up, 38 I couldn't quite get that. 39 40 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I have a question for Staff, is the C&T determination for deer in Unit 4 41 42 currently at all rural residents? 43 44 MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair, this is 45 Terry Suminski. The C&T determination for deer is all 46 residents of Units 1 through 5 can hunt deer in Units 1 47 through 5. 48

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Any

49

0331 other questions or points of discussion regarding this potential proposed regulatory language -- change in 2 regulatory language. 4 5 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair. 6 7 MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chair, this is 8 Ian. 9 10 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair, this 11 is Don. 12 13 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Go ahead, Mr. 14 Hernandez and then Mr. Johnson. 15 16 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, I 17 think this is certainly an appropriate proposal. It 18 could possibly go a little further maybe to be more 19 effective. Question for Mr. Slater, if you're trying 20 to, you know, slow down the take by non-residents, is 21 there very many non-residents that, you know, come to 22 these lodges after October 15th, would you say? 23 24 MR. SLATER: Well, there's not per se 25 deer hunting lodges at this point. There may be but 26 there are some non-residents who come up there and I 27 think there's -- in the November and December timeframe we had somewhere between, you know, in the neighborhood 28 29 of 8 to 10 last year, I think, or somewhere in that 30 range in Lisianski Inlet. 31 32 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah, and I 33 could see where that could increase, so, yeah. Well, 34 like I say after October 15th, that's an effective time 35 for, you know, slowing down the harvest from non-36 residents for sure. I was just wondering if you, you 37 know, another consideration is you could also propose 38 to lower the bag limit for non-Federally-qualified, 39 that's something else that's in the tool box, instead 40 of six deer if you wanted to restrict the number of 41 deer they could take before October 15th. I don't know 42 if that's a consideration. 43 44 MR. SLATER: I think that is a 45 consideration. My only concern there is it really 46 wouldn't cut down on any of the non-resident hunting in 47 that timeframe because they're normally going to take 48 one or two based on just the cost of permits 49 themselves. They're still in the area at that time,

you know, affecting the hunting just by being present and shooting a deer and so on right in that critical time right there.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. And the answer doesn't surprise me. I don't expect that a lot of non-residents would take a lot of deer, I think they have to pay, you know, a tag fee which is somewhat significant.

MR. SLATER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: You're probably right that one or two deer is probably the norm. So you know with that in mind I guess I can see that keeping the bag limit high, at six, does continue to offer opportunity to some of the folks that might want to come from Juneau and hunt that area before October 15th, could still bring home, you know, more deer if they so choose. But anything after October 15th would certainly slow down the take I would expect but you're still allowing some opportunity so that could be a good balance.

MR. SLATER: That was the intent. And like I said, these are -- this is -- if anyone has any strong opinions these are -- this is a draft proposal but this is what we thought was a good balance.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:} \mbox{ And I think I would concur with that, yeah, thank you.}$

MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair, this is Calvin Casipit.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Casipit, I'm going to ask if you could hold off if that's okay because I recognized Mr. Johnson to go after Mr. Hernandez.

MR. CASIPIT: Oh, okay, sorry.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yeah, actually a lot of my thoughts were in line with what was just discussed. I feel like the merits of this proposal, as it is, does seem to strike a balance in regards to meeting its goal of decreasing pressure during kind of critical seasons and I guess like I'm thinking about particularly that October 15th deadline

matching up with snow conditions and times when subsistence hunting becomes more, you know, well, at least pressure could like significantly decrease subsistence opportunity when snow falls and deer are on the beach. So I guess I was curious -- I think this kind of answered through the discussion with Don and Jim, but it's my perception would be that, you know, leaving some opportunity from August forward kind of provides that gap for Alpine hunting and other more sport-orientated hunting and then the October 15th --it just seems appropriate to me. It seems like -- I see -- I mean like what I've learned through the proposal process to date is that when you can strike this balance you put a lot of strength in your proposal and I see that balance happening here.

So that's all I have to say.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thanks for that input, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Casipit.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you. I don't disagree with anything that's been said. I think that it strikes a really good balance. I like the dates. That preserves the best time for subsistence users, so I support all that.

The issue -- I just wanted to be -- maybe this needs clarification from Staff, but I know under Federal regulations, yeah, the limit is six deer, but I thought under State regulations for sporthunters and that would be basically Juneau people, I thought it was only four, am I wrong, or does it change when you go across the sound.

MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr. Casipit. The harvest limit was changed by the Board of Game I'm pretty sure just in the last cycle. It was raised to six deer for Unit 4 remainder, the northeast -- or the Chichagof Island east of Port Frederick and north Tenakee Inlet is three deer.

MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Suminski. I was unaware of that Board of Game change to the remainder. I didn't realize that was in there, thank you. I was aware of NECCUA limit though.

 $\mbox{ \begin{tabular}{lll} VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Any other Council \\ \mbox{members have comments for this potential proposed \\ \end{tabular}}$

```
0334
 1
     language for a proposal.
 2
 3
                     MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, it's Harvey
 4
     Kitka.
 5
 6
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair.
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Kitka.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Harvey go first.
11
12
                     MR. KITKA: I didn't want to break into
13
     their discussion on this. It's amazing the
14
     consultations that happen with the change of time.
15
     Back in the day when our people were, before contact,
     and somebody came into our territory they were -- was
16
17
     usually relatives or really close friends, and an elder
18
     would take them out hunting and that was the extent of
19
     their permission. They had to get permission from the
20
     local people. And the reason the elder went with them
21
     or the uncle went with them was for their safety
22
    because they knew where the hunting spots were. This
23
     way we use these regulations, it really complicates
24
     things.
25
26
                     Thank you.
27
28
                     (Laughter)
29
30
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:
                                          Yep.
31
32
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM:
                                          Thank you for
33
     that. Mr. Hernandez, did I hear you had a question.
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you,
36
     Cathy. I was just wondering if it's required that we
37
     make a motion at some point here to accept this as a
38
     proposal from the Council.
39
40
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, thank you,
41
    Mr. Hernandez. I want to make sure, there were some
42
     other potential deer proposals in the same unit, I was
43
     kind of thinking that we would discuss them to decide
44
     if we were going to -- I mean this could be one
45
     proposal and then we could have two separate proposals
46
     for the same unit if we need to do that but I just
47
    wanted to get a feel for the discussion of where it's
48
     going and then we can address whether or not the
```

Council would like to put forward a proposal.

49

```
0335
 1
                     MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair, this is
 2
     Frank.
 3
 4
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Wright.
 5
    Mr. Wright.
 6
 7
                     MR. WRIGHT: Pelican's proposal and our
 8
     proposal is.....
 9
10
                     (Teleconference interference -
11
    participants not muted)
12
13
                     MR. WRIGHT:
                                 ....invasion of people,
14
    especially when a ferry comes into town, and they have
15
     an invasion of people going to their area so I'm not
     sure if that's -- you know, I -- you know sort of go
16
17
    with this because the similarities are the same but
    they have -- their population and their area is smaller
18
19
    than ours, but Hoonah gets the ferry sometimes and the
20
    season starts twice a week and that's an overkill, you
21
    know, you got people camping out so it's kind of like
     -- that's all I got Madame Chair.
22
23
24
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
25
     Wright.
26
27
                     MS. PHILLIPS: Madame Chair, is it
28
     appropriate for public comment.
29
30
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Well, Ms.
31
     Phillips, I would take a comment from you regarding
32
     this since you have testified about the need for this
33
    potential proposal.
34
35
                     MS. PHILLIPS: This is Patricia
36
     Phillips. So you have the latest draft of the proposal
37
     that Mr. Slater's working on, however, there was a
38
    proposal that him and I discussed where the line would
39
    be at the beginning of Lisianski Inlet, and I had
40
     suggested that it be from a line from Mite Cove east
41
    over to Collin Point, and the reason I selected that
42
    there's a marker at Mite Cove, it's on the south side,
43
    southside of Mite Cove, is because of the -- you know,
44
    that's across Sound that Lisianski Inlet goes out into.
45
    And a lot of times those boats will go into -- if the
46
    weather's too rough to go on the outside, they'll go
47
    into Mite Cove or they'll go into Soapstone Cove and
48
     anchor up and wait on weather to go around or whatever,
49
     so they should -- I think they should be able to get a
```

```
0336
     deer in there if they can. But that is also a comment
     I can submit when the proposal goes out to public
     comment. But I just wanted to make that point clear.
 4
 5
                     And I thank you for getting the
 6
     Solicitor's opinion on my question earlier, I
 7
     appreciate it. I'm done, thank you.
 8
 9
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay, thank you,
10
    Ms. Phillips.
11
12
                     MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim
13
     Slater, could I comment on that.
14
15
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. I was going
16
     to ask while you're commenting if you could address
17
     whether or not this new language that we're looking for
18
     actually incorporates that.
19
20
                     MR. SLATER: That's fine with me.
21
     Basically the language came from Justin Koller as a --
     we originally had those -- the original lines in there
22
23
     and I think this is -- he said this is more of a line
24
     that they would propose. If we can basically edit that
25
     and come up with a line that would be similar to what
26
    Ms. Phillips just said, then that's fine with me, and I
27
     think it accomplishes all the same things.
28
29
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
30
     you for that.
                    So back to Mr. Hernandez' question.
31
     sounds like this is a potential proposal that would
32
     stand in and of itself that this body could put forward
33
    if we so choose. So it could now be the time that we
34
    would entertain if we want this proposal to go -- be
35
     submitted to the Federal Subsistence Program as a
36
    proposal from the Southeast Regional Council.
37
38
                     (Teleconference interference -
    participants not muted)
39
40
41
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Madame Chair.
42
43
                     MR. SLATER: Can I make a.....
44
45
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm sorry there's
46
     some background noise, I wasn't sure who was calling
47
     for the floor, if people could mute their phones.
48
```

MR. DOUVILLE: This is Mike Douville.

49

0337 1 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Douville. 2 3 MR. DOUVILLE: So this is putting a 4 restriction on non-Federally-qualified users, however 5 it hasn't been made clear that there is a conservation 6 concern. So I would like to have that addressed by 7 somebody smarter than me. 8 9 MR. SLATER: Would that be part of the 10 evaluation process for this? 11 12 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: It would be -- I 13 mean it probably could -- if there is an answer to the 14 question now we could ask Staff if there is, if there's 15 not then it would be part of the evaluation process. So I'm sure if there's any Staff that feels that they 16 17 could offer an answer to that question at this time. 18 19 MS. KENNER: Madame Chair, this is 20 Pippa. Can you hang on just a minute while we organize 21 ourselves. 22 23 (Pause) 24 25 MS. KENNER: Terry Suminski, do you 26 have something to say to that question. 27 28 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr. 29 Douville. Unit 4, as a whole, does not have a 30 conservation concern at this point. I'm sure there's 31 localized areas but the Unit -- deer are managed at the 32 unit level and most of the unit is at very high deer 33 levels right now. Again -- I'll leave it at that, 34 thank you. 35 36 MS. KENNER: And Madame -- excuse me, 37 Mr. Chair, this is Pippa. 38 39 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Ms. Kenner. 40 41 MS. KENNER: Oh, it is Madame Chair, 42 sorry I'm confused. Yeah, for the record this is Pippa 43 Kenner and the way the regulations read it includes two 44 items. One is for the protection of healthy 45 populations of the resource, and the other is to ensure 46 the continuation of subsistence uses. Those are the 47 two points that are covered when an analysis is done 48 for the Board.

0338 1 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for 2 that, Ms. Kenner. 4 MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair. 5 6 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka. 7 8 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Kitka, I 9 heard you loudest and clearest. 10 11 MR. KITKA: I just wanted to make a 12 point is that if Pelican would put on their report that 13 their needs are not being met that would be helpful. 14 15 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 16 Kitka. 17 18 MR. SLATER: Do you mean on the..... 19 20 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater, would 21 you like to field that question sort of with your 22 knowledge of Pelican? 23 24 MR. SLATER: Sure. Do you mean why 25 this regulation should be changed and that section there, to put a statement in there regarding that 26 27 subsistence hunters are having difficulty meeting their 28 needs? Is that what you're asking? 29 30 (No comments) 31 32 MR. SLATER: Did you guys hear me okay? 33 34 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Slater. 35 I heard you. You responded to Mr. Kitka's question about whether or not Pelican's needs are being met for 36 37 deer and you said that they were not which is one of 38 the reasons why the community is working to try to 39 potentially put a proposal forward. 40 41 Was there another Council member at the 42 same time as Harvey that wishes to be recognized at 43 this time. 44 45 MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, this is Cal. But 46 Harvey covered it for me already. And I wanted to 47 thank Pippa for reading that out of the regs. I know 48 that closure for healthy populations is one of the

reasons and I knew that continuing subsistence uses is

49

also one of the reasons so I think it's important that Pelican -- that we add that issue about subsistence needs not being met for the residents of Pelican.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Casipit.} \\$

MR. CASIPIT: And I also think, you know, I -- excuse me. And then also adding to that, why that regulation should be changed, what comes to mind from some of the discussion yesterday and even me looking out my window right now, the way the weather's been in not having the snow when the deer want to move to the beach and whether or not the snow is driving them to the beach. You know, we'll get a dump of snow and a bunch of rain for six weeks and they'll disappear until the snow comes back. I mean in the future we're going to have more of this. I don't think we're going to get less of it and because of climate change. And I think that we -- I think Pelican's on the right track here, that they're trying to take proactive action before something bad happens where, you know, then we're in the position where we're cutting off the whole season, or cutting bag limits, or that kind of thing. And I think -- anyway, that's just kind of my thoughts.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.

28 Casipit.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr.

33 Hernandez.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you. Just for the purpose of this discussion, I don't think we need to make any kind of a determination now about whether or not needs are being met. That will all be presented in the analysis, all the information we need to determine that. All we need to put a proposal forward is, you know, the testimony that we've heard from the public expressing their concern and telling us a problem that they see. So you know these discussions of whether or not the subsistence needs are being met, it's a little premature. And, you know, moving forward with these other proposals we're talking about for Angoon and Hoonah, like I say we don't need to go down that road yet. Let's just get the proposals out there based on what we're hearing from the public and let the

0340 analysis take its course. 2 3 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. Mr. 4 Hernandez. I'd like to ask the Council if the Council 5 would like to put a proposal forward, which would potentially be the language that's been presented to us 6 7 by Mr. Slater regarding Unit 4 deer around Lisianski Inlet. I'm wondering if we can make a decision -- if 9 we're ready to make a decision of whether or not we 10 want to put this proposal in to the Federal Subsistence 11 Board. 12 13 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair. 14 15 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. 16 Hernandez. 17 18 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I would like to 19 make the motion that the Regional Council submit a 20 proposal, which outlined there, basically it would 21 restrict the season to non-subsistence users for 22 October 15th on, and later, in the area that's 23 designated in the proposal. 24 25 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. 26 there a second. 27 28 MR. WRIGHT: Second the motion. 29 30 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Seconded by Mr. 31 Wright. All right, so the motion is whether or not the 32 Regional Advisory Council is going to submit this 33 proposal so I would like to find out if there are any 34 other Council comments that they'd like to make in 35 support of the motion, or if you're not supporting the 36 motion. 37 38 MR. JOHNSON: Madame Chair, this is 39 I have a quick clarification, I guess. 40 41 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Johnson, 42 go ahead. 43 44 MR. JOHNSON: Which is, if we do 45 support going forward with this proposal, what is the 46 process for that in terms of our involvements crafting 47 the language. Like I got some -- like when do we have 48 other opportunities to review this. 49

```
0341
 1
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm going to ask
     our Staff to give us an overview of this proposal
 2
     process to answer Mr. Johnson's question.
 4
 5
                     (No comments)
 6
 7
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there a Staff
 8
     person there that wants to go over that or would you
 9
     like me to butcher the process.
10
11
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair. This is
12
     Terry Suminski.
13
14
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
15
16
                     MR. SUMINSKI: I would say that the
17
     wording doesn't need to be perfect but, you know, the
18
     intent should be clear, and by the meeting, because
19
     once your meeting's over.....
20
21
                     (Teleconference interference -
     participants not muted)
22
23
24
                     REPORTER: Wait, can I have whoever's
25
     phone isn't on silent to mute it please.
26
27
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: If you could all
28
     check to make sure that your phones are on mute that
29
     would be appreciated.
30
31
                     REPORTER:
                                Sorry, I couldn't hear
32
     anything you were saying.
33
34
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Suminski, if
35
     you can start over please.
36
37
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair. Mr.
38
     Johnson. I think any of the edits should be done by
39
     the end of this meeting, or if there's clear intent
40
     that's -- that Staff could fix it up with the Chair's
41
     consent afterwards, I think that is a possibility.
42
     Throughout the analysis -- or throughout the regulatory
43
     cycle when it comes before the Council again, you can
44
     always make adjustments or, you know, changes when you
45
     recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board but I think
46
     ideally you would have it pretty close by the end of
47
     your meeting.
48
49
                     Thank you.
```

0342 1 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you for that 2 Mr. Suminski. 4 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair. 5 6 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Comments from the 7 -- yes. 8 9 MR. SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim 10 Slater. 11 12 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes. 13 14 MR. SLATER: I think one of the edits 15 that was identified by Ms. Phillips' comments were that we did want to change the first geographic line in the 16 17 restricted area from -- it would be from Soapstone 18 Point to Collin Point would be changed from something 19 equivalent that would be southeast of about a quarter a 20 mile or half a mile through Mite Cove and it's directly 21 across the Inlet, or maybe that could even go to Collin 22 Point again but it would expose the harbor -- or an 23 inlet for safe mooring for anyone coming into the Inlet 24 who wanted to hunt. So I don't know if we want to make 25 those edits now or if we want to talk to Justin Koller 26 or just leave that as an item that needs to be edited 27 and give permission to the Staff to do that. 28 29 That's all I have. 30 31 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I think if the 32 Council -- yeah, if the Council's in concurrence to 33 make the edit then we can ask Staff to do that for us. 34 35 So if there's no objection to adding 36 Ms. Phillips comments to the boundaries of this 37 proposal. 38 39 (No objection) 40 41 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing 42 none, if Staff could make sure that that is 43 incorporated in that proposed language to include that, 44 that would be great. 45 46 MR. SUMINSKI: And, Madame Chair, we 47 can work with Mr. Slater to do that. Unless he has 48 some description right now, but I don't, I'm not as

familiar with the area as he is so -- but with your

49

direction we can accomplish that. 2 3 MR. SLATER: Yeah, that sounds good. 4 I'd have to get a chart out so let's wait and do it 5 properly at a later time. 6 7 MR. KITKA: Madame Chair, Harvey Kitka. 8 9 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Kitka. 10 11 MR. KITKA: Yes, I just wanted to make 12 sure that the Pelican community, when they submit the 13 thing -- the Council isn't going to make the -- say at 14 this point that we're -- their needs are not being met, 15 so you got to put it on your proposal that you're 16 submitting and it should be almost -- it's so important 17 when it comes back to us the issue that your needs are 18 not being met. 19 20 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. 21 Kitka. 22 23 MR. SLATER: Harvey, this is Jim. How 24 would you best see the way to do that, just put it in 25 the proposal form here where it talks about why this 26 regulation should be changed or include some testimony 27 or what would you recommend? 28 29 MR. KITKA: I'd put it in your -- why 30 the regulation should be changed, because your needs 31 are not being met. I don't know about the rest of the 32 Council but that was always our marching orders. If we 33 got a proposal from one of the communities, that their 34 needs are not being met, that was the most important 35 part. 36 37 MR. SLATER: We say that in one of the 38 sentences, roughly, we say it's been challenging for 39 subsistence hunters in Lisianski Inlet and Lisianski 40 Strait and Stag Bay to harvest sufficient deer for 41 their needs. Should we be more forthright in saying 42 that or explicit, would you recommend, or change the 43 word challenging to difficult? 44 45 MR. KITKA: I'm not sure how you want 46 to word it but I know straightforward and say our needs 47 are not being met. 48

MR. SLATER: Okay. Do you recommend I

0343

49

```
0344
    do that live right now?
 2
 3
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater, I
 4
     think what we'll do is -- we do have a motion on the
     floor about whether or not we want to submit a proposal
    and I think we could probably close that out. We can
 7
    let Staff tweak the language in the proposed regulation
     as well as add to that section that says why this
 9
     regulation should be changed and we'll see a final
10
    version of it at some point tomorrow that we can
11
    approve to be forwarded on.
12
13
                     MR. SLATER: Okay. That sounds great
14
    to me.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: So we don't have
17
    to necessarily do it live right now.
18
19
                     MR. SLATER: Okay.
20
21
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: The motion on the
22
    floor....
23
24
                     MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair....
25
26
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....is that the
27
     Council will -- I'm sorry, I'm getting feedback from
28
     folks, was there somebody who was calling for the
29
    Chair.
30
31
                     MR. CASIPIT: This is Cal, I was just
32
     trying to get recognized. I was just trying to call
33
     for the question -- sorry.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
36
     Casipit. The question's been called. The motion is
37
     for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council to put
38
     forward a proposal to the Federal Subsistence Program
39
     wildlife cycle. Mr. Wright, can you do a roll call
40
     vote.
41
42
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I'm here, I had to
43
     find my mute button.
44
45
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
46
47
                     MR. WRIGHT: Okay.
48
49
                     Ian Johnson.
```

0345		
1		MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
2		MD DDTCIII. Catha Nasalhan
3 4		MR. WRIGHT: Cathy Needham.
5		VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes.
6		ND TIDEOUR TO D
7 8		MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
9		(No comments)
10		ND TIPEGUE TO D
11 12		MR. WRIGHT: Larry Bemis.
13		(No comments)
14		MD MDTGHT H
15 16		MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka.
17		MR. BEMIS: Yes. Larry Bemis, yes.
18		MD MDTCHE. Observ
19 20		MR. WRIGHT: Okay.
21		Harvey Kitka.
22		(37
23 24		(No comments)
25		MR. WRIGHT: Harvey Kitka, I know
	you're there.	
27 28		(Laughter)
29		(Haughter)
30		MR. KITKA: Yes. I had it on mute.
31 32		MR. WRIGHT: Harold Robbins.
33		income indicate nossins.
34		MR. ROBBINS: Yes.
35 36		MR. WRIGHT: Don Hernandez.
37		
38		CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Yes.
39 40		MR. WRIGHT: Albert Howard.
41		inc. Wildin. Tipere noward.
42		MR. HOWARD: Yes.
43 44		MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.
45		
46		(No comments)
47 48		MR. WRIGHT: Bob Schroeder.
49		III. MITOIT. DOD DONITOEGET.
50		

```
0346
 1
                     (No comments)
 2
 3
                     MR. WRIGHT: Jim Slater.
 4
 5
                     MR. SLATER:
                                  Yes.
 6
 7
                     MR. WRIGHT: Michael Douville.
 8
 9
                     MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
10
11
                     MR. WRIGHT: Calvin Casipit.
12
13
                     MR. CASIPIT: Yes.
14
15
                     MR. WRIGHT: Frank Wright votes yes.
16
    Motion passed.
17
18
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
19
     you, Mr. Wright.
20
21
                     MR. SLATER: Thank you, everyone.
22
23
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: So we'll be
24
     putting that proposal forward and we'll have some
25
     tweaked language to look at tomorrow to make sure it
26
     captures everything that we needed to capture. We had
27
     a number of other potential proposals. We're getting
28
     towards the end of the day. Is there another proposal
29
     that might be in a place that we would be able to have
30
     a discussion about whether or not we want to submit it,
31
     it doesn't necessarily have to be in regulatory
32
     language just yet, but whether or not we're going to
33
     submit proposals on that we can potentially work on
    between now and tomorrow to make this process go a
34
35
     little more efficiently.
36
37
                     On my list I have Mr. Wright suggested
38
     potentially looking at limiting deer in Unit 4 around
39
    Hoonah. And Mr. Howard had a question if we could do a
40
     potentially similar action regarding deer around
41
     Admiralty. Are either of those potentially ready to go
42
     or should we take them up fresh tomorrow.
43
44
                     MR. WRIGHT: Madame Chair, this is
45
     Frank.
46
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright.
47
48
49
                     MR. WRIGHT: Our proposal is pretty
```

0347 much similar to Pelican so it might be a little quicker or you could take it up tomorrow. 2 3 4 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. 5 6 MR. WRIGHT: If we have the time, yeah. 7 8 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Do you have 9 specific language that you would potentially put 10 forward or do you want to -- do you know what you want 11 to do and it's kind of in the same intent and we can 12 just discuss it now? 13 14 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. 15 16 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, you 17 have the floor. 18 19 MR. WRIGHT: I'd like to -- one of the 20 things in Hoonah is we have a ferry that comes in all 21 the way up through the hunting season and we get so 22 many people coming in and camping out and having a good 23 time instead of worrying about what they were getting 24 and shooting bambis and everything, and leaving the 25 bambis out there because they're too small and we got 26 people that want the big bucks and they go out hunting 27 for the big bucks and don't do the right thing, taking 28 everything. And then, you know, this year, like Ian 29 had said the hunting was pretty poor this year so --30 and he's a young man that goes out so -- and I see guys 31 coming in from hunting and they -- right on Front 32 Street, so I wonder about the people coming from out of 33 town to -- especially on a ferry, you know, there was 34 one -- one time I saw a guy with a truckload and his 35 truck was down, his springs were down and everything 36 and so.... 37 38 (Teleconference interference -39 participants not muted) 40because of the 41 MR. WRIGHT: 42 employment right now, because we don't have the right 43 to go to Costco, they can't go hunt in Costco so they 44 love the deer that they get. So my concern is that, 45 you know, this community is only 49 percent now of 46 Native people so I worry about the culture of this

So thank you, Madame Chair.

47

48

community.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Wright. Did you have any potential specifics about locations, boundary lines, bag limits, what you'd like to see in proposed Federal regulation language.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, I don't know how to put it because Hoonah's, you know, got -- there's a road system that runs miles, I mean miles, 20 or 30 miles, you know, this road system runs all the way to -- everywhere, it even runs right up to Tenakee so but it doesn't go into Tenakee but it's right next -- you can almost see Tenakee from there so I don't know how I would word it. Because there's just miles of road system and that brings up -- you know, goes up to Whitestone -- people park at Whitestone because of the big park, so I don't know how to word the location.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Is there any Council members that have any suggestions of how to potentially capture this proposed language that Staff could put into a draft proposal for us?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SLATER: Madame Chair, this is Jim Slater.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Slater.

MR. SLATER: Thank you. When I tried to consider ways to do it it was difficult, especially in light of the fact that really the only thing you have is Federally-qualified versus non-Federally-qualified people to make the first cut at deciding who can hunt and who can't hunt. And after that it's only dates or bag limits. So we're kind of constrained in the solution set that we have. So I mean it kind of starts from that point. I don't know if you have thought about, you know, reduced bag limits or restricted seasons. I know it's a complicated issue for any community but that's the only thing I could come up with.

And that's all.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you. At this time did we want to just potentially consider having draft proposal language drafted for a potential proposal from Southeast Regional Advisory Council to the Federal Subsistence Board regarding restricting deer harvest to non-Federally-qualified users around

```
0349
    Hoonah and then tomorrow when we look at the language
     on the screen maybe we can tweak it with actual
 2
     landmarks.
 4
 5
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, that would be good.
 6
 7
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. I
    believe Terry Suminski is taking notes on sort of your
 8
 9
     discussion, Terry, do you have any specific questions
10
     at this time or need more clarification?
11
12
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Thanks, Madame Chair,
     this is Terry Suminski. Yeah, it's -- all I really got
13
14
     is that want to close a portion of something around
15
    Hoonah to non-Federally-qualified. I would definitely
    need a little more detail than that and maybe we can
16
17
     work on that tomorrow but it's a start.
18
19
                     Thanks.
20
21
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
     you. So hopefully Staff will have that in kind of this
22
23
    proposal format that we can look at tomorrow as we
24
    decide -- as we define it more and decide if we want to
25
     submit it coming from the Southeast Regional Advisory
26
    Council.
27
28
                     (Teleconference interference -
29
    participants not muted)
30
31
                     MR. CASIPIT: Ms. Chair.
32
33
                     MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. So that's
34
    ours.
35
36
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
37
     you, Mr. Wright. Mr. Casipit, are you trying to.....
38
39
                     MR. CASIPIT: Yeah, I'm trying to chime
     in but there's a bunch of feedback from somewhere.
40
41
42
                     Anyway, I was wondering and I was going
43
     to ask Frank this -- Mr. Wright this, as far as the
44
     geographic area, maybe for Staff -- it might be easier
45
     for Staff for the geographic area to just use the
46
    Northeast Chichagof Controlled Use Area and that pretty
47
    much takes in the road system around Hoonah. Would
48
     that geographic area fit for you or work for you?
```

```
0350
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it would. You know,
 1
    what we're concerned about is the people coming in on
 2
    the ferry and, you know, there's nothing we can do
     about people that are coming in on the boats, but when
 5
     they come in on the ferry the road system runs all the
 6
     way down to Tenakee, so, yeah that would work.
 7
 8
                     MR. CASIPIT: Okay. So for Staff, if
 9
     we can make the geographic area, the NECCUA, that would
10
    help. And then as far as the restriction on non-
11
     Federally-qualified, we could either do a time or bag
12
     limit or, you know, like Mr. Slater was doing. So I
13
     guess that's something for us all to think about.
14
15
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
16
17
                     MR. CASIPIT: What would be best, so.
18
19
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is
20
    Albert.
21
22
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Howard.
23
24
                     MR. HOWARD: I'm testing my cousins in
25
     Hoonah, so we think the road system -- every road
26
     system connected to Hoonah should be closed to non-
27
     Federally-qualified subsistence users.
28
29
                     (Teleconference interference -
30
    participants not muted - papers - cars)
31
32
                     MR. HOWARD: I'm not sure who's filing
33
    papers when someone else is talking but.
34
35
                     REPORTER: Yes, if we could have
36
     everybody just mute their phones unless they're talking
37
     that would be greatly appreciated.
38
39
                     MR. WRIGHT: This is Frank. I don't
     know how that would work for Federal lands around here
40
41
    but anyway thanks for the suggestion.
42
43
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. So we
44
     have two potential -- well, we have one proposal that
45
     we'll submit, we have another potential proposal that
46
    we're starting to hash some language out for,
47
    Albert....
48
```

49 (Teleconference interference - 50

```
0351
     participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
 2
 3
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: .... Howard.
 4
 5
                     (Teleconference interference -
 6
     participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: If you can mute
 9
     your phone, if your phones are not on mute, we're
10
     getting a lot of feedback and hearing a lot of
11
     conversations so if you could mute your phones please.
12
13
                     Mr. Howard, I was wondering, you also
14
     said that you were interested in potentially looking at
15
     Admiralty Island, which is also Unit 4, did you have
     some thoughts that you wanted to put forward and ask
16
17
     Staff to potentially start drafting up a proposal.
18
19
                     MR. HOWARD: I think everything west of
20
     Point Retreat on Admiralty Island, west and everything
21
     west of -- west side of Gardner on Admiralty Island, so
    basically the west side of Admiralty Island closed to
22
23
     non-Federally-qualified users unless otherwise -- as an
24
     example -- and you guys can figure this part out --
25
    unless they go hunting with me, Mr. Wright, or Harvey
26
    Kitka mentioned in the past and I do this when I go to
27
     Sitka or Hoonah, I'll hunt with my cousins in Hoonah
28
    because I don't know the area. Just like when I
29
    learned how to do herring eggs in Sitka, someone from
30
    Sitka took me out and showed me. So there's an
31
    opportunity there to address this in a unique way that
32
    maybe as an example, if my brother comes home one of
33
     these days I can take him out hunting and we're still
34
     within regulation even though he lives in Juneau.
35
36
                     So thank you.
37
38
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
39
     Howard. Other Council questions or comments about
40
     potentially putting in a third proposal regarding Unit
41
     4 deer, that may potentially limit non-Federally-
42
     qualified users in and around Angoon.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Madame Chair.
45
46
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, who --
47
     somebody -- was that Mr. Douville, I wasn't quite sure.
48
```

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Don has a

49

0352 1 question. 2 3 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Sorry. Mr. 4 Hernandez. 5 6 (Laughter) 7 8 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, just, you 9 know, thinking about the point that Albert and Harvey 10 brought up, it seems to me that in the case of -- I'm a 11 little unclear on this, but in the case of a Federal 12 closure, if a relative who is non-Federally-qualified 13 came out to your area I don't know if it's possible 14 that -- say Albert could get proxy tags for his 15 relatives to hunt under State regulation during a Federal closure. I'm thinking if there's a way that --16 17 I know designated hunter couldn't be used but, you 18 know, could proxy tickets possibly used. This would 19 take some investigation. So that a relative could hunt 20 under.... 21 22 MS. KENNER: Madame Chair, this is 23 Pippa Kenner. 24 25 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Go ahead, Pippa. 26 27 MS. KENNER: Oh, are you the Chair --28 oh, sorry, yes, okay thank you. For the record this is 29 Pippa Kenner with OSM. So if Federal public lands are 30 closed to the harvest of deer by non-Federally-31 qualified users then the person could not legally apply 32 for a proxy tag under State regulations and hunt on 33 Federal public lands. There are private lands. But on 34 Federal public lands, Forest Service lands is basically 35 what we're talking about, a non -- a person living in a 36 non-rural area would not be able to hunt deer on 37 Federal public lands and a person wouldn't be able to 38 use a State proxy to -- or a Federal designated 39 harvester permit to hunt deer on Federal public lands. 40 CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Very good, thank 41 42 you, Pippa, for answering that question. So that 43 brings up my other question for Frank, and I'm 44 wondering about there's a fairly large amount of, you 45 know, private corporation land in that NECCUA area that 46 we're talking about, both Sealaska and Hoonah Totem, I 47 believe both have large landholdings, quite a few 48 acres, I don't know what the hunting practices are

there. I know they are regulated by the State

49

```
0353
    regulations and not Federal. I don't know if the
    private land owners allow access on their lands. I
    don't know how significant, you know, of an impact that
    is to the local area but kind of curious about that
 5
    factor.
 6
 7
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Madame Chair.
 8
 9
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Wright.
10
11
                     MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, there is a lot of
12
     corporation land around here but when you got just
13
     clear-cuts to go hunting on -- anyway, yeah, there is a
14
     lot of corporate land but another question would be
15
     when -- if they do hunt on the corporation land and
16
     they're driving into town and a State Trooper stops
17
     them how do they designate where they shot an animal,
18
     so that's something that I thought about, too, you
19
    know, so -- yeah, there's Sealaska land which runs out
20
    towards Game Creek and -- but then Juneau Totem
21
    Corporation is on the other side there and then
22
    Sealaska is the other side, I think you saw -- you saw
23
     a picture of that. Yeah. Yeah, I don't -- well, the
24
     corporate land is supposed to be for corporate people
25
     but no one -- no one monitors it.
26
27
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
28
29
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
30
    you for that.
31
32
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is
33
     Albert.
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I wanted to check
36
     to make sure Mr. Hernandez was complete and then Mr.
37
     Howard.
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ:
                                          Yeah. Yeah.
40
     answers my questions, thank you.
41
42
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
43
     Howard.
44
45
                     MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Madame Chair.
46
    My reason behind trying to do this was mainly to shut
47
     down out of state bear hunters from hunting deer while
48
     they're in the area. They can go hunt them somewhere
49
     else if they want to but not on Admiralty. But then
```

this whole thing got mixed in with other communities and what they wanted. The reasons why I don't think the deer should be taken for sport on this island, and I mentioned earlier in Monument language, this Preserve was for the well-being and protection of the indigenous people of the island and it's never been -- the island has never been treated that way.

We have bear hunters coming in and I'm going to keep harping on it until somebody until somebody gets talking about them robbing our crab pots to feed their clients when the lodge I worked for had to buy a crab permit and then by crab from themselves to feed it to the customers, so there's a discrepancy there we don't agree with.

But I think the intent of what I was trying to do is to make sure the bear hunters go somewhere else to get their deer and not on Admiralty Island and not residents -- residents of Alaska hunting, I'm more against non-residents hunting. I don't know what the difference is, when they allow a resident to keep king salmon and then non-residents aren't allowed to retain any at all. It seems to be the same. You know one's fish and one's game.

But, you know, that's just kind of my thoughts but I think the west side of Admiralty can be closed to non-Federally-qualified subsistence users and if my brother wants to go with me he can watch and since he's my older brother he does anyway, so, thank you, Madame Chair.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Howard.} \\$

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted - overlapping conversations)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: And I had a question, do you -- yeah, I'd like to ask a question of Mr. Howard, if he knows when the bear -- what the overlap is between the bear hunting season and the current August 1st through January 31st season for Unit 2 [sic] deer, do you know what that overlap might be?

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard.

0355 1 MR. HOWARD: We start seeing bear hunters on Admiralty Island in September, not so much 2 in August because we do a lot of our stream fishing in August and we wouldn't hardly see them, so most of 5 their traffic was September/October. Not so much concerned about the spring season because there's no 6 7 hunting for deer in that time period, but that seems to be when they enjoy eating our crab so. 9 10 VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: So a potential 11 proposal that would address that concern could be 12 closing it to except for Federally-qualified users to a 13 time period that bear hunters..... 14

15 (Teleconference interference -16

17 18

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM:would be

participants not muted - overlapping conversations)

19 present.

20

21 REPORTER: Can everybody please mute 22 their lines.

23 24

MR. HOWARD: I wanted to hear more of that language, but, yeah.

25 26 27

MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair, can I offer a couple things. This is Terry Suminski.

28 29 30

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, please, Mr. Suminski.

31 32 33

34

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, to answer your question, I'm looking at the State regulations and the fall bear hunt, if I'm not reading it wrong, is September 15th to December 31st. However, I do have a potential solution outside of this regulatory avenue for Mr. Howard. If he is only concerned with guided deer hunting, that can be controlled just -- you know, the Department and the Forest Service work together to control bear hunting and deer hunting as well. So there's a very limited number of guides that bear hunt and we have -- the Forest Service has a fair bit of control over the conditions of those permits. And it might be more productive if Mr. Howard only wants to limit the guided aspect, to work with the District Ranger, you know, for Admiralty, which is Basia Trout, to talk to her about really what kind of guiding is going on, how many bear hunts are allowed, how many

```
0356
     deer hunts are allowed and try to potentially steer
     those away from, you know, the places that are most
 2
     important to Angoon. That's just a suggestion.
 4
 5
                     Because if we go down this road to
 6
     closing to non-Federally-qualified, then, yes, friends
 7
     and family from Juneau would not be able to participate
     in deer hunting on the west side of Admiralty during
 9
     those dates.
10
11
                     So just a suggestion that there may be
12
     other options.
13
14
                     Thank you.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
17
     Suminski. Mr. Howard, do you think that those
18
    potential suggestions might address your concern or
19
     would you still like the Council to think about
20
    potentially putting forward a proposal?
21
22
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair. I've
23
     learned through many of these processes that if you ask
24
     for the island and what you really want is just the
25
    west side of the island you'll probably get it. So I
26
    quess if we ask to close it to non-Federally-recognized
27
    subsistence hunters and then they say well how about we
     just close it for guided hunters then I get what I
28
29
    want. But there's going to be negotiating in there
30
    somewhere probably so I think we can start with closing
31
     the whole west side to non-Federally-qualified hunters,
32
     if that makes any sense.
33
34
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
35
36
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right.
37
    Mr. Howard, would you like to put the timeframe on
38
     that, overlapping with the bear hunting season. I'm
39
     just trying to make sure.....
40
41
                     MR. HOWARD: That would be perfect.
42
     Close it to non-Federally-qualified hunters.....
43
44
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM:
                                          Okay.
45
46
                     MR. HOWARD: .....from September 15th
47
     to December 31st. If that's when the bear season runs.
48
49
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you.
```

MR. HOWARD: I mean it may even -- I don't see bear hunters in December so you may want to be until the end of November.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. That provides some clarification and we can ask Staff to put that draft language before us tomorrow so that we have something a little more concise in front of us to decide if we want to submit a proposal, so I appreciate you answering that question.

We're getting pretty late in the day and I know we had a couple of other potential proposals and a couple of them came from Mr. Hernandez and one was an idea from Mr. Douville. I'm wondering if it would be more efficient to find out from those gentlemen if we could have them put it in proposal form so that we could see it before. I know I hate to ask for people to do homework but it seems like these conversations go a little more efficiently if we have some potential language in front of us so that we can decide if we want to submit a proposal and then have a discussion on how to tweak it tomorrow. I wonder if it's fair to ask Don Hernandez if he has a couple of proposed things -- if you have them done now you could ask Staff to do it if it's concise and then we can have the discussion on it tomorrow, but I'd like to ask Mr. Hernandez that question about the elk proposal he was thinking about, and then Mr. Douville about moose.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Well, my two proposals, one of them is fairly straightforward, the other one requires probably some discussion.

The one is to reinstitute what the State had in regulation up until a couple of years ago for Federally-qualified users only, would be to allow for the taking of any elk outside of the Etolin and Zarembo Island. In other words — they had a regulation — they didn't want the elk to spread to neighboring islands and they rescinded that but I would like to see that brought back for subsistence hunters only.

And then the other one which requires a little discussion is whether or not we'd want to do something similar to what we did in Berners Bay, where we have a drawing permit for elk that we institute some kind of a priority for subsistence users. Now that we

have a customary and traditional use determination for elk, that's an option. And that requires a little more discussion.

But they're two pretty basic ideas there that just need to be fleshed out a little bit.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. I'm wondering if we can ask Staff to take those two concepts and start getting them into proposal format so if there's an existing regulation and then what a potential proposed Federal regulation would be before -- and if there's not an existing regulation, kind of what that would look like, so that tomorrow morning when we have these before us we can have the discussion tweaking the language and then voting on if we want to submit it forward.

CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Excuse me, Cathy. If I could ask Staff to research that a little bit. I don't have the means to go back and see what the regulation was before the State rescinded it and if we could -- like I say, I just want to kind of bring that back and it would be a Federally-qualified user only this time. So if I could ask Staff to do that before we get back to it that would be great. And then the other one I think we, you know, we know what we did in Berners Bay, we might want to mirror something similar to that for elk.

So that would be simple to do if the Council thought it was something they wanted to put forward.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Great, thank you} % \end{substitute} %$

MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville -- yeah, Mr. Suminski.

 MR. SUMINSKI: Yes, just before we move on. Through the Chair. Mr. Hernandez. Yeah, basically what you said, that could be the Federal regulation, take any elk that's outside of those islands, but I wanted to confirm you said Etolin and Zarembo?

```
0359
 1
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: I believe that was
    the original State regulation. I think it was both
 2
     Etolin and Zarembo but I'm not positive on that.
 4
 5
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Okay, we can get started
 6
    on that. Yeah, and -- okay, got it, thank you.
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN HERNANDEZ: Thank you.
 9
10
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr.
11
     Suminski.
12
13
                     MR. HOWARD: Madame Chair, this is
14
    Albert.
15
16
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yeah, Mr. Howard.
17
18
                     (Teleconference interference -
19
    participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
20
21
                     MR. HOWARD: (Indiscernible) something
22
    out of the Fish and Game's regulations.....
23
24
                     (Teleconference interference -
25
    participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
26
27
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Howard, if you
28
     could hold on a moment, I'd like to ask folks to mute
29
     their phone we're getting another conversation at this
30
     time.
31
32
                     (Teleconference interference -
33
    participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
34
35
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: If you could mute
36
     your phone please.
37
38
                     (Teleconference interference -
39
    participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
40
41
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'm sure if the
42
     court reporter can isolate a line and.....
43
44
                     REPORTER: Yeah, I can try and do that,
45
    hold on just a second.
46
47
                     MR. JOHNSON: Whoever is talking about
48
     figs....
49
```

```
0360
 1
                     REPORTER: Hey, whoever's speaking
     right now about figs, we can hear you right now, you're
 2
     not on mute.
 4
 5
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, it
 6
     sounds like that situation has been taken care of, Mr.
 7
     Howard, if you'd like to proceed please.
 8
 9
                     MR. HOWARD: I guess I'm chucking
10
    first, that was pretty good. I sent something that
11
    might help us to DeAnna.
12
13
                     MS. PERRY: I have....
14
15
                     MR. HOWARD: (indiscernible -
     overlapping conversation) by Alaska Department of Fish
16
17
     and Game. They may have already addressed it at some
18
    point on relatives coming to hunt with you, I'd have to
19
     look further into it, I mean.
20
21
                     (Teleconference interference -
22
    participants not muted - overlapping conversations)
23
24
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Okay. Can that be
25
     incorporated.....
26
27
                     MS. PERRY: I just sent that to.....
28
29
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: ....in our
30
     discussion then tomorrow?
31
32
                     MS. PERRY: Madame Chair, I just sent
33
     that to Greg to put up on Teams if you want to do that
34
     now, and I've also sent it to Mr. Suminski, if you want
35
     us to work on that and revisit it tomorrow.
36
37
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: I'd like to
38
     capture the rest of the proposals that Staff can help
39
     us with between today and tomorrow to get into
40
     regulatory language so that we can see it fresh
41
     tomorrow. I want to -- so if this is a proposal that
42
     we've already talked about I'd like to wait until
43
     tomorrow, but if it's something new then we should
44
     probably look at it.
45
46
                     MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair, just
47
     really quickly. Those are from State regulations.
48
     They really have no bearing on Federal proposals.
49
```

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you, Mr. Suminski. And thanks for providing that, Mr. Howard, and we can take a look at it tomorrow when we're looking at the elk proposals.

Mr. Douville, do you want to throw the concept of a potential moose proposal for Unit 3 out so that Staff can kind of capture it so that we'll have regulatory language to look at for tomorrow.

 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah. The tribe was working on it, it might be easier or better for some help with regulatory language. And I think what they were looking for was a similar hunt as Berners Bay, like a Federal draw hunt where moose in Unit 3, they were looking at any bull instead of some of the qualifying language the State has for bull moose. I think the number was 20 but.

So that's the general idea.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. Mr. Suminski, did you have followup questions for that so that some language could be thrown together for us?

MR. SUMINSKI: Madame Chair, this is Terry Suminski. I guess is that 20 moose or a percentage because we know that quotas go up and down, or especially if we're talking about any bull. Yeah, I -- I'm not sure how to quite do that but anyways, so this is for all of Unit 3?

MR. DOUVILLE: I think they were looking at Kupreanof and Kuiu specifically.

MR. SUMINSKI: Okay, thank you.

 $$\operatorname{VICE}$$ CHAIR NEEDHAM: Mr. Douville, was that the number, 20 moose, or 20 percent of the estimate?

MR. DOUVILLE: I believe it to be 20 moose but I think what you'd want is a reasonable number, just to give an added opportunity for rural users.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you. We'll start there and have the discussion from

that. I just want to check to make sure that during these proceedings nobody else has thought about any potential additional wildlife proposals that you might ask this Council to put forward in this cycle so that there are no surprises tomorrow. Is there any other proposals that I didn't capture on my list that we haven't talked about thus far.

Harold.

MR. ROBBINS: Madame Chair, this is

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: Yes, Mr. Robbins.

MR. ROBBINS: Yes. We've got one that we may want to consider on mountain goat on -- it's more or less just a housekeeping thing on how the quota ratio is set up for subsistence and it's just a minor change. I need to spend a little bit of time with our local biologist, Susan Oehler, and work that out.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right. Did you want to try to do that before tomorrow morning so that we could throw some potential proposed language up on the screen for consideration?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ ROBBINS: Yes. I'll see if she can't help that out, and see if we can get that put together tonight.

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank you for that. Any other Council members proposing other potential proposals.

(No comments)

VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, hearing none, I'm sure everyone is getting ready for dinner. This was a long afternoon and I appreciate all of your patience and your participation. It's officially past the 5:00 o'clock hour but I think we will recess for today. Just as a reminder, we do have the rest of this new business on the call for Federal wildlife proposals to work through tomorrow morning. We have a couple of other action items under new business. And then we have our slew of agency reports. So tomorrow is going to be another action-packed day.

 $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$ would ask if there is any announcements that Ms. Perry needed to make before we

```
0363
     recess for the day.
 2
 3
                     MS. PERRY: No, Madame Chair. I'll
 4
     followup with the Staff on these proposals.
 5
 6
                     Thank you.
 7
 8
                     VICE CHAIR NEEDHAM: All right, thank
 9
     you, so much, and thank you to the Staff that's going
10
     to do a little bit of homework for us in the off hours.
11
     I really appreciate your time as we work through this,
     you're amazing and always ever so helpful for us. And
12
13
     with that we'll recess until 9:00 a.m., tomorrow
14
     morning.
15
                      (Off record)
16
17
18
                  (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)
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
```

0364 1	CERTIFICATE		
2	UNITED OF THE OF THE OF THE OF		
3 4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA))ss.		
5 6	STATE OF ALASKA)		
7	I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the		
8	state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:		
9 10	Reporters, LLC, do nereby certify:		
11 12	THAT the foregoing pages numbered through contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the		
13	SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL		
14 15	MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically on the 17th day of March;		
16 17	MILTARE the transcript is a true and		
18	THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and		
19 20	thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and		
21	ability;		
22 23	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or		
24	party interested in any way in this action.		
25 26	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 20th		
27 28	day of April 2021.		
29			
30 31	Salena A. Hile		
32	Notary Public, State of Alaska		
33 34	My Commission Expires: 09/16/22		
35 36			
37			
38 39			
40			
41 42			
43			
44 45			
46 47			
48			
49 50			