

Roadless Scoping Meeting
9/19/18

TS: Tenakee Springs resident (when known, named in parenthesis)

FS: Government scoping official (when known, named in parenthesis)

xxx: words or phrases that were difficult to discern in recording.

TS (Kevin): I'd be curious to find out how much high volume timber is left in these roadless areas. I bet that there's relatively little left and my concern is that those would go.

FS: That's a valid concern and I definitely would encourage you, if you have a specific area that you're concerned about please let us know.

TS: I noticed in the... different groups are participating like the group of fishermen tourism, mining, and all that, I didn't see any subsistence groups represented personal use resource reasons will they be included in that?

FS: Yeah they could, absolutely. I've learner that folks have different concepts of subsistence but rural communities, if you think of subsistence in that way, or native Alaskans, if you think of subsistence in that way would both be represented and the administrative work calls for that representation on that group. There's also an at-large public representation that can be on that group and so there really is no limits to interests that can be represented on that group. That's how the administrative order is written. So I think that the governor's intent is to have the broadest spectrum of interests represented as possible. If you have interest in any of those sections or categories I'd encourage you to apply for that group.

FS2: Can I follow up on one point? So the forest service still will have to go through their subsistence testimony so there's a second part outside of that for a subsistence standpoint so that process would still have to be in place.

FS1: Absolutely. Subsistence hearings—there will be formal subsistence hearings.

TS: I was stunned when I heard that you're planning to have 13 people that aren't even picked yet and they're supposed to have a report by November 30th. That is exceedingly optimistic and unrealistic. And the other thing I'm wondering is the Tongass 77 area. We just finished two years ago working out an agreement with the TLUMP 2016. It took a lot of time to work out and I think we came to a consensus in the state. Now we're getting thrown a whole new thing that potentially I believe—I mean, you said that it won't alter TLUMP—but if it's not, tell me if I'm wrong, I think depending upon what's decided on this it will require a revision of TLUMP.

FS: It could change.

TS: So I think it's very likely, unless we stick with the no change alternative, that it would, so we'll be back into that again. But what happens with the Tongass 77? I believe that those are at the lower end of policy so those are all open to being taken out of the roadless rule.

FS: So the regulation—or, uh, the broader layer that would allow or disallow certain activities within a specified area—and the forest at that point they can make it more restrictive or less restrictive—or, not less restrictive, they can make it more restrictive than the regulation if they choose to do so.

And that would be a separate process if it's needed.

TS: But they theoretically could take Tongass 77 out of the protected system with this new change and then it would require a new change to TLUMP obviously. So that would be something that we should make sure that specific detail that we can state “include all the tongass 77” and that's specific enough?

FS: Yep, we'll understand what that means.

Baret: I have a question: The 13 members on the citizen advisory committee—how are they chosen? Do they apply? Do you pick them? How's that process work?

FS: There's an application that you express an interest to the governor's office.

TS: I thought those were due already.

FS: The administrative order called for applications by last Friday the 14th. But they haven't been named so if you have an interest, apply. But the governor did open it up for a seven-day application period but there's no law that says you can't accept an application after that. So they're working right now—the governor's office is working right now to consider the applications they have and make the appointments to that group. So I am not going to tell you not to apply. At the top of the press release there are contacts to the governor's office—staff phone numbers—and then at the bottom there's a link to where you can express an interest. I think it's an email and a website. I checked on Tuesday and the application like was still live on Tuesday.

TS (Molly): Can you address the need for haste? It seems like, we've been involved in so many EIS processes, we kind of know the drill. And this seems like a hugely accelerated process. Can you explain that?

FS (Kyle): It's not my process, so I'll look to these gentlemen.

FS2 (Earl): The process was set forth—and I'd have to yield to Ken to go through those steps—I think they're looking for a draft this summer and a final the following summer.

FS3 (Ken): So the secretary of Agriculture pretty much set that deadline for us. And the secretary actually, rightfully so, when we say two years it sounds like a really accelerated process to us because we've been doing this a long time and it takes us typically three, five years to do this. And under the new administration the agency has been looking at our processes trying to speed them up trying to be more efficient because, if you think about it, when it takes you five years to develop a forest plan and the time horizon is for fifteen, that doesn't make any sense. We spend an extraordinary amount of time planning and going through this process of documentation when in reality the process itself is fairly straightforward: you develop alternatives, you analyze the impacts and you do that twice, and you should be able to do that in two years. And so we are trying to meet the demands of the new administration and it's not an unreasonable demand to speed up the bureaucracy.

TS: What was the timeline for the 2016 plan amendment?

FS2 (Earl): August 2013 to December 2016, so whatever that period of time is.

TS: So three years, three years for a full plan amendment.

TS (Tuck): It's pretty clear that the greatest economic driver in SE Alaska now and has been reconfirmed again in a study that today came out on raven radio is tourism, guiding, fishing—those kinds of opportunities. Now I'm pretty sure that it wasn't that industry that went to the governor and said, "Hey, we want to change this roadless rule." So can you explain who and which industries it was that specifically went and why if the greatest economic driver is tourism, why are they not being listened to?

FS (Kyle): I'm gonna try to answer this in maybe an indirect way. To be honest, I don't know what industries, if any, came to the governor and said we want you to petition, it's certainly not evident in the petition itself, but to your point and what I really want to encourage you to do is to speak to this in a scoping comment. Here's why: the 2001 national roadless rule, it was national in scope, so I can almost guarantee you that it did not consider tourism, fishing, recreational interests when it was promulgated in 2001. These are the exact local issues that Earl was talking about and Ken was talking about that should drive this Alaska roadless rule that they're contemplating right now. And so that, I totally agree with you, I think what you're saying is that the timber industry is—well, I don't know what it is—I think it's less than 1% of the economy of Southeast and these other industries are collectively a large percentage of the economy, that's exactly what the Forest Service needs to here. Now to take it to the next step you would need to say, therefore, here's how I want you to manage the roadless areas on the Tongass under the Alaska roadless rule.

TS (Kim): I guess, to follow up on Tuck's comment, is there something in the public record to the state of Alaska—letters, meetings, something with Governor Walker—that spurred him to petition the Federal government to open up this rule?

FS: If there is, I'm not aware of it.

TS (Kim): I find that incredulous to think that there's nothing in writing, that there's nothing public to share with the citizens of Alaska as to why you're looking at pursuing this rule? We have something in place; it's not broken. So why are we pursuing something? It feels like there's things that aren't being shared with the public.

FS (Kyle): So the state objected to the 2001 roadless rule as applied in Alaska immediately following the record of decision for that rule. That objection ultimately led to the Forest Service issuing an amended record of decision in 2003 that became the Tongass Exemption Rule; so from 2003 to 2011 the Tongass was exempted through an objection process by the state of Alaska. The court case that was initiated in 2009, that ultimately went to the ninth circuit court of appeals, that resulted in the exemption being set aside—meaning being invalidated; that was an important case. Again, the state challenged that decision immediately following. The US Supreme court opted not to take that up, so that ended our legal challenges on the 2003 exemption. We filed a lawsuit with the US District court of DC around that time challenging, again, the application of the national rule in the Tongass, and that case is still pending and oral arguments are scheduled for October. Respectfully, I think the state has been consistent from day one in its objection of the roadless rule and the various iterations of it, all through that entire period and we continue to argue that it's a violation of other Federal law applied in the Tongass. So what's different with this rulemaking, though, is this is not the 2001 roadless rule and it's not the 2003 exemption. It's something that has never been tried before. It's can the Forest Service develop an Alaska-specific roadless rule that manages appropriately the roadless values on the Tongass and also allows for some exemptions to allow for...for things that are important to the region.

TS (Kim): So you're trying a way that—it hasn't worked in the courts thus far, so you're looking for another legal route to—

FS (Ken): So we've been in litigation with the 2001 either all on or all off for 17 years and frankly that is broken, that is broken. We've spent millions of dollars on just this one rule and what we're trying is something totally different in that we aren't trying the one-size-fits-all approach, we're trying to go to the local communities, trying to find out specifically what is the local communities needs and desires for roadless area management around their communities. And we can take a rule and not make it one-size-fits-all for the Tongass, we could tailor it for specific communities. And that's what we believe at this point.

FS (Earl): Can we do a check in there were a few hands...

@ 14:00

TS (Dorti?): I very, very much appreciate you speaking to the public process and how all of that works, and I really appreciate you, Kyle, for giving that whole litigation history, but it was specifically stated that one of the state's concerns was how this constrains rural economic development, and while the question has been asked a few times, I think it's

sort of been danced around, and I would appreciate you to maybe be more specific to some of the reasons that there's concern for constraints for rural economic development in southeast.

FS (Kyle): Boy, uh, this is where I really need to have the petition and our legal arguments go into that. I just don't know if I have a lot of detail beyond what I've given you.

TS (Dorti?): I mean, he could give us great examples of situations like skiing in Colorado, there was the mention of Hoonah. Would you give me a few examples of specific concerns to constraints to rural economic development in southeast?

FS (Kyle): Well, yeah, I think it's around communities that are surrounded by roadless areas. How do those communities develop and evolve through time? You know there's been discussion about connecting energy networks in southeast for a lot of years. There's been discussion about connections from those communities to marine access, port facilities, for the ferry. Department of Transportation has a southeast transportation plan that can't be fully implemented because of the roadless areas on the Tongass, but their plan is to have a road corridor connections between communities with shorter ferry routes, so it's those types of vision documents that the state has developed over the years that having some accommodations in an Alaska-specific roadless rule could see those through, and ultimately those would be for community development benefits.

TS (Dorti?): One more follow-up, and not to put you on the spot further, but as far as I understand it, there's already exemptions to allow for things like hydro and power and DOT corridors, so how do those things not already meet the current needs?

FS (Kyle): Yeah, there's exemptions for reasonable access for those things. There isn't—as one example—there isn't a provision that says a road to achieve those is the reasonable access. So in the 2001 roadless rule it says that you should have reasonable access to energy, if I go down the list, there's minerals, things like that but procedurally, having someone go through that process and putting the State, it's a process that's uncertain and it's burdensome and I think very few projects have actually been able to navigate that process. Plus, when you're looking at an island archipelago, which we are here on the Tongass, you have to look at road access versus water access, air access, these other forms of access, before you have this determination of whether a road is actually the most reasonable alternative.

FS (Earl): Without usurping my colleague's authority, I was gonna offer a different perspective.

FS (Kyle): Please do.

FS (Earl): The situation in Southeast Alaska across all thirty-two or three communities, they're all very different. They all have very different interests. That's really the intent of trying to come out and get the comments from the different communities; trying to visit

roughly half of them. Because I don't know that anybody knows exactly what that answer would be from each of the communities because thus far—I think we've been through six so far, something like that, six or seven communities, we still have about ten to go—I think it's gonna become very clear in the comments and the responses back, where each community sits and how they apply it. I think that's why I would urge folks to respond in the fashion of what your community is interested in and how you'd like to see that applied both spatially or geographically in the narrative that—uh, cause I think we'll see some variation there.

TS (Dorti?): Thank you for answering that and making the effort to go to all the places.

@ 19:00

TS (Craig): Yeah, I'm speaking as an American taxpayer now not as a person from a specific community in Southeast Alaska: Let's assume for a minute that a community in Southeast Alaska would like to see roading in roadless areas so that they could timber harvest old growth, I mean that's just a hypothetical. Based on what we've seen through many decades, it costs about one hundred and sixty thousand to five hundred thousand dollars per mile to build road in the Tongass, the figures we've seen. So my question do you is this: Let's assume that community X gets their way and they get to build (xxx) road. Are my tax dollars going to be spent to subsidize those roads? Or is the timber industry going to in and pay for that with timber harvest and then sell the timber to pay for all that. Because in the old days, it was my tax dollars paid for those roads, and it just absolutely made no economic sense, and I don't think we need to go there again. It's stupid.

FS (Earl): I can't even guess to predicate what the future looks, so I wouldn't, I wouldn't be able to even try.

TS (Craig): Well I just hope we don't go there because it's stupefying that we would pay...its corporate welfare, is what it is.

TS (Tuck): Just adding onto that, after those roads were built, and we subsidized those roads, we had to go back and pull out all the culverts, all the bridges that stopped salmon from going up streams and—and—and we had to spend tax dollars there again. And so are you guys asking us now to subsidize this new roadless rule with more taxpayer money, and are we gonna have to go back and pull out all of those culverts afterwards, after they've stopped up streams. Or are you gonna have a different plan for fixing culverts and bridges as we go along to stop salmon from going up rivers.

FS (Kyle): I'm not saying what the rule's gonna look like. It could, it could occur.

FS (Earl): And, and it's fairly important that I acknowledge right off the top that the issue of aquatic organism passage, of these culverts in many cases, is still a significant issue on the Tongass. So I don't wanna minimize that where we are right now is the right place. We are working diligently to assess all of the culverts across the entirety of the Tongass

and trying to ascertain which ones still need to be, allow for passage—and I'm not a hydrologist, so I can't speak to that—but I know that number is well in excess of a hundred, that we've already determined. So I'd like to say to your comment about—so we've got them all pulled out and everything's in good shape—but it's not, it's not there yet, there's still a lot of work to be done.

TS (Joanie): Yeah, I have a question about your, if the roads were allowed, as I recall on your PowerPoint that one thing that would not be allowed would be authorized ground disturbing activities. Is that correct?

FS (Kyle): With this regulation.

TS (Joanie): So how would you do that, how would you build roads without disturbing—

FS (Ken): So that's a great question. This regulation does not authorize any ground-disturbing activities. We are not authorizing any activities. What we're doing is we're developing the underlying regulation that could allow for it. Right now, it's not allowed within inventoried roadless areas—timber harvest or road construction—we could change the underlying regulation, so the forest plan has to comply with all actable regulations. So the forest plan may be changed in the future. xxx 22:50 and that is what we mean by there's no authorized activities. So it's really kind of bureaucratic at this stage of the game.

TS (Kim): But it's key.

FS (Ken): It is key. It is key. We acknowledge it. What we're saying is there's no direct effects of this regulation because there's no specific activity that we're allowing to occur. However we recognize that we are increasing the potential for those activities. And we will analyze for that increased potential.

FS (Earl): And then just for clarity, because I know how much everybody loves scoping meetings; it just really drives all of us. You mentioned this at a regulation level. So that could likely drive either an amendment or a revision to the forest plan, which is another level down. And then you could actually have to have the environmental analysis associated with actually doing something. And so it's not just the action of the regulatory side of it, it's all the other sub actions that really get to that—

TS (Joanie): So I have another question: If we just decide that we want to change the roads, could we change it so it's more restrictive?

FS (Ken): Yes, we did in Colorado. We made it more restrictive in places.

TS (Joanie): And—uh—one more: What's the citizens group the state was represented on and they've met for quite a bit of time and to decide—and it wasn't long ago that it was disbanded—but they did come to this recommendation that we not have any more roads that we continue harvesting, um, no more old growth, and the state was on it, the forest

service, the environmental groups. What happened to that recommendation? That was just last year, wasn't it?

FS (Earl): So I would have to assume that it's the Tongass Advisory Committee that you're referring to.

TS (Joanie): Yes. The TAC.

@ 25:00

FS (Earl): So the TAC was put together, I think in August 2013 and assigned to come up with recommendations associated with the amendment of the forest plan. The focus on that was to allow for a transition from old growth to young growth within the forest products industry side of it. The forest supervisor added one more caveat: He said I want you to look at renewable energy options because there were several communities that were trying to get off of diesel-generated power. And so that was the focus of the TAC was transition from old growth to young growth and to renewable energy components. Those recommendations came in, they came in in draft form. We went through those as they went from draft to final in the forest planning process and then incorporated most of the operational components; there were some that were cultural, that didn't come into play. But those were effectively activated on in the December 2006 forest plan amendment.

TS (Joanie): Good. But they didn't include logging old growth.

FS (Earl): It still allowed for old growth logging. So I don't wanna say it was excluded. But it was a shift in the xxx from old growth that went down and young growth coming up over the next fifteen, twenty years.

TS: I'm just unclear, then what happens to that plan?

FS (Earl): It depends. If you go through the potential options here if it's a no-action alternative, then I guess it's basically you stay where you're at. If it becomes an action, then you're probably going to have to assess it and either amend or revise the forest plan again.

FS (Kyle): Can I try to add one thing?

FS (Earl): Please.

FS (Kyle): If either of these gentlemen propose any changes to the 2016 forest plan, they come back before you right here, and they'd be talking to you about that proposal. So they have to have scoping meetings, they'd have to have another draft EIS, they'd have to have another final EIS, they'd have to have another record of decision.

TS: And that's gonna happen in two years?

FS: No, that's not happening.

FS: The state asked us to do that and we did not agree to do that, just like we did not agree to do a full exemption. We haven't agreed to do a forest plan revision. Or amendment at this stage of the game because we want to explore the, what an Alaskan roadless rule would look like. And it may or may not be consistent with the existing management plan.

TS (Molly): Again, I also want to thank you for coming here. It's really good to have the opportunity to talk. I want to frame my comments as a question. I guess the question comes down to, do you understand why we feel, I feel, so strongly about this? Why we look at this roadless rule as another layer of protection on the areas that we care about so much? People like me who have been here since the last ice age—(laughter)—I remember when I first arrived 43 years ago, the intent was to clear cut every valley in this inlet. Liquidate all the decadent old growth. And it's been a long and persistent, consistent effort by people in Tenakee to keep these places in tact. And there's so many reasons but it all revolves around salmon, at least that's a good way to express it. We all eat salmon, we all have an economic stake in salmon, and we all understand that in particular Coho salmon that are the lynchpin of the trolling industry right now require intact watersheds. You can't just protect the river. They require rearing areas for up to three years that are tiny tributaries and beaver ponds and they're very vulnerable to disturbance and as the ocean conditions and the climate is changing, the salmon are under threat from all corners and our inlet is a refuge in addition, Tenakee's economy is, it's amazing to me if I start counting the population of full time residents not much more than 100. Start to count up the commercial fishery permits in this town —mostly troll—I came up with—there's Rudy, there's Jason, there's Yuriah—eight. It's a huge—it is what we're all about here and any threat to that is something we all stand up and take notice to. And if you say that the roadless rule, we have to change this, we have to change that but it's just like putting layer after layer of protection on, and you're trying to strip off one of those layers. I think that Tenakee's history bears out that we're very concerned about that. I'm sure you're aware to some extent that one of the things that started the whole debate about the pulp mills and the kadasham lawsuit—tenakee versus xxx(wak)—and that was about road construction in an untouched watershed. And those reasons are still here, and I guess that's the question: Do you guys all get that? Do you understand that there is a deep history here of protecting these watersheds?

@30:00

FS (Earl): So I would have to respond and recognize that many of the communities I go into I hear a very core, visceral accordance to the watersheds to the salmon to the components that they live. That people constantly talk and they recognize—and I have to recognize—the significance that it plays in their lives because when they speak, it is pure and straight from the heart. I could not ever do anything but allow my respect to the folks that are committed to that and their continued energy. As to where this goes, I can't predict that, but I don't wanna minimize the importance that you offer in talking about

what it means to you, to your colleagues and to your partners and to your community and everything, because I do hear it from many communities, and I would offer that I have to honor that and give some respect to Southeast Alaska in that people are willing to put that forth and to commit to their community, and I'd say somewhat perpetual energy to protect and provide for that.

TS (Craig): The thing that makes this place so special is that it's roadless in so many areas when so much of the world is roaded. **And once it's roaded, it's never the same.** You know, I mean, like in Hoonah—people in Hoonah are coming from Anchorage to hunt deer there because they can drive. And it's forever changed and there's so little left of roadless areas in the world on a percent basis. And we do feel as a community that what we can keep roadless, we'd like to keep roadless.

FS (Earl): If I could offer one other point to that. I appreciate you bringing it up. This is the highest, the highest attendance we've seen.

FS: Percentage-wise of the population.

TS (Tracey?): My comment, I want to tie onto what Molly had to say. I commercial fish. I troll out of Tenakee. My next-door neighbor back here, Tuck, is a charter operator. There's eight commercial boats parked down in the harbor that call Tenakee home. There's over thirty trollers, crewmen that spend money in Tenakee. And like Molly said, it's about one hundred people here. So you can do the math on the percentage of commercial fishermen in Tenakee and you know if you've ever seen the book, the salmon are in the trees, I mean the trees go away, the salmon go away and—you know—this town will go away. Um, it's—it would be a big deal. It's just, ya know the economic driver in Colorado being the ski areas, I mean if we have, we start building roads to go from Hoonah to Pelican, great but you're gonna knock out four or five rivers along the way and the salmon runs are gonna go down. So, I mean those things just. I mean it's fine the way it is right now.

TS (Kim): It's not broken.

TS (Kevin): And then there's the noneconomic angle. I recently hiked from Tenakee Inlet to Pelican, and I did not see any sign of human activity not a cut stick not a piece of flagging not a weather balloon—nothing for twenty miles and that you can't buy.

FS: I agree with that.

TS (Kevin): And if they put a road from Hoonah to Pelican, that would be gone.

TS (Kim): And I would say that what you did has value. It has definite value. It may not be in another economic sense—it is an economic piece—that is a valued economic piece that is worth keeping in our lives here.

TS (Wendy): And I'm in a family of three including myself. The fish is all we eat, that's our protein. I'm here full time. My family's here full time. You're talking about what I eat, so it's a big deal. Huge. And I wanted to say, too. I come from the state of Washington. I lived there since the early 70s on the Olympic peninsula so I saw the change industrial logging—I never, when I got to the state of Washington, I didn't have an opinion about logging, but by the time I left there 35 years later, I had an opinion. And I saw the Hoh River and the xxx—all those rivers change so much. And when I came here I had the most amazing opportunity to do fish work with Molly and her husband Nick. And, um, I actually was breathless with what I saw.

35:29

TS (Tuck): Yeah just um further comment xxx on fishing charters and have been here for twenty-five years and I employ five people in our community and of course fishing a significant impact. My father was a fisheries biologist so I have a pretty strong scientific background in this and one of the things that we want to make sure is that. In 2002—I usually bring about 75 to 100 people into this community through my business—and in 2002, I asked many of those people to make a comment about the roadless rule. Almost every single one of them made a comment. The roadless rule comments were the largest ever amount of comments—ever—on any rule in the forest service all favoring maintaining that roadless rule. I just gotta ask you, why are we going through this process again? Why do we have to continuously do this?

FS (Ken): Like I said before, I think that the one-size-fits-all may not be the best approach and I think there's probably a compromise that can be made that addresses local community needs like Tenakee and we could construct something that would be more protective around Tenakee and yet, timber-dependent communities, we can provide for them too. And we can address—construct a rule that's not a one-size-fits-all approach across the Tongass. I think we can nuance it for your concerns. That's what I personally believe. And this is not an agency standpoint. This is my personal beliefs. So, that's what I think we can do.

FS (Earl): I think it's really key to recognize that the concern that's expressed is to be more permissive and allow more. But there's a latitude to allow less, or be less permissive. And so we really need to think about the full spectrum and how it represents each individual community.

FS (Kyle): Can I ask something of the group? Does Tenakee consider themselves a roadless community?

TS: YES, YES YES.

FS (Kyle): What other community would be better suited to tell the Forest Service how roadless should be managed?

TS (Kim): That's what we're trying to tell you.

(laughter)

FS (Kyle): I'm trying to tell you, I hear you. I dunno, maybe that was the obvious thing. Just point out the obvious. Look, the Tongass is the salmon forest. I mean that's—you've heard—one of the reasons in the notice of intent, to prepare EIS for an Alaska-specific roadless rule to recognize the uniqueness of the Tongass. I'm onboard, you guys. This is one of the unique aspects of the Tongass. I'm a fisheries biologist. I just happened to draw the short stick and get into timber management and my day job is mining management, so you don't want my workload as a marine biologist. But beyond that I'm a public servant, right, so what I'm hoping everyone comes out of this meeting today having is a game plan for how you will compel the Forest Service to hear your perspectives and hear your input on what you believe Alaska roadless rule should do. Fish is in the conversation, commercial fishing is on the conversation. Recreation. Subsistence. Fish, fish, fish. The Tongass 77 has been incorporated into the forest plan. Stream buffers have been incorporated on multiple layers. I was really happy to hear you recognize that layering effect of statutes, regulations, plans, and policy. They all stack up and they all apply. I don't think that they're proposing to remove one of those layers. They're proposing to define it with consideration of the uses and the people of the area, the region. So I guess that's my little soapbox piece. Sorry.

TS (Tuck?): So my concern—to echo Steve—is that the governor's going to have a committee, task force, whatever, of thirteen individuals who haven't been selected yet. And they've got less than 60 days to prepare a final recommendation to the Governor. And I'm not sure—so, that seems an insanely short period of time for a process that's then going to be two years while that information is taken in and discussed by the Forest Service—I don't know who all—before there's a record of decision. It seems to me that that part of the process ought to be more inclusive and take more consideration than 60 days. And I hope that there's some latitude in what the governor's proposed that he could give that committee an extension of another 30 days or 60 days to, ya know, make sure that this and all of the scoping comments that you're asking all of us, written comments, you're asking all of us to make, are those comments going to the Forest Service? So those concerns won't be included in whatever the governor recommends to the Forest Service.

FS (Ken): We are going to share our public comments with the state. And so they'll have that to consider.

TS (Tuck): I'm just concerned about the process.

@ 42:00

FS (Kyle): Yeah. It's a train that's going fast. The administrative order by the governor that established the citizen committee, it was signed on September 6. The notice of intent by the Forest Service that defined the timeline for the rulemaking was xxx earlier. So, I agree with you—accelerated timeline. It's gonna be difficult on those members to meet

those timelines, but the governor's trying to stay within the timelines that are defined by the Forest Service.

TS (Jed?): This is a question: Potential for a change in administration in the Governor's level. Could that

FS (Kyle): Yeah, what happens December first? I don't know. I'll be watching the TV with my bag of popcorn on election night.

TS (Jed?): This could all be washed under the table by the new administration potentially.

FS (Kyle): Yeah, it could go any number of ways depending upon what happens. Honestly, if the Walker administration is granted a second term, I would venture to guess there's not going to be a change. If another administration comes in, I would be in a number of meetings finding out.

TS (Joanie): I would just like to comment that there's probably 26 or 27 of us residents here, these are adults. If you had that percentage of Juneau, you'd have 7,500.

FS (Kyle): If we had what?

TS (Joanie): If you had that percentage of adults attending the meeting in Juneau. Just to give you an idea of the concern of all of us. And I don't think there's anyone here who's in favor of this.

FS (Earl): I was making the attempt to recognize and acknowledge that.

TS (Joanie): You did.

FS (Earl): The interest by population level and the alignment between individuals is absolutely clear to me.

TS (Kim): And will that be, because what we heard in preparation for this meeting is that this is just question and answer and you are not accepting comments. Can you clarify? What are you all taking away from today that will inform the ultimate EIS documents that you're drafting?

FS (Ken): That's a good question. So we're going to take everybody's comments. The written comments are what's documented. However a good half of the xxx here. And what we heard from Tenakee Springs is you would rather—you either want more protection or you want the 2001 rule in place around your community.

FS (Earl): Let me come back and reinforce one thing: It's the written comments that come into the system. Our awareness of that represents is one thing, but I would still ask you to try to submit something in writing.

TS (Joanie): So why wasn't there a testimony time scheduled for this meeting?

FS (Ken): The Forest Service typically doesn't do that. We do that with subsistence hearings but our experience is we are not that good at taking your comments and distilling them in written format because, ya know, everybody has their own specific nuance of communicating and it's better if you guys write down and therefore there's no way that we're going to miscommunicate and misinterpret what we're hearing. So that's the best way for us to take your comments and digest them, is through the written format.

TS: I just have a question on process having to do with the elections, state elections. So let's say we get a new governor and the new governor no longer wants to proceed. Is the Forest Service, they would still be in the go-mode or would there be some way to halt it.

FS: It would be up to the Secretary of Agriculture to decide what to do. But the petition still is there. Like in Colorado, that process took from 2005-2012, we had three different governors in that timespan. And at each stage of the game, there was a pause. And one of the governors submitted a revised petition during that pause and the same thing could happen here, ya know, we don't know.

TS: You refer a lot to the NEPA process and EISs and there are potential changes coming down to all of that. How would that potentially impact the buffers of the EIS process?

FS: The changes that I'm hearing about are essentially agency changes about how the agency approaches it but the bottom line is the underlying statute which, all the regulations have to be consistent with the statute, and we're following the CEQ—the Council of Environmental Quality—regulations on our EIS development. So we should be consistent with the statute and any changes that occur within the Forest Service to the agency process for addressing within the agency, it has to be consistent with the CEQ regs. So I think we'll be consistent.

TS: I asked a question about xxx2 and I wasn't quite sure of the final answer. It sounded a little bit confused. Am I correct that Led 2s are unlike wilderness open to potential road building under or changes under this modification to the roadless rule? Led 2s are a statute and so a regulation cannot trump a statute and so whatever the statute says about led 2s has to remain. The roadless rule would have to comply, unlike Tongass 77, the led2s are not effected by xxx. Correct. I guess we could make them more restrictive.

@ 49:00

TS (Megan): I'm gonna make a really quick comment before I head back to work: We were talking about population and number of people here and I wanted to say that I moved to this community three years ago and it was because it's such a vibrant community and because of the wild spaces around here. My husband is currently making a living in the roadless area down the inlet. And so that's why he's not here. I can tell you that most of the families are up at a birthday party, which is where I'm headed back—I run the school. So there would have been more here and there would have been—I love

all you guys—there would have been a lot less gray hair. (laughter) This is a living, breathing community with people of all ages and we're coming and we're continuing to come because of this area. So that's all I wanted to say.

FS (Kyle): Can I ask what is your husband making a living doing?

TS (Megan): He's guiding. Yep, he's bear hunting right now in Goose Flats.

FS: Thank you.

FS: Really quick on the LUD II. I just wanted to make sure. When you look at the map, when I look at the map, the LUD II also have 2001 roadless layered over them. Where the wilderness areas do not have roadless on them. I'm wondering if that's part of your question. Wilderness is not considered roadless. But LUD II, it can be considered roadless and that's what you see on the maps.

FS: Maybe would be better if we carved LUD II out to make it clearer. I don't know, we'll have to think about that. But theoretically we could ask that our LUD IIs in the Tenakee Inlet be given more protection.

FS: Under an Alaska-specific roadless rule.

TS (Linda): I was just, in the small world category, this morning I was texting a friend in Anchorage about using her mother's condo and then I saw the name up there and I just texted her and I said: Are you the deputy commissioner for DNR? And she says: Yep, that's the Heidi H—. We might be a huge state but we're a really small community.

I went to another very charged meeting with xxx about the mental health trust lands about what's going on in Haines. And the response from the Forest Service, I mean they had an agenda, it was completely different, and I just have to thank you that I really felt like we were listened to, and it was very respectful and that there wasn't like—like you didn't already have your minds made up. And it's just, ya know, cus as you can hear, there's so much emotion for those of us who have lived on this beautiful land for decades. And we have children and grandchildren and they want to enjoy it too. So, thank you.

FS (Ken): So we have a flight to catch at 4. But we also want to allow time for people who aren't comfortable expressing their questions in front of a group. So we'll be here another 15 minutes or something like that, before we pack off.

TS: So what were some of the responses from the other communities? Were the six other communities in favor of this roadless ruling?

FS: This is our third stop. We have another team—there are two teams going out.

FS (Kyle): One of the things I was interested to hear in Hoonah, where we were at on Monday. Somebody asked about exemptions in roadless areas for harvesting for cultural

purposes. Like being able to take a totem log or a canoe log from an inventoried roadless area and that clearly wasn't considered explicitly in the 2001 roadless rule. So I thought that was a really interesting question that that person asked.

TS (Molly): Wouldn't that be allowed in the personal use permit, which is allowed in the roadless areas?

FS: But it's not explicitly—

TS (Molly): But it is permitted.

FS: Could be, it depends upon how we interpret that.

FS (Kyle): But I think that what you have to demonstrate is that it's not reasonable to get that from a non-inventoried roadless area.

TS (Craig): You said earlier that there's 80,000 roaded roadless areas in the Tongass.

FS: Roaded roadless acres.

TS (Craig): Well, ya know, that's plenty of roads.

FS (Earl): And from a depend standpointxxx the number's just over 80,000. It's actually 81 thousand or more.

TS (Craig): But that's 80,000 acres of roadless area that already has roads in it.

FS (Kyle): Thank you for your time.

FS (Earl): I would offer a little different thank you. Thank you for sharing your heart, because that's what I felt, more than anything else, is recognizing where it comes from and how you approach it and the connctivities to your life, your soul, your feelings, your blessings, your preferences. For me that's where the tie really was. I mean I felt a much more visceral response than I've heard from other places and I acknowledge that and I respect that and I really appreciate that. Thank you.

FS (Ken): And we'll be around for 15 more minutes.

FS: Make sure and write your comments.