United States Department of Agriculture

Subsistence and Other Non-Commercial Harvest Resource Assessment

Tongass National Forest Plan Revision



Forest Service | Alaska Region | Tongass National Forest | August 2025

Cover Photo Credit: Barbara Miranda, Tongass National Forest

Subsistence and Other Non-Commercial Harvest Resource Assessment

Tongass National Forest Plan Revision

Forest Service, Alaska Region

Prepared by:

Rob Cross, Forest Subsistence Program Manager, Tongass National Forest
Greg Risdahl, Subsistence Program Leader, Alaska Regional Office
Erin Noesser, Senior Planner, PPSG

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Figures

This page intentionally left blank.

Introduction

This assessment report will first discuss subsistence as defined in Title VIII of the Alaska National Lands Interest Conservation Act (ANILCA) and implemented through the Federal Subsistence Management Program on the Tongass National Forest. Currently, all permanent residents of Southeast Alaska (including Yakutat) are Federally qualified subsistence users except for residents of Juneau[1]. Discussion of other non-commercial harvest, which includes harvest under Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) general hunting, sport fishing, personal use, and state subsistence harvest regulations will follow. Harvest and management of marine mammals, waterfowl and marine fish species are not managed by the USDA Forest Service and not specifically addressed in this section. However, these resources are an important resource for many Alaskans including Federally qualified subsistence users.

The Tongass National Forest provides fish, wildlife, and other resources harvested by residents and non-residents each year for sport, personal use, subsistence, cultural and traditional uses. Harvest regulations vary by land designation, jurisdiction, and residency. Non-commercial uses of resources are managed primarily under ADF&G, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and Federal Subsistence Management regulations. The USDA Forest Service manages the Tongass National Forest to sustain resources for multiple uses. However, under ANILCA Title VIII the non-wasteful subsistence uses of fish and wildlife and other renewable resources by rural residents of Alaska are given priority over all other consumptive uses of all such resources.

The third section will describe general fish, wildlife, and plant harvest conditions and trends. The last section discusses species-specific conditions and trends for the major species and groups harvested on the Tongass National Forest.

Federal Subsistence Management Program

ANILCA Title VIII defines "subsistence uses" as "the customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska residents of wild, renewable resources for direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation; for the making and selling of handicraft articles out of nonedible byproducts of fish and wildlife resources taken for personal or family consumption; for barter, or sharing for personal or family consumption; and for customary trade." (ANILCA Sec. 803) (emphasis added).

Under delegated authority from the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, the Federal Subsistence Board manages the subsistence taking and uses of fish and wildlife on federal public lands and waters in Alaska, including navigable waters in which the United States has reserved water rights. This assessment will refer to the subsistence harvest of fish and wildlife by rural Alaskans on federal public lands and waters as "federal subsistence."

In its findings for Title VIII, Congress identified the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses by rural Alaska residents, including both Natives and non-Natives, as essential to the physical, economic, traditional, and social or cultural existence (ANILCA Sec. 801), among other things. The statement of congressional policy in Title VIII further instructs that nonwasteful subsistence uses be prioritized on the public lands in Alaska (ANILCA Sec. 802(2)), and that the public lands be managed to cause the least adverse impact to rural residents who depend on the resources from such lands, consistent with sound management practices and the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife (ANILCA Sec.

802(1)). Section 802 also states that the purpose of Title VIII is "to provide the opportunity for rural residents engaged in a subsistence way of life to do so[.]"

Several ANILCA Title VIII sections cover uses on National Forest System lands:

- Establishes the rural subsistence priority by prioritizing the taking on public lands of fish and wildlife for nonwasteful subsistence uses over the taking on such lands for other purposes (ANILCA Sec. 804).
- Explains how to allocate resources when restrictions on subsistence uses become necessary (ANILCA Sec. 804).
- Establishes administration of subsistence uses throughout Alaska through measures such as regional advisory councils (ANILCA Sec. 805).
- Provides for use of cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, the State, and Native Corporations to effectuate the purposes and policies of ANILCA (ANILCA Sec. 809).
- Requires that federal land use decisions take into account their effect on subsistence. (ANILCA Sec. 810).
- Requires that the Secretary of Agriculture ensure that rural residents engaged in subsistence uses shall have reasonable access to subsistence resources on public lands (ANILCA Sec. 811).
- Confirms the Secretaries' closure authority for nonsubsistence users, while also clarifying that there shall be no unnecessary closures to nonsubsistence users (ANILCA Sec. 815).
- Defines when there can be restrictions on subsistence uses (ANILCA Sec. 816).

The Forest Service Region 10 Handbook 2090.23 provides further direction for the Forest Service to implement federal subsistence requirements from ANILCA related to land management decisions and National Environmental Policy (NEPA) requirements for those decisions.

The purpose of this assessment is not to define the value of subsistence for every person. Subsistence in the broader sense is deeply personal. It can mean something different to every person. Yet it is also a statutorily defined term. In Title VIII of ANILCA, Congress defined "subsistence uses" as "the customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska residents of wild, renewable resources for direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation . . . ." ANILCA § 803. This assessment will address how the Tongass National Forest currently seeks to maintain abundance and distribution of wild resources, as well as reasonable access to those resources by federally qualified rural residents and identify conditions that restrict use of these resources. This assessment will also demonstrate our commitment to recognizing the customary and traditional practices of rural residents in southeast Alaska.

The goal of this assessment section is to identify all important values related to subsistence, including other non-commercial harvest of wild resources (sport, State subsistence and Personal use), food security, caloric contribution, economic impact, and social and cultural traditions. This assessment will focus on Tongass National Forest management that supports healthy ecosystems and provides opportunities for the harvest of subsistence resources and access to these resources for Federally qualified subsistence users for the continuation of subsistence uses as mandated in Title VIII of ANILCA. It will also highlight the unique importance of wild resources in sustaining long-established subsistence ways of life in Alaska.

For many Alaskans, harvest of wild resources is a part of the fabric of society that is necessary for maintaining cultural identity (Langdon 2011). The value and definition of subsistence is beyond the economic value and analysis of how much food and calories from wild harvested resources provide people and communities. The Tlingit in Southeast Alaska, and many other indigenous and rural Alaskan communities, regard subsistence as much more than the acts of harvesting, preparing, and eating the food required for nourishment (Thornton 2008). As Thornton (2008: 117) notes, the Tlingit "regard subsistence as an intricate and profound set of relationships with particular geographic settings where their social groups have dwelled historically. For them subsistence is *haa Kusteeyí*, 'our way of living', 'real being,' and 'enriching existence,' and not just 'the minimum (food, etc.) necessary to support life.'" Anthropological studies also illustrate the cultural importance of reciprocity and sharing of subsistence resources within the community, as sharing of subsistence resources and knowledge promotes sociality and future harvest success, while preventing potential wastage when subsistence resources are harvested in abundance (Langdon and Worl 1981, Langdon 2021).

While harvest occurs on most land ownerships, the Tongass National Forest manages about 80% of the land in the Southeast Alaska panhandle, and many communities are encompassed by these National Forest System lands. Therefore, most harvest, and access to harvest in Southeast Alaska occurs on the federal public lands and waters of the Tongass National Forest, or in adjacent marine waters.

Many species of fish, wildlife, and plants are harvested for subsistence purposes. The most commonly harvested wild foods in Southeast Alaska are salmon and other fish, deer, and berries (Sill and Koster 2017). Wood products, such as cedar, and other non-food uses are also very important for shelter, fuel, handicrafts, transportation and cultural uses. The important foods and materials, and the social and cultural structures around subsistence ways of life are different depending on local resources, landforms, marine interface and traditions.

Alaska faces unique food security challenges because of its remoteness, high costs of transportation, limited agricultural production, and high reliance on imported food (Fall and Kostick, 2018). Wild food harvest in the Southeast Alaska Region makes up roughly 17% of daily caloric requirements, and 121% of the daily protein recommendations, averaged across all residents (Fall and Kostick, 2018). Beyond food, wild resources are harvested for firewood, building materials, cultural purposes, art, clothing and other uses.

During public engagement, many people brought up the importance of federal subsistence harvest. The overall summary of comments is that subsistence uses should be prioritized in the Forest Plan. Further, many comments requested better integration of traditional ecological knowledge into subsistence and other non-commercial harvest and related ecosystem management. Traditional ecological knowledge is broadly defined as knowledge and practices passed on from generation to generation informed by strong cultural memories, sensitivity to change, and values that include reciprocity (Kimmerer 2000). While many commenters suggested defining traditional and customary use areas for communities, to ensure adequate management (as requested in the 2020 Homelands Petition), commenters were also concerned about giving location information for cultural resources, as well as for harvest areas because of the possibility that cultural resources might be damaged and harvested resources might be overharvested (USDA 2024, Summaries of public feedback). Thus, this assessment will not go into detail about specific locations of harvest, or even specific community uses.

Current Subsistence Management

The existing Forest Plan direction on subsistence generally summarizes the requirements in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA), and direction in the Region 10 Subsistence Management and Use Handbook (Forest Service Handbook 2090.23). This includes general guidance to consider subsistence users' physical, cultural, and spiritual needs in project planning, coordination with subsistence users, providing for access, and facilitation necessary for subsistence users. It also directs the Forest to maintain reasonable access to subsistence resources, and abundance and distribution of subsistence resources necessary to meet subsistence user needs.

The existing plan does not identify different subsistence ways of life, cultures and traditions, subsistence resources, or access requirements, or provide specific harvest management goals by community or resource. In part, this is because the Tongass National Forest does not directly manage the taking of fish and wildlife on the national forest. This is generally left to the State of Alaska (for non-subsistence uses) or to the Federal Subsistence Board (for subsistence uses). Additionally, the existing plan does not contain goals or objectives beyond meeting ANILCA requirements for federal subsistence and does not contain standards and guidelines specific to the Tongass National Forest. There is little direction in the existing plan on how best to ensure that the management of the Tongass National Forest prioritizes the subsistence uses of wild, renewable resources, as well as for other uses of fish, wildlife, and plant resources. Establishing locally informed plan components for subsistence resources, resource access, community engagement, and tribal consultation could improve the ability to gauge the efficacy of the Forest Plan for subsistence on the Tongass National Forest. More emphasis on local community use areas and using local knowledge in the revised Forest Plan could increase sustainability of these resources and their use.

Other Non-Commercial Uses of Wild Resources

Federally qualified subsistence users may use multiple regulatory structures managed by multiple agencies (e.g. ADF&G, NOAA, U.S. FWS) in addition to the Federal Subsistence Management Program to fulfill their subsistence needs. Most frequently, this occurs because the harvest location is not on federal public lands (e.g., marine waters) or because the harvested species is not covered by the Federal Subsistence Management Program regulations (e.g., the subsistence harvest of migratory birds in Alaska). Thus, the applicable regulatory framework for harvesters (e.g. federal subsistence vs. other state or federal regulations) depends on the harvest species and location (e.g. freshwater vs marine). For this reason, non-federal subsistence harvest of wild resources may be important to Federally qualified subsistence users in some circumstances.

State Subsistence & Personal Use

ADF&G manages fish and wildlife populations throughout Alaska including on the federal public lands of the Tongass National Forest, whereas the Federal Subsistence Board administers the subsistence taking and uses of fish and wildlife on public lands. Under ANILCA, the taking of fish and wildlife on federal public lands, such as the Tongass National Forest, for non-subsistence uses is generally governed by state law unless such state law is preempted by federal law. In Alaska, state law and Title VIII of ANILCA establish subsistence as the priority use of fish and wildlife and subsistence is managed under both federal and state subsistence harvest regulations. But they define "subsistence uses" differently. Federal subsistence regulations apply to rural Alaskan residents on federal public lands and waters under Title VIII of ANILCA. State subsistence regulations apply to all Alaska residents, meaning that rural residents do not have a priority under the state regulations. There are also other distinctions between the state and federal subsistence programs. For example, the statutorily-required Regional Advisory Councils have more authority to shape the federal regulations than State Advisory Committees because the Federal

Subsistence Board is required to defer to their recommendations with three limited exceptions. ADF&G manages a state subsistence program for all Alaska residents by identifying subsistence and non-subsistence areas. State subsistence hunting and fishing is authorized throughout Alaska. In non-subsistence areas there is no subsistence priority but the area may be open to Personal use harvest for Alaska residents, offering more liberal harvest limits and or methods and means than general state regulations in these areas. Many Federally qualified subsistence users also participate in state subsistence and personal use harvest to meet their harvest needs.

General and Sport Harvest

General wildlife and sport fish harvest is managed by ADF&G throughout Alaska, including on federal public lands such as the Tongass National Forest. Sport regulations apply to Alaska residents and non-residents but may differ based on residency. General and sport harvest is managed through state hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses, registration hunts and draw hunts. Many Federally qualified subsistence users participate in state general and sport harvest to help meet their harvest needs, as well.

Gathering

Gathering of non-fish and wildlife resources such as mushrooms, edible plants, spruce tips, cedar bark, and berries is common on the Tongass National Forest; however, non-commercial use of these resources is not regulated by state or federal agencies on the forest.

Wild Resources – Status and Trends

This section discusses drivers and stressors on the Tongass National Forest that can affect subsistence uses of fish and wildlife resources, as well as other non-commercial uses. The status and trends of fish and wildlife populations and other natural resources affect subsistence and other non-commercial uses to varying degrees.

There is not a singular culture in Southeast Alaska, but a multitude of traditions linked to different communities. These "uses" are parts of localized traditions of wild food production, tied to specific places by ecology, community, culture, and economy," (Wolfe, 2004). While not each specific area or type of customary and traditional subsistence way of life is discussed in this assessment, we will illustrate with some location-specific examples of resource use.

Subsistence harvest usually occurs in traditional use areas accessible to nearby community residents. These traditional and established harvest areas may be locations adjacent to a community or seasonal camps in more remote locations. Areas are often used by people who have lived in an area over generations, or millennia in the case of indigenous people. Some traditional use areas move around based on year-to-year conditions. Therefore, these same harvest locations may not be used every year, and continuous use is not a requirement.

Successful harvest depends on high-quality habitat that is capable of supporting sufficient fish and wildlife populations, and that is within safe and reliable travel distance from each community. This includes maintaining high quality spawning or rearing habitat for fish and wildlife, respectively. In many cases, access for hunting, fishing, or gathering in Southeast Alaska is by small boats with limited capability to travel long distances in rough water. Therefore, good hunting and fishing areas near a community, with protected anchorages and sheltered sea passages, are necessary for sustainable harvest practices.

The graphs below compare percentages of commercial, sport, state Personal use and subsistence food harvest across Alaska, volume of subsistence food harvest across Alaska and within Southeast Alaska, and categories of food resources used in Southeast Alaska. Figures 1 through 4 were produced by ADF&G and the term "subsistence" includes both state and federal subsistence harvest statistics. Non-commercial users, i.e., both rural and non-rural Alaska residents harvesting in a state non-subsistence area, are classified as "Personal use" under state regulations.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 show that salmon is the largest single type of food harvested by residents of Southeast Alaska. Other wild renewable resources, including fish, deer, moose, and berries remain major staples for many Southeast Alaska residents too. Other species, such as kelp and other seaweed, bird eggs, birds, shellfish, and land mammals are also commonly harvested, though hundreds of species are used by people for food and materials.



Figure 1. Fish and game harvest in Alaska, showing percent, by weight of harvest used for commercial, personal, subsistence and sport. From Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 2018. It shows that commercial fishing is by far the largest use of wild resources across the State.



Figure 2. Wild food harvest in Alaska by area, from 2017, for personal use only. From Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 2018. This graph shows that Rural Southeast Alaskans used, on average, a little less than 200 pounds of wild food, per capita, in 2017.



Figure 3. Harvest of wild food resources by category, pounds per capita, 2017. From Alaska Department of Fish and Game Division of Subsistence, 2018.



Figure 4. Harvest by community and resource, for select Southeast Alaska boroughs, from 2012. Adapted from Fall, 2016.

Chamberlain et al. (2025) estimated that 66 percent of the total average annual subsistence harvest in Southeast Alaska was directly reliant on National Forests. They estimated the total usable weight per capita for all of Southeast Alaska is about 170 pounds, considering the entire population of Southeast Alaska. There are many ways of measuring personal and subsistence harvest in Southeast Alaska. However, they all show the importance of wild, renewable resources to the region.

Overall, the Tongass National Forest continues to provide for most harvested resources and uses within a healthy, intact and natural ecosystem. Specific species harvested and long-term sustainability is highly variable by year, location, resource, and community, especially in light of changing climates and effects resulting from an increased human population in recent years. The population of Alaska has increased by 69% from 229,000 in 1960 to 734,406 in 2023. In contrast, the total US population only increased by 48% since 1960. The 2020 Census reported around 72,000 residents living in the Southeast Alaska economic region, and the 2024 Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development (2025) estimated about 70,600 residents in 2024. Using the 2024 ADLWD estimates, approximately 39,200 qualify as rural residents under federal subsistence regulations; approximately 31,400 are urban residents living in Juneau. The increased human population, while not necessarily reflecting the population of Southeast Alaska, creates more conflicts and competition for resources, including from increased tourism, sport fishing and hunting, and commercial seafood harvest.

There are, however, many populations of fish and wildlife or subsistence activities that are less viable than in the past. While most salmon systems on the Tongass National Forest are considered to have stable populations, some individual stocks have suffered from declining productivity, which may lead to localized harvest restrictions (Munro 2023, Conrad and Thynes 2024). In particular, Chinook Salmon stocks throughout the Tongass National Forest have declined, with four individual stocks listed as Stocks

of Concern by ADF&G. Chinook salmon have experienced major declines in population and body size, and other salmon have declined or shifted location or timing of spawning (Kovach et al. 2015; Roadless Rule Subsistence Hearing transcripts 2019; Schoen et al. 2023). Shellfish are showing greater prevalence of toxins related to ocean acidifiation and warmer ocean waters (Litaker et al. 2020, Central Council of the Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska 2021, McIntyre et al. 2021, Lefebvre et al. 2022), though clams have always been avoided during warmer seasons (Newton and Moss 2009). Many beach foods have been impacted by warming water temperatures, or other climate-related impacts (Alcantar 2024, Spurkland & Iken 2011, Wyllie de Echeverria & Thornton 2019). Deer harvest has also declined in some Game Management Units (GMU) on the Tongass National Forest recently, and many users have reported shifts in productive harvest locations or greater effort for each deer harvested, which may indicate that some deer populations that are under pressure. In some areas, deer populations and harvest have remained relatively stable, however. Declines in deer harvest do not necessarily directly translate to declining deer populations. Harvest levels may decline due to reductions in access, reduced ability to spot deer in dense young growth stands and reduced or shifting hunter participation. Yet, the number of deer actually harvested from Unit 2 each year could be up to double this average (~5,302 deer) if accounting for estimated rates of unreported and/or illegal harvest (see Person 2010). ADF&G believes Unit 2 has one of the highest illegal and unreported harvests in the region" (Hasbrouck 2023: 17), and unreported harvest has previously been estimated to be equal to the Unit 2 reported harvest (Person 2010). Deer populations are difficult to estimate with accuracy on the Tongass National Forest due to dense vegetation, which makes aerial surveys impractical. Deer pellet surveys were used in the Southeast region from 1981 to 2019 to monitor deer population trends and document substantial changes in deer density in specific watersheds but have since been discontinued due to their inaccuracy (McCoy 2017; Hasbrouck 2023).

As reported in Reid et al. (2022), Alaska Native Elders identified the top five threats to salmon as aquaculture, climate change, contaminants, industrial development, and infectious disease, with local variation in importance of each threat. Here, we will discuss these, as well as impacts from timber harvest, recreation, and competition from commercial and sport fishers. While we did not assess conditions and trends for habitat, populations, and harvest patterns for all harvested species, we will discuss conditions and trends for the most commonly used species later in this assessment.

Different publications estimate that less than 50 to over 350 pounds per year of wild food is harvested in Southeast communities. At a value of four to eight dollars per pound, that equates to a value of $200 to $2,800 per person per year in some communities (Mazza and Kruger 2010). ADF&G estimated that rural Southeast Alaskans harvested about 5 million pounds of wild resources for food in the mid-2010s. The replacement cost for these foods would be 20-40 million dollars per year for all rural Southeast Alaska Residents (ADF&G 2019). Although the economic value is important, the significance of wild food harvest far exceeds the economic value. "Sharing with relatives, friends, elders and people in need, and in community events, is a key cultural value in many communities. Families work together to harvest and process wild foods. Essential skills and traditional knowledge are taught across generations. Participants in these activities learn key values, including non-wasteful and efficient harvesting, and respect for the fish and wildlife upon which their ways of life depend," (ADF&G 2019).

Subsistence harvest in Southeast Alaska as a region or by community are collected by ADF&G and the Forest Service, but not from each community or on an annual basis. A 2016 article reported that harvest of wild resources by rural residents in Southeast Alaska increased slightly between 1986 and 2012, from 85.5 to 90.8 kg per person (188 to 200 pounds per person) (Fall 2016).

While recent overall harvest pounds may not be changing, some species are not as plentiful and users have reported increasing problems with accessing subsistence resources in recent decades. The ability to live a subsistence way of life has become more difficult because of other competing uses.

The rest of this assessment will focus on some of the factors that can affect subsistence harvest, and some of the conditions, trends, and management of specific key harvested species.

Wild Resource Harvest Drivers and Stressors

There are multiple ways that subsistence and other non-commercial harvest of subsistence resources have been affected. The key impacts are described below.

Ecosystem alteration through vegetation harvest or forest thinning

Sitka black-tailed deer are most often cited as being directly affected by timber harvest. Deer are also by far the most hunted big game animal in Southeast Alaska. The importance of deer for subsistence varies throughout the region due to access to alternative resources and the abundance of deer on the landscape. Harvest also occurs in various habitat types such as alpine, timber, muskegs, and marine shoreline, depending on the time of year and harvester access. In interviews with hunters on Prince of Wales Island, Brinkman (2009) found that muskegs were the most popular habitat to hunt, followed by clearcuts, then alpine areas. The common factor in these areas is open terrain with high visibility. Although recent clear cuts were a preferred place to hunt, they have negative longer-term impacts to deer habitat (Farmer & Kirchhoff 2007). Clear cuts or even-age timber harvest affects deer by first reducing the quality of habitat, especially during harsh winters with increased snow depth. Clearcutting can result in relatively quick regeneration of abundant forage for deer (Hasbrouck 2023). However, this forage is not accessible during periods of deep snow (Hasbrouck 2023). Furthermore, a regenerating forest enters a stem-exclusion stage after about 25 years of regrowth, where the evergreen canopy closes, shading out understory forage vegetation (Alaback 1982; Crotteau et al. 2020; Farmer & Kirchhoff 2007, Hasbrouck 2023). Thinning second growth forests can improve habitat conditions for deer (Crotteau et al. 2020). Successful treatments will increase light transmission through the overstory canopy and thereby enhance quality and quantity of forage for deer in the short-term, increase connectivity between seasonal habitats and forage resources, and accelerate old-growth conditions which improve deep snow winter habitat in the long-term. Deer are discussed in more detail in the species-specific section of this assessment.

Past timber harvest practices have led to negative effects to anadromous fish and other aquatic species, leading to erosion or changes in runoff large enough to impact water quality, stream substrate, or water flows (Grant et al. 2008). Depending on timber harvest practices and environmental factors within the stand, changes can occur through soil disturbance from equipment, loss of soil holding capacity from roots, and from erosion if roads are not maintained properly near water (Moore et. al 2024). Removal of large trees can also reduce large wood debris input into streams, which reduces salmon habitat suitability (Murphy and Koski 1989). These areas are relatively few across the entire Forest (See *Watershed Condition and Water Resources Assessment*). The presence of roads can affect salmon movement if culverts are not providing proper fish passage. The Tongass National Forest staff has been working on stream improvement projects to replace culverts and increase large wood in streams. Watersheds with degraded condition on the Tongass National Forest mainly resulted from timber harvest and road building prior to 1990. The Tongass Timber Reform Act (TTRA)(Tongass Timber Reform Act, 1990) and subsequent Forest Plans (1997, 2008, 2016) greatly increased protection measures for watershed condition and aquatic habitat. The TTRA requires a minimum 100-foot no-cut buffer along all Class I

streams and all Class II streams that flow directly into a Class I stream. The Tongass Forest Plan places additional riparian buffers on streams depending on process group and extent of riparian soils and vegetation. Additionally, Class III streams are given a slope-break buffer. All stream buffers require additional consideration for wind firmness in high wind risk areas. This riparian management approach effectively addresses fundamental ecological principals to maintain and restore riparian and aquatic ecosystem diversity and reduces the potential impacts of altered flood patterns or changing water temperatures. See the *Watershed Condition and Water Resources Assessment* for more information about stream restoration trends.

Alaska Natives use red and yellow cedar for traditional and cultural purposes such as for totem poles, canoes, and housing, while wood and bark are used for art and ceremonial objects. For totem poles and canoes, cedar trees must be old, large, and slow growing to produce tight growth rings and clear boles (mainstem of the tree). Such trees take 450 years to grow (Johnson and Cerveny, 2022). Permitting requirements, effects from changes to climate, commercial timber harvest and lack of long-term planning to sustain road accessible old growth areas for future generations affect continued access to cultural trees. Community discussions brought forward ideas for protecting cultural trees including, "engaging local artisans in forest planning, selecting and delivering specific trees to roads as part of ongoing timber sales, allowing bark removal prior to forest-timber sales, simplifying the tree-acquisition permit process, and setting aside cultural forest groves to sustain trees seven generations into the future," (Johnson et al. 2021).

In Alaska National Forests, "Bona fide settlers, miners, residents, and prospectors for minerals in Alaska may take green or dried timber from the National Forests in Alaska free of charge for personal use but not for sale. Permits will be required for green saw timber. Other material may be taken without permit. The amount of material granted to any one person in 1 year shall not exceed 10,000 board feet of saw timber and 25 cords of wood, or an equivalent volume in other forms. Persons obtaining materials shall, on demand, forward to the supervisor a statement of the quantity taken and the location from which it was removed," (36 CFR § 223.10). Timber harvest and road access can also affect peoples' ability to collect personal use wood by increasing access through new road construction or decreasing localized availability. The effects of timber harvest on free use wood depends on its intended use. Much of the personal use wood is harvested for firewood which can be accessed more easily through the construction of logging roads. However, residents also harvest free-use wood for milling into wood products. The availability of desirable timber for milling may be limited in localized areas by commercial timber harvest. The perceived or actual regulatory burden of obtaining free use wood can also affect access. The regulations for free use personal wood can be confusing and not interpreted the same by all users and Forest Service staff.

As discussed in the species-specific section of this assessment, timber harvest can increase or decrease the growth of plants harvested for subsistence such as mushrooms, berries, and devil's club. Some of these species thrive within clearcuts, for example, with increased light. Others require shade, or cool microclimates that can be negatively impacted by timber harvest (Alaback 1984, Kerns et al 2003). Considering effects to fish, wildlife, and gathered species is an important part of minimizing negative effects to wild resource harvest in all Tongass National Forest projects and when developing the revised Forest Plan.

Roads and Road Access

Roads can impact subsistence harvest in multiple ways. Anadromous fish can be impeded by culverts or other road crossings that affect fish passage, by blocking or degrading upstream or downstream movements. Montgomery (1994) found that drainage concentration from ridgetop roads caused both landsliding and integration of the channel and road networks. Road drainage concentration increased the effective length of the channel network and strongly influenced the distribution of erosional processes in Southeast Alaska. Kahklen and Hartsog (1999) found that road induced erosion was highly variable on the Tongass National Forest . The density and location of roads within a watershed and degree of road maintenance are variables that influence the effect of roads on anadromous fish habitat. Roads have the potential to reduce water quality or affect stream substrate. The existing land management plan contains direction to protect streams from road effects, and the Forest Service is replacing culverts to improve fish passage. Roads can also fragment habitat, though most places on the Tongass National Forest have very low road density and there are likely few effects from habitat fragmentation due to roads. Prince of Wales Island has a higher road density than anywhere else on the Tongass National Forest, which affects harvest methods and some species' behaviors. Roads provide access for hunting, which improves subsistence users' ability to harvest animals, but has also led to increased hunting, overharvest or increased illegal harvest in some areas (Person and Russel 2008).

In the Roadless subsistence hearings, there were differing views about roads and how they impact subsistence, illustrating how roads can play both a beneficial and detrimental role for subsistence users. Many objections to repealing Inventoried Roadless Area status were based on the expected timber harvest or mining impacts, not from the roads themselves. Multiple people mentioned that road building for timber harvest was usually not helpful for increased access, since the roads are only temporary and blocked off after harvest is complete, so only the negative impacts remain, and none of the positive. Others mentioned the benefit of roads, and better maintained roads, to access harvested resources. Speakers mentioned that maintaining roads for vehicle access in harvest use areas provides greater access to resources, distributes harvesters, and may reduce overall competition between users. Generally, new roads are often not desired, but maintenance of existing roads is seen as necessary for access to wild resources. Communities can identify which roads are the highest priority for harvest activities (Subsistence hearing transcripts, Computer Matrix, LLC 2019).

The Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council was active during the Roadless Rule process, and their position on roads was that they are generally detrimental to deer and deer habitat, fish and fish habit, and subsistence uses. They consider roads, along with timber harvest, as one of the major factors in deer population declines on Prince of Wales Island (GMU 2) (Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, 2020, letters on pages 17-57).

Based on the public input and knowledge of on-the-ground concerns, access for subsistence users and other harvesters can be complicated and there is no one agreed-upon position by all users. Access restrictions are rare in Alaska, though. ANILCA contains unique access provisions that protect access for subsistence. Most notably, Sec. 811(a) of ANILCA provides that the "the Secretary shall ensure that rural residents engaged in subsistence uses shall have reasonable access to subsistence resources on the public lands." Similarly, Sec. 811(b) states that notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary "shall permit on the public lands appropriate use for subsistence purposes of snowmobiles, motorboats, and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents, subject to reasonable regulation." Additionally, while not directly applicable to federal subsistence, ANILCA Sec. 1110(a) provides that the Secretary shall permit, on conservation system units . . . the use of snowmachines (during periods of adequate snow cover, or frozen river conditions in the case of wild and scenic rivers),

motorboats, airplanes, and nonmotorized surface transportation methods for traditional activities . . . .”). However, much of the Tongass National Forest is not a conservation system unit. The access rights from Sections 811(b) and 1110(a) are both subject to reasonable regulation, so access may be restricted to address specific concerns such as public safety or conservation so long as they are consistent with ANILCA.

Other Access

Access to subsistence harvest areas within the Tongass National Forest is often by boat or on foot since there are few roads in many Southeast Alaskan communities. Many marine resources are necessarily accessed via boat. Marine access facilities, boat ramps, docks, or anchorages, are valuable assets for providing access to harvest areas. However, marine access improvements can also cause competition among and between user groups. There can be competition between subsistence users and other users, for water access to prime hunting locations (Risdahl, personal communication) and, therefore, improvements in traditional hunting areas are not always wanted by subsistence users as it increases conflicts and competition with other users. Charter fishing use has displaced subsistence users in some areas, causing subsistence users to move to different locations (Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council 2020). Tongass National Forest managers have little direct jurisdiction over water or boating uses, in navigable waters, other than permitting or maintaining docks or other marine access facilities located on land within the National Forest boundaries.

Indirectly, the continuance of customary and traditional uses of cabins and related structures both within and outside of Wilderness Areas is important for maintaining reasonable access to subsistence resources. “ANILCA cabins” and public use cabins are both important to provide shelter for overnight harvest activities. There are about 100 “ANILCA cabins” on National Forest Lands in Alaska authorized under ANILCA Sec. 1303 and Forest Service Handbook 2709.11, Chapters 40 and 50. There are about 160 public use cabins and shelters available for use by reservation. Continued use of these cabins and other facilities is essential to support customary and traditional harvest activities.

Recreation and Tourism

Recreation and tourism can adversely affect subsistence harvested resources, and also adversely affect access. Local harvesters have expressed concern that exhaust emissions and gray water dumping from cruise ships contaminates marine resources and terrestrial wildlife, and that a high volume of nature tours can have localized effects on wildlife distribution and habitats. Visitors engaged in kayaking, boat tours, wildlife viewing, or other recreational activities often access traditionally important areas used for subsistence fishing, berry picking, or hunting, displacing subsistence harvesters (Cerveny 2005).

Cerveny (2005) reported that community members in Haines, Craig, and Hoonah described changes in access to their harvest from tourism, mainly through charter fishing activity causing shifts of harvest patterns for salmon and halibut. In Alaska, the number of anglers participating in charter fishing increased threefold from 1984 to 2019, with the number of resident anglers remaining steady over the same period (Fowler and Chapell 2021). In some areas, guided and non-guided sport anglers compete with subsistence and personal use harvesters for the most productive harvest areas. Conflict between these uses negatively affects subsistence and other traditional fishing harvest and can result in residents fishing in less desirable areas.

Mountain goats can be affected by aircraft use, changing their behavioral patterns, and do not habituate to the disturbance over time (Goldstein et al. 2005). The existing land management plan (pp. 91-02) contains requirements to avoid mountain goat kidding areas and maintain a 1,500-foot vertical or horizonal clearance from traditional summer and kidding habitats whenever feasible (2016 plan, chapter 4). The effects of helicopters are relevant to management decisions about recreational, commercial, and administrative activities by the Forest Service itself.

The tourism industry is expected to continue growing throughout Southeast Alaska, increasing pressure on resources and increasing user conflicts. Maintaining the federally mandated subsistence priority, and overall harvest success, requires considering the various effects of recreation and tourism in different communities, which are well understood by the residents of those local communities.

Warming Temperatures and Changing Precipitation

Warming temperatures and changing precipitation patterns can affect wild harvested resources and access to those resources in many ways, starting with changes in ecosystem function. The Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment explains the current future predicted effects to air and water temperature, precipitation, snowmelt, and streamflow (Littell and Johnson, DRAFT). Stream flows are already showing changes in timing due to reduced snowpack and increased rain. Ocean warming in the Gulf of Alaska began to show novel impacts in 2014, shifting foraging conditions and spatial distribution of salmon (Bellmore et al, DRAFT). Predicted effects to salmon and other anadromous and marine fish populations or health are not certain and may not all be negative. However, they have and will continue to shift harvest patterns, affecting subsistence harvest location or timing. Consideration of changing migration patterns and timing will be necessary when planning restoration or other management on streams to ensure the timing does not impact populations or harvest activities.

While sea level rise is not occurring across most of Southeast Alaska, both sea level rise and land level rise could affect shorelines and beach foods. Isostatic rebound is the rising of land when large amounts of ice melt and remove its weight. In the southern portion of Southeast Alaska, such as near Metlakatla and Ketchikan, sea level is expected to rise about half a meter over the next eighty years. In the northern portion, near Yakutat and Klukwan, the land is expected to rise over two meters relative to sea level, which would lead to a relative sea level drop of about two meters (Johnson et al. 2019). Changing shorelines affect beach foods such as plants, shellfish and seaweed, and eelgrass ecosystems (Johnson and Kruger, 2019). While some ecosystems will shift with sea level, others may not.

Hunting and gathering locations may continue to shift, or habitats may be lost altogether. Commenters at the 2021 federal subsistence policy tribal consultation, held by the U.S Department of the Interior and U.S. Department of Agriculture, expressed concern about the adverse impacts of changing climate on the availability, location, and timing of subsistence resources, and on their traditional harvest activities and practices more broadly (USDA and DOI 2022). Many commenters emphasized the loss of productivity in fisheries, pointing to changes in freshwater temperatures and timing of runoff, which have had a particularly negative effect on salmon runs as fish are either dying off pre-spawning or migrating at younger ages than usual, resulting in smaller fish and less developed eggs in returning females.

In marine environments, increased algal blooms are likely with warming oceans, leading to a higher prevalence of toxins in shellfish and affecting sustainability of shellfish harvest and other marine animals (Sill and Koster 2017, USDA and DOI 2022).

There have been and will continue to be changing migration and distribution patterns for wildlife and changing distribution of plants. While the coastal temperate rainforest is predicted to show resiliency to increasing temperatures and altered precipitation patterns, without wholesale ecosystem change, subsistence harvested resources will likely require a change in harvest location, depending on the abundance and accessibility to game, fish, and plants. Consideration of these changes, informed by local knowledge of climate change effects, can help Tongass National Forest management maximize the ability to retain the customary and traditional subsistence ways of life.

Social and Economic Impacts

Many of the impacts to subsistence and other kinds of harvest are related to wider cultural and economic shifts. Rural residents cite increased cost of fuel and equipment, scarcity of jobs allowing families to remain in rural areas, time available to harvest, and other factors. While these factors are not under the control of the Tongass National Forest, consideration of these factors could help inform management that supports resilience of the subsistence way of life.

Competition with Commercial Harvest and Other Uses

The Tongass National Forest is managed for multiple uses. Competition for wild resources is a major concern among all user groups. The taking on federal public lands and waters of fish and wildlife for nonwasteful subsistence uses is accorded priority over the taking on such lands of fish and wildlife for other purposes. Some competing uses occur off of public lands yet still may affect the use of wild resources on the Tongass National Forest. In such cases, it may be difficult or not practicable to manage these through the forest plan or the Federal Subsistence Board process. -Subsistence users face competition with commercial and non-commercial harvest and non-consumptive uses on and around the Tongass National Forest (e.g. tourism, wildlife viewing). This section identifies existing and potential competition between wild resource user groups. While the revised forest plan will continue to manage for multiple uses, it is important to identify user conflicts and minimize conflicts, while protecting the subsistence use priority and promoting multiple uses.

Competition with Commercial Harvest

The Federal Subsistence Board has limited jurisdiction over commercial fishing, because this activity most commonly occurs in marine waters, even though the Tongass National Forest plays a vital role in the production of wild salmon stocks through protection and restoration of spawning and rearing habitat. Except for discrete parcels of submerged lands that did not pass to the State of Alaska at statehood, marine waters are generally not Federal public lands subject to the federal subsistence regulations. About 75% of the salmon caught in southeast Alaska commercial salmon fisheries originate in Tongass National Forest streams, with the remainder resulting from hatchery production (Johnson et. al 2019). These salmon have an annual ex-vessel value of approximately $50 million to $150 million, depending on the abundance and market value each year (Johnson et. al 2019).

The Federal Subsistence Board has regulatory authority over marine waters in certain identified areas, including the Makhnati Island area in Sitka Sound and roughly 160 parcels of submerged lands within the boundaries of the Tongass National Forest. These submerged lands parcels came under the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board when the Secretaries published two final rules (83 FR 23813 and 89 FR 22949) identifying certain submerged lands within the Tongass National Forest that did not pass to the State of Alaska at statehood and, therefore, that remained Federal public lands subject to Federal subsistence provisions.

Most of the documented commercial competition concerns are related to salmon harvest. While charter fishing has increased over the past few decades, commercial harvest of salmon in Southeast Alaska has been relatively steady over the past 30 years. Annual harvest varies greatly, but the average across all years since the early 1990s remains at about 180 million salmon of all species in Alaska as a whole. Southeast Alaska salmon subsistence fisheries follow a similar pattern, though the proportion of subsistence fish caught in Southeast Alaska has generally declined over the past 40 years. By number of fish, most of the commercial harvest (around 90%) is wild pink salmon. Commercial harvest generally occurs in saltwater before salmon reach the terminal areas typically used by subsistence harvesters, such as the mouths of streams. Harvest of salmon in commercial mixed stock fisheries can reduce the number of salmon returning to small river systems important to subsistence harvesters. For example, commercial purse seine fisheries targeting Pink Salmon in northern Chatham Strait also harvest Sockeye Salmon bound for traditional subsistence fishing locations like Kanalku Bay, Basket Bay, and Sitkoh Lake (Bednarski et. al 2014). This may reduce the number of fish available for subsistence users and reduce the productivity of the individual stocks they depend on.

Beyond salmon, commercial harvest of other marine resources has caused subsistence harvesters to change locations or led to reduced success. An example of how subsistence use was considered in commercial harvest regulations is the herring spawn in Sitka Sound. Subsistence harvesters were concerned that the commercial sac roe herring fishery was negatively affecting subsistence harvest success. The area was determined to be a customary and traditional use area by the Alaska Board of Fisheries in 1989. Between 2012 and 2018, a series of decisions closed portions of Sitka Sound to the commercial sac roe fishery, so that a core area was available only to subsistence harvesters (Sill and Lemons 2021). Commercial harvest of Eulachon in District 1 contributed to a decline in Eulachon numbers returning to the Unuk River. The fishery collapsed in 2005 and did not open again until 2021, with a strict harvest limit for federal subsistence (5 gallons per household per year).

Competition With Other Uses

Sport harvest (guided and unguided fishing, hunting, transporters)

An emerging issue throughout the Tongass National Forest is the increasing number of "unguided" non-resident harvesters. These are typically fishermen or hunters who sport fish or hunt without the services of a guide but rent boats or use transport services to access resources. While the extent of the unguided harvesting industry is unclear, subsistence users have reported increasing competition with unguided harvesters. In most cases, the primary issue is not direct competition for resources, but rather the disruption of subsistence activities by the influx of unguided users. These disruptions are often highly localized, such as when unguided anglers congregate in fishing areas important to rural communities and compete for space, or when hunting transporters drop clients off at locations used by subsistence hunters, forcing local hunters to move elsewhere. Subsistence users have also reported competition concerns related to Alaska resident sport fishers and hunters.

The difference in reporting requirements between guided and unguided non-resident users contribute to difficulties in assessing the extent and specifics of competition and conflict between unguided and subsistence users. Charter boat operators are required to complete detailed logbooks documenting their fishing areas and catch (5 AAC 75.076), but no such requirement exists for unguided anglers. Similarly, hunting guides using National Forest lands must obtain special use permits detailing the number of clients, areas, and times permitted for use, while transporters have little or no restriction on dropping clients off on state-owned tidelands.

The lack of specific information on the extent of competition between unguided harvesters and subsistence users complicates efforts to address any conflicts that may occur. Identifying the areas and circumstances where subsistence users are in competition or conflict with unguided harvesters is the first step needed to mitigate any issues that arise. As many of these conflicts occur in marine waters outside the jurisdiction of the Tongass National Forest, they are beyond the scope of the Forest Plan. However, a better understanding of the issue will be crucial in addressing any conflicts that can be addressed in the Plan.

Tourism (wildlife viewing, guided recreation)

Harvest activities often occur in areas of high abundance, which are also desirable locations to conduct tourism activities. The Tongass National Forest hosts several types of tourism that compete with subsistence uses of the land in a variety of ways. Vessel-based wildlife viewing and scenic tours tend to move from place to place seeking out protected anchorages for visitors to stop and explore wildlife. Many of those locations can overlap with hunting and fishing efforts. Additionally, established wildlife viewing and recreation sites or facilities prohibit hunting activities, in order to provide a safe and welcoming environment for visitors. The presence of vessels, planes, and on-the-ground explorers and the added noise that is often associated with such operations interrupts normal animal behavior, which can drive deer, bears, and other prey species farther into the forest resulting in reduced efficiency and accessibility for hunters. Fishing activities are often interrupted by accessibility issues that result from large and small vessel or kayak utilization of the marine space in which harvesters would deploy large nets to efficiently harvest salmon. These outcomes not only inconvenience harvesters but often result in increased time and distance traveled from their home community which confers drastic increases in fuel costs and risk. Other outdoor recreational activities can also impact harvest activities. Hiking, photography, and camping are a few examples of such activities that when conducted during hunting and fishing seasons can impact animal behavior and reduce success and efficiency of harvest.

Regulations

The laws and regulations for federal and state subsistence, personal use and sport harvest on federally managed lands in Alaska are complicated and can be confusing to users. There are State of Alaska regulations, federal regulations, and different decision makers based on the agency and in-season manager. The Federal Subsistence Board regulates federal subsistence activities on federal public lands and waters. The Federal Subsistence Board is made up of the Directors of the DOI federal land management agencies in Alaska, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the USDA Forest Service's Regional Forester; plus, the Chair and five public members (including 3 tribally nominated public members) with direct subsistence experience in rural Alaska, which are selected by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. . This brings the number of Board members to 11. The Board is informed by a State Liaison and the Chairman of each of the 10 Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils. The Councils are statutorily required and provide a forum for rural residents with personal knowledge of local conditions and resource requirements to have a meaningful role in the subsistence management of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands in Alaska. The Council members represent varied geographical, cultural, and user interests within each region.

The Alaska Region Subsistence Program represents a unique Forest Service role in wildlife and fisheries management. In most other states, the Forest Service's role does not extend to direct management of fish and wildlife, as state managers conducting fish and wildlife population surveys and inventory and harvest

management. In Alaska, the Forest Service has a substantial role and workload, largely through the Regional Forester's seat on the Board and the Forest Service's role in the Interagency Staff Committee, in developing harvest regulations for subsistence use of wildlife and fish on all federal lands and waters and enforcing subsistence regulations on national forest lands (USDA Forest Service 2010).

The District Rangers of the Tongass National Forest have been delegated authority by the Federal Subsistence Board to take in-season management actions. Delegation of Authority was given to District Rangers to take immediate action, outside of the Federal Subsistence Board cycle, to ensure continued viability of a particular fish or wildlife population, to ensure continued subsistence use, or for reasons of public safety. These actions, termed temporary or emergency special actions, can restrict use of fish and wildlife by both Federally qualified subsistence users and non-subsistence users (i.e., sport, state subsistence, and State Personal use). These actions may also be deferred to the Federal Subsistence Board.

Related to the regulatory framework for subsistence, competition within and among communities of federally qualified subsistence users may increase over time or when fish or wildlife populations decline. When this happens, the Federal Subsistence Board determines which communities have the greatest direct dependence (ANILCA Sec. 804) and grants those with the greatest need a priority for harvest over other federally qualified users.

Increased use of local knowledge and coordination with local communities for all types of projects that have any potential to affect harvest is a consideration for improving sustainability of Tongass National Forest management.

While this assessment does not cover all aspects of regulations, the Forest Service has a large role in sustainable management of wild resources, in terms of managing resources sustainably, protecting access to subsistence harvest, working with other agencies, tribes and communities to ensure the subsistence way of life can continue, and using local traditional ecological knowledge to help inform management.

Primary Subsistence Species on the Tongass National Forest

This section goes into more detail about a few of the most widely used species on the Tongass National Forest. A multitude of species are used by people for food, fiber, art, medicine, or other cultural uses. This section briefly describes some of the main habitat requirements for selected species, general life cycles, and some of the management activities or other factors that can affect habitat or populations. It also discusses how these wild resources are used by people. It will include a detailed account of each species and a brief discussion of those factors most relevant to management undertaken by the Tongass National Forest. These species-specific descriptions include ecological and habitat requirements, to provide context, and not always within the framework of how they are used for subsistence and other non-commercial harvest.

Salmon

Salmon are an important anadromous fish that depends on streams and rivers within the Tongass National Forest. Other fish, including halibut, herring, trout, eulachon, and shellfish (e.g., mollusks and other aquatic invertebrates) are also important for human uses in and adjacent to the Tongass National Forest, but are not described in detail in this section. This section focuses on salmon both because of their

widespread importance to users throughout the Forest, and because they can be particularly affected by land use activities due to their freshwater residency and life history.

Contribution of use to cultural, social and economic sustainability

The importance of salmon to the economy, ecology and culture of Southeast Alaska is immeasurable. The Tongass National Forest supports all five species of Pacific salmon: chinook, coho, chum, pink, and sockeye. While salmon are important across Alaska, the Southeast region supports a greater abundance of salmon than any other region of Alaska (Clark & Thiessen-Bock 2019).

Changes in the abundance and stability of salmon populations have cascading effects on communities and fisheries in the region. Salmon that spawn and rear in Tongass National Forest watersheds support commercial, sport, personal-use, and subsistence fisheries that are critical to community well-being and local economies. A 2010 estimate suggest that about 1 in 10 jobs are directly linked to salmon fisheries in Southeast Alaska (TCW Economics 2010). Furthermore, there are 33 federally designated subsistence communities in the region, which often acquire all their annual protein requirements from wild foods—especially salmon (Fall and Kostick 2018).

While this assessment focuses on subsistence and other non-commercial uses, we also include some information here about commercial and recreational uses of salmon, to provide context and highlight the importance of salmon for the economy and culture of Southeast Alaska.

The Tongass National Forest supports a large proportion of salmon harvest in the region. For example, from 2007 to 2016 it was estimated that 75% of commercially harvested salmon in Southeast Alaska were derived from or supported for some aspect of their life cycle by Tongass National Forest watersheds. These fish were estimated to have an annual dockside value of ~$68 million (Johnson et al. 2019).

Salmon are a keystone species for many Tongass National Forest ecosystems, both in an ecological and cultural sense. An ecological keystone species has a disproportionate effect on the structure and functioning of an ecosystem relative to its abundance. Cultural keystone Species have been described as "culturally salient species that shape in a major way the cultural identity of a people, as reflected in the fundamental roles these species have in diet, materials, medicine, and/or spiritual practices" (Garibaldi and Turner 2004).

Salmon are ecological keystone species because they transfer marine-derived nutrients into the terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, and many terrestrial and freshwater species and ecological processes are inextricably connected to salmon (Willson and Halupka 1995). Over 50 animal species directly depend on salmon on the Tongass National Forest. Salmon-derived nitrogen has been found over ¼ mile away from salmon streams, indirectly feeding vegetation as well as animals.

For Alaska Natives, salmon are the major wild food source and have been at the heart of survival and cultural practices for thousands of years, as well as having cultural and ecological importance to the Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian people. Alaska Natives developed a cultural system interconnected with fisheries for social cohesion, identity, cross-generational learning, and a strong subsistence economy. Salmon remain key to subsistence uses and other harvest, and maintaining high-quality aquatic habitat and healthy salmon populations was identified as a major concern and focus by public, tribal representatives and agencies in public participation for this Plan Revision as well as previous engagement efforts. Sockeye salmon is the species of salmon used by far the most for non-commercial fishers in Southeast Alaska, with pink salmon the most abundant and commercially harvested.

Commercial fisheries have been a part of the Alaskan economy for generations, shaping cultural structures, cultural and community identity, and are part of the market economy. While the non-commercial and commercial fisheries can sometimes be in conflict, they are also intertwined in the sense that the same individuals may participate in both commercial and subsistence or other personal use fisheries. Therefore, the economic value is tied in with social and cultural stability, as well as economic stability.

Commercial harvest, including salmon of hatchery origin, has ranged from less than 20 million, to over 100 million over the past 40 years, for all salmon species. One report, by Trout Unlimited, found that the total economic output associated with commercial, sport, and personal use and subsistence fisheries, including hatchery operations, in Southeast Alaska was estimated at $986.1 million in 2017 (TCW Economics 2010). Research into the monetary value of salmon produced on the Tongass National Forest estimated the dockside value of all Pacific Salmon originating on the Tongass National Forest from 2007-2016 to range from $50 million to $150 million, with an average value of about $69 million. Pink salmon had by far the greatest value during that time.

Sport fisheries also comprise significant contributions to communities and local economies across Southeast Alaska. In 2023, ADFG estimated 519,000 angler-days fished across the region, with Juneau, Prince of Wales, Ketchikan, Sitka and Yakutat survey districts reporting the highest ranked fishing effort. Freshwater harvest for all salmon species topped 59,000 fish and saltwater harvest tallied 451,076 fish retained by an estimated 155,584 anglers, a peak angler estimate for the 2014-2023 reporting period. (Alaska Department of Fish and Game 2024). Updated economic analyses of the impacts of sport fisheries are needed across the region.

Habitat Trend and Occurrence

Most information about habitat needs, and trends of salmon and their habitat can be found in the Salmon assessment. A brief summary is included here for context.

Within the Tongass National Forest, about 13,379 miles of anadromous fish bearing rivers and streams and about 213,000 acres of lakes and ponds have been estimated to support and produce wild salmon. In general, most streams that do not have natural or anthropogenic physical barriers support at least one species of salmon (Armstrong et al. 2016).

All salmon species, and the other anadromous fish species on the Tongass National Forest, including steelhead, Dolly Varden, eulachon, and some cutthroat trout, spawn in freshwater, and spend varying life stages in salt water. The different salmon species have different and often distinct habitat needs, and spend different amounts of time, from months to years, before migrating into the marine environment, and varied number of years in the marine environment. Therefore, while there are some similar habitat requirements and threats, there are also threats specific to a particular species.

All Pacific salmon need cold, moderate to fast-moving freshwater, at sufficient depths to spawn and migrate to and from their stream of origin. In systems with lakes, some salmon species can rear for one or more years in the lakes, particularly coho and sockeye. Some species and individual populations spawn in lakes, while others spawn miles upstream from the ocean, and others spawn at the mouth or lower sections of rivers. All species in Alaska migrate into salt water to mature. Because their lifecycle spans many different aquatic habitats, conditions in streams, rivers, lakes and the marine environment can affect their survival and fitness.

Chinook salmon have the most limited range of the salmon species on the Tongass National Forest, mostly in the larger rivers. Sockeye salmon are associated with watersheds where lakes are present, and are generally found in fewer systems than coho, chum, and pink salmon. Sockeye salmon are highly used in subsistence and personal use fisheries. Sockeye salmon abundance has been variable due to a variety of factors including shifts in freshwater and marine conditions and interception in mixed-stock fisheries. Coho salmon are among the most widely distributed salmon across Southeast Alaska and are important contributions to both recreational, sport and commercial fisheries. As juveniles, coho salmon are highly migratory, utilizing diverse habitats throughout the year, and rearing in small, first-order tributaries to large, forested floodplains and side-channels. Coho most frequently encounter habitat stressors from past forest management activities and roads and are considered a 'design species' for in-stream restoration in historically disturbed watersheds as well fish passage improvement projects at road/stream crossings.

Population status and trends

Salmon are the largest single wild harvested resource used by rural residents of Southeast Alaska, with all other fish combined making up about the same harvested weight. For Alaska Natives, salmon are the major wild food source and have been at the heart of survival and cultural practices for thousands of years. Alaka Natives developed a cultural system interconnected with fisheries for social cohesion, identity, cross-generational learning, and a strong subsistence economy. Salmon remain key to subsistence uses and other harvest, and maintenance of salmon streams and populations are identified as a major concern and focus by public, tribal representatives, and agencies in public participation for this Plan Revision, as well as previous engagement efforts.

In general, salmon populations throughout the Tongass National Forest are healthy, though subject to considerable annual and geographical variations. For example, of the 12 Sockeye Salmon stocks with escapement goals, 9 met or exceeded their goals in 2023 (Table 1). The notable exception is Chinook salmon, which have experienced poor productivity throughout the region in recent years, attributed mainly to marine conditions. Chinook salmon spawn in a limited number of river systems, most of which are large transboundary watersheds. These populations are intensively monitored, and fisheries on Alaska-origin stocks have been severely curtailed as a conservation measure.

Table 1. 2023 Escapement estimates and escapement goals for southeast Alaska Sockeye salmon stocks (reproduced from ADF&G 2024).

Stock	Goal Type[1]	Estimated Escapement or Index	Escapement Goal Range	Comment	Enumeration Method
Hugh Smith Lake	OEG	1,689	8,000-18,000	Below goal	Weir count
McDonald Lake	SEG	74,900	55,000-120,000		Expanded foot survey
Stikine-mainstem	SEG	TBD	20,000-40,000	In progress	Run reconstruction
Stikine-Tahltan	BEG	38,000	18,000-30,000	Above goal	Weir count
Speel Lake	SEG	3,556	4,000-9,000	Below goal	Weir count
Taku-in-river	SEG	123,000	40,000-75,000	Above goal	Mark-recapture
Redoubt Lake	OEG	153,406	7,000-25,000	Above goal	Weir count
Chilkoot Lake	SEG	67,674	38,000-86,000		Weir count
Chilkat Lake	BEG	128,002	70,000-150,000		Weir/sonar count
Situk River	BEG	127,873	30,000-70,000	Above goal	Weir count
Klukshu River	BEG	14,118	7,500-11,000	Above goal	Weir count
East Alsek River	BEG	19,300	9,000-24,000	Above goal	Peak aerial survey

[1] Goal types include optimal (OEG), sustainable (SEG), and biological (BEG) escapement goals

Status and trends in subsistence use of salmon

Subsistence fisheries typically occur at the mouths of streams, or in freshwater. Beach seines and gillnets are usually used in stream mouths, while dipnets are commonly used in freshwater. Sockeye Salmon are by far the preferred species for most harvesters, composing approximately 85% of the fish harvested. Since the number of Sockeye Salmon streams is limited compared to other species of salmon, communities tend to use a limited number of fishing sites that are accessible without extensive travel.

The majority of subsistence fishing is conducted under State regulations, using household subsistence permits. Federal permits may only be used in Federal waters, which includes freshwater in the Tongass National Forest. Under the State system, household possession and annual limits are set for individual salmon streams, though a household can fish at multiple streams. State subsistence permits are available to all Alaska residents regardless of residence community. Federal permits sometimes use the same harvest limits as State permits, but only rural residents are eligible for federal permits in federal waters.

Salmon harvest and effort must be reported at the end of the fishing season under the terms of both State and Federal permits. The reported harvest is used to monitor the health of stocks used for subsistence, as a declining harvest could signal problems with a particular stock. Self-reporting of harvest is mandatory under both state and federal regulations. However, harvest is often under unreported and therefore total harvest numbers should be considered a minimum. While the degree of underreporting cannot be determined, ADF&G conducted in-season monitoring of the Klawock River fishery from 2001 to 2008 and found that harvests reported on subsistence permits averaged 71% of the harvest estimated by the in-season monitoring program with a wide range from 47%–80% (Cartwright and Conitz 2006; Conitz 2008). Failing to report harvest on a state subsistence permit means that a person is not eligible for a subsistence permit for that activity for the following year under state regulations. Failure to report may confound monitoring efforts in areas with substantial unreported harvest, but in general, harvest data is the most useful tool available to monitor the status of individual stocks.

While salmon stocks have generally been healthy, effort and harvest in subsistence salmon fisheries has been slowly declining. The State of Alaska reports the number of state subsistence salmon permits it issues, and the reported catch from those permits. While these data do not represent Federally qualified subsistence users, they are still useful for illustrating salmon harvest trends. Using data collected by the State of Alaska, between 1985 and 2004, an average of 3,480 household permits were issued each year. The average number of Sockeye Salmon reported to the State of Alaska harvested during that same time period was 40,233 per year. From 2005 to 2016, the average number of State of Alaska issued subsistence salmon permits fell to 3,146, with a harvest of 35,354 Sockeye Salmon per year (Conrad and Thynes 2024, Figure 5). The reasons for this decline are varied and complex, and include declining populations in rural communities, as well as loss of capacity and equipment to engage in harvesting activities (boats, nets, etc.).



Figure 5. Number of salmon harvested by species and number of permits fished in the Southeast Alaska State subsistence and personal use fisheries, 1989-2023 (from Conrad and Thynes, 2024).

While reported harvest data from household fishing permits is invaluable for fisheries management, it doesn't tell the whole story of subsistence use of salmon. Additional information about harvest, use, and sharing of salmon and other resources has been collected using household surveys conducted by ADF&G and other researchers. Data from these surveys can be used to better assess the role that subsistence use of salmon plays in households and communities. The ADF&G Community Subsistence Information System (CSIS) is the central hub for information collected by the ADF&G Division of Subsistence. Data from the CSIS, as well as from other agencies, can play a crucial role in informing Forest Plan development.

Information gaps in subsistence salmon fisheries

The escapement data currently collected is adequate for fisheries managers to monitor broad trends in salmon populations, as well as the health of some key individual stocks used by subsistence harvesters. However, many subsistence communities depend on a limited portfolio of individual salmon stocks that receive little or no monitoring. Future monitoring efforts should identify and prioritize these unmonitored stocks so that future effort can be focused where it can provide the most-needed information.

Tongass National Forest Management Related to Salmon and Other Anadromous Fish

The existing Tongass National Forest plan provides protections for salmon and other anadromous and resident fish habitat throughout the plan. Anadromous fish have long been a focus for resource protection and restoration, and much of the modern era of existing forest and land management has maintained aquatic and riparian habitat quality. Further information about salmon and other anadromous fish, and effects from management, can be found in the *Salmon* and *Aquatic Ecosystems* Assessments.

Until the 1990 Tongass Reform Act (P.L. 101-626), timber harvest occurred in riparian areas, on alluvial fans, and within beach fringes. Effects of these timber harvest practices included reduced large woody input to streams essential for maintaining riffles and pools, straightening of channels, and changes in substrate size of harvest disturbed soils and increased fine sediment in streams. Timber harvest within 300 feet of anadromous fish streams has generally not occurred on Forest System lands since 1992 (Flitcroft et al. 2022). Legacy effects do remain, however, with harvests in riparian areas having remaining impacts on instream large wood, pool frequency, pool depth, and stream width, though these differences were modest (Flitcroft et al. 2022). Monitoring has shown that riparian and aquatic protections in the current Forest Plan are generally successful at maintaining or improving anadromous and other aquatic habitat (Tongass National Forest 2020-2021 Biennial Monitoring Evaluation Report, Flitcroft et al. 2022).

Roads can affect salmon habitat by reducing or eliminating anadromous fish access to upstream habitat if fish cannot pass through a road-stream crossing such as a culvert. Roads can also increase fine sediment introduction into water bodies if they are located near those streams, occur in high densities in a watershed, or are initiation points for landslides that deposit in a valley floor stream. The Watershed Condition and Water Resources assessment includes more discussion of impacts on roads and timber harvest to water quality and geomorphology.

The Tongass National Forest has been conducting stream restoration projects, including adding large wood to streams that had reduced habitat conditions, and replacing culverts that hinder fish passage for nearly three decades. Recent fish habitat restoration initiatives have occurred in conjunction with adjacent landowners, communities, non-government organizations and Native Alaskan tribes, and these shared stewardship efforts are important to continue in order to provide knowledge and capacity for continued watershed-wide stream restoration.

While much of the aquatic resource monitoring and habitat restoration has historically focused on past forest and road management activities, large scale mining is a significant economic industry occurring on the Tongass National Forest and has potential for further exploration and expansion. It is a major concern expressed in public comments related to fishery health. Mining by-products such as tailing and waste rock storage have the potential to have direct negative effects to water quality in anadromous fish-bearing streams. Continued mitigation and monitoring is important to minimize these effects. Monitoring has shown some increases in metal concentrations in sediment and fish downstream of mining activities, relative to areas without known mining, though most monitoring shows compliance with standards (Kanouse and Fritz 2020, Lindgren and King 2024). The Forest Service is increasing its capacity to actively engage with State of Alaska and industry to refine monitoring programs and identify remaining risks to water quality and fish.

Deer

Contribution of use to social and cultural sustainability

Sitka black-tailed deer are a food source for humans and predators in southeast Alaska and strongly influence region-wide cultural, social, economic, and ecological systems (Bennetsen 2020). They are considered an ecological keystone species because their effects on the landscape. When they are removed from the ecosystem, vegetation and even soil can change, (Cobb 2014). Their availability also affects populations of predators (wolves, black bear, and brown bear), including humans, who rely on them for food (Schoen and Kirchhoff 2007).

Deer are the most extensively harvested big-game species for both subsistence and sport hunters in Southeast Alaska, and replacing deer meat with store-bought foods during times of harvest difficulty can represent a substantial cost for southeast community households, particularly lower income households (Brinkman et al. 2009). Increasing per capita harvest of deer and demand for deer in southeast communities has been correlated with declining median household incomes and rising poverty rates (Mazza 2003 in Brinkman et al. 2009).

Habitat and Occurrence

Sitka black-tailed deer are dependent on the availability and accessibility of diverse habitats during different seasons of the year. A diverse, productive mix of habitat types (alpine, old growth, muskeg, riparian, beach fringe, etc.) are essential for populations to be sustained. Certain activities can alter the availability, abundance, and accessibility of needed habitats and therefore must be managed to ensure that proper habitat function for deer exists across landscapes and across seasons. In some areas of the Forest with extensive past even-age timber harvest activities, deep snow winter habitat for deer is currently limited by dense, closed-canopy young growth that is unfavorable for understory plant development and snow interception. Deer rely on structurally complex tree canopies that both intercept snow and provide accessible understory vegetation for forage during heavy snow accumulation. Important landscape characteristics include habitat connectivity, especially for seasonal movements between alpine and low-elevation forests, and areas with sufficient cover and forage for winter survival (Tongass National Forest 2020).

Sitka black-tailed deer spend the winter and early spring at low elevation on steep slopes where there is less snow accumulation, and old-growth forests provide snow-intercept and foraging opportunities. Fawning occurs in late May and early June as vegetation greens-up, providing abundant forage to meet energetic needs of lactating does. Some deer migrate and follow the greening vegetation up to alpine for the summer, while others remain at lower elevations. The breeding season, or rut, occurs from late October through late November. Wolves, bears, and humans are the primary predators present, and their activities may reduce deer populations or increase the time needed for deer populations to recover after severe winters.

Conditions and Trends of Species and Uses

As shown in Figure 6 below, deer harvests have fluctuated, but with no overall trend, in the past few decades. Game Management Unit 2, which i Prince of Wales and surrounding islands, is often cited as an area with declining deer populations and harvest. The extensive clearcut logging that has taken place on Prince of Wales has significantly altered deer habitats, with corresponding impacts on local deer

populations, hunting opportunities, and hunting competition (Brinkman et al. 2009, 2011). Harvest numbers rose in the early 2000s and have declined in the past several years. However, reported deer harvest numbers have been estimated to be upwards of 100 percent underreported, based on the number of radio-tagged deer and documented and anecdotal accounts of found deer remains in Unit 2 (Porter 2001).



Figure 6. Reported deer harvest in Southeast Alaska Hunting Units, 1997-2023. This includes both subsistence users and other personal use hunters. Data from Alaska Department of Fish and Game 2024.

Observations from Alaska Natives about changing deer harvest due to increasing temperatures, changing precipitation patternsm and other factors were recorded by Wyllie de Echeverria and Thorton (2019). They state that with less snow accumulation in many Southeast Alaskan communities, deer migrate higher into the hills and mountains, making them less accessible to hunters. Warming temperatures can also affect the quality of meat and the amount of winter body fat gained and increase disease prevalence. Overall, though, the effects of changes to temperature and precipitation patterns on deer populations are not well understood. Nevertheless, harvest season regulations can become out of sync with deer abundance and movements; thus, making them less accessible to hunters.

Tongass National Forest Management Related to Deer Habitat

Effects from past timber harvest activities, especially on Prince of Wales Island (Game Management Unit 2), are an often-cited factor responsible for reduced deer numbers observed by residents over the past decades. Clear cutting reduces important thermal cover for deer and therefore winter forage, which is believed to be population limiting in this region and therefore negatively affects deer populations (Bennetsen 2020, Brinkman 2009). Stands that are in stem exclusion (crowns of trees close, shading foliage below with scarce understory seedlings) also fragment habitat and reduce summer forage, which is a contributing factor to deer population decline. Habitat models show a decline in deer habitat on Prince of Wales Island, mainly due to timber harvest, road building, and loss of habitat connectivity.

The Tongass National Forest young-growth management strategy includes specific guidelines for stands with a wildlife management objective to minimize impacts to specific representative species, including deer, other land mammals, and bird habitats. Though young-growth forests typically lack several key habitat characteristics present in old growth forests integral to some wildlife species, thinning and other treatments can be done in ways that improve many of these characteristics for old-growth associated wildlife in short and long terms. Short-term benefits may include increased understory vegetation and structural and plant species diversity, while long-term benefits include expedited development of old-growth conditions (Bennetsen 2020). In general, thinning stands that had previous even-aged harvest have been found to improve habitat and abundance of most wildlife species.

Local conditions and culture can affect the type of timber management that could be most beneficial or minimize impacts to subsistence uses. In other words, timber management actions to improve wildlife habitat will be different in different places, based on species and local conditions. In Petersburg, for example, small shelter cuts (removing most trees but retaining some shade and seed source trees, leaving a relatively even age stand), are used to improve moose habitat, which is the main big game in that area. But on Prince of Wales, where deer are the key big game species, small shelter cuts are not helpful for improving big game habitat.

Regulatory actions under Title VIII of ANILCA are also used as a management tool on the Tongass National Forest, although wildlife is also managed by the state through state hunting regulations that apply to non-subsistence users. As an example of management under ANILCA Title VIII, the Federal Subsistence Board has taken numerous actions in Game Management Unit (GMU 2) to continue the subsistence uses of deer or for conservation purposes. These actions have ranged from closures to non-Federally qualified users at the beginning of the season, adding extra time at the end of the season to allow Federally qualified subsistence users an additional opportunity to harvest deer, and limiting the number of deer harvested by non-Federally qualified users. As another example, the Board enacted closures on other parts of the forest after severe winters to allow for deer populations to recover, most notably in the Central Tongass after the severe winters of 2007-2009.

Wolf predation is an issue brought up by some deer hunters as a major driver of reduced numbers of deer, especially on Prince of Wales Island. The Alexander Archipelago wolf is a generalist but predominantly preys on deer. This wolf subspecies is a species of concern, though it was found not to be warranted for Federal listing in 2023. Managing wolf populations is often one of the considerations for deer management and vice versa through the use of models for deer populations and a model developed by ADFG for wolf populations Wildlife management activities on Federal public lands other than the subsistence take and use of fish and wildlife, such as predator control and habitat management, are the responsibility of and remain within the authority of the individual land management agencies. The Federal Subsistence regulations have not been interpreted as extending to predator management.

Gathering

Plants are a vital part of a subsistence way of life, relating to food security, food sovereignty, relationship building, and culture. “Haa Atxaayu Haa Kusteeyix Sitee” means ‘Our Food is Our Way of Life’ in Tlingit and speaks to the strong ties between plants and the Tlingit people. As the Forest Plan revision continues, the Forest Service will need to continue to work closely with Southeast Alaska Tribes, as well as non-Native subsistence users, to ensure the new plan addresses the importance of plants integral to a subsistence way of life, such as those used for traditional foods, medicines, and rituals.

The Tongass National Forest is recognized for being a biologically rich area with diverse ecosystem types. Within the various habitats found on the forest, opportunities for gathering a variety of fruits, bark, roots, mushrooms, and plants exist. The Forest manages the commercial use of plants as special forest products via a permitting process. Most personal use of special forest products is not tracked. However, permits for research, educational, or demonstration purposes are typically entered into the permit system.

Special forest products are defined as products derived from biological resources that are used for personal, educational, commercial, and scientific use. Special forest product resources include but are not limited to mushrooms, boughs, Christmas trees, bark, roots, ferns, moss, burls, berries, cones, conks, herbs, and wildflowers; excluding saw-timber, pulpwood, cull logs, small round-wood, house logs, utility poles, minerals, animals, animal parts, rocks, water, and soil (USFS 2006). Special forest products that are used for personal needs (not sold commercially) may include artwork, crafts, dyes, floral arrangements, syrups, teas, flavorings, seed collection, edible and medicinal fungi, and edible and medicinal plants, scientific research, and educational examples. Special forest products and non-timber forest products (NTFPs), an internationally recognized acronym, can be used interchangeably; however, the term special forest products will be used in this document. Those plants gathered for commercial sales under a special forest product permit can be sold at a variety of markets, including but not limited to local, portable retail, local wholesale, tourism and recreational, commodity, and internet markets (USFS 2006). While permittees may generally not sell or exchange special forest products material harvested or gathered under free use, customary trade and barter, as defined in section ANILCA Sec. 803, is permitted for rural residents of Alaska (Forest Service Handbook 2409.18, Chapter 80, §§ 82.3, 87.51).

Special forest product permits typically have limitations on harvest areas, particularly those near recreational areas or roadways, to ensure that personal use of berries is not impacted by commercial uses. On the Sitka Ranger District, the Sitka Tribe of Alaska's (STA) Kayaaní Commission has been working to prepare a special forest products guidance document that the district ranger can use to inform decision-making on such permits. When complete, this guidance will provide information about appropriate manners of gathering various species, portions of the species used, and areas that it may make sense to exclude from commercial harvest. This guidance will not, however, supplant the Forest Service's obligations under existing law and policy, including Section 810 of ANILCA, nor will it require the Forest Service to take or not take any particular action.

Berries

Contribution of use to enjoyment, social and economic sustainability, and culture

Berries are an important source of traditional food for local Tribes, being one of the main sources of sugar for the Tlingit before contact with Euro-Americans (USFS 2006). Many subsistence users, both Native and non-Native, gather berries to eat or preserve, making jams, jellies, syrups, and other food items. Berries gathered within the boundary of the Forest may be used for commercial sales. Wild berry products may be a significant source of income to many people, and according to interviews conducted by the Pacific Northwest Research Station, the majority of gatherers are women (USFS 2006).

Habitat and Occurrence

Berry species that are gathered can be separated by habitat types – those found in forested areas, open meadows or beaches, and muskegs.

Forest Berries

Forest species include to blueberries (*Vaccinium ovalifolium, V. alaskaense*), red huckleberry (*Vaccinium parviflorum*), salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), thimbleberry (*Rubus parvifolius*), salal (*Gaultheria shallon*), and currant and gooseberry species (*Ribes*).

Wetland Berries

Species in this habitat type include strawberry (*Fragaria chiloensis*), nagoonberry (*Rubus arcticus*), bog blueberry (*Vaccinium uliginosum*), dwarf blueberry (*Vaccinium caespitosum*), crowberry (*Empetrum nigrum*), cloudberry (*Rubus chamaemorus*), lowbush cranberry (*Vaccinium oxycoccos),* and lingonberry (*Vaccinium vitis-idaea)*.

Conditions and trends of species and associated uses

Of the commonly requested species for special forest product permits, none are considered at-risk based on Global and State rankings (NatureServe 2024). All are either considered secure with a very low risk of extinction or collapse or have no ranking.

Since 2000, the Forest has administered eight commercial use special forest product permits for berries (NRM TIM 2024). Species that are commonly requested for commercial non-forest products include: blueberry, red huckleberry, bog cranberry, and salmonberry. To date, access has not been a barrier to gathering berries on the Forest; however, any future road closures could potentially make it difficult to access certain gathering locations.

Stressors

Forest Ecosystems

Changes in climate may impact berry species found in forested ecosystems, with warmer and drier conditions at lower elevations and latitudes impacting the overall growth of plants, and also alter the distribution of vegetative species. For more information on how climate change may impact vegetation growth in forested ecosystems, see the Terrestrial Ecosystems Assessment.

Wetlands

Increasing temperature and changing precipitation patterns are the main stressor to this ecosystem; specifically leading to changes in overall vegetation species composition (Halofsky et al., DRAFT). Climate change may also have varying impacts to different species in wetlands. For example, under predicted climate change scenarios, cloudberry may benefit from increased temperatures as it may delay leaf senescence, thus allowing for more photosynthetic resources to be stored in plant roots to be used in the following year; an increase in precipitation in the form of snow to coastal regions may make more areas suitable for growth; and an increase in winter wind may decrease snowpack protections resulting in reduced berry production (Alaska Berry Futures 2023).

Mushrooms

Contribution to enjoyment, social and economic sustainability, and culture

Mushrooms are popular wild edible foods, and some mushrooms may be used in dyeing fiber for art and creating artwork. Species gathered include chanterelles (*Cantharellus* species, *Cratellus* species), hedgehogs (*Hydnum* species), reishi and artist's conk (*Ganoderma* species), chicken of the woods (*Laetiporus conifericola*), boletes (*Boletus* species), polypores (*Fomitopsis* and *Phaeolus* species), and morels (*Morchella* species). Mushrooms may be commercially harvested under a non-timber forest products permit. The Forest does not track the personal use of mushrooms.

Habitat and Occurrence

Most mushrooms that are gathered for food, medicinal, cultural, or artistic uses grow in forested ecosystems. Species distribution varies across mature forests and recently disturbed forests, with some species only occurring in disturbed areas, where others prefer intact habitats.

Conditions, species trends, and uses

Of the commonly gathered species, none are considered at-risk.Since 2000, the Forest has administered ten commercial special forest product permits and three personal use special forest product permits with the majority of commercial permits being administered in the last ten years. Trends in administered permits show a gradual/slight increase in the number being requested (TIM 2024). In recent years, there has been a general increase in interest around the use of mushrooms as a food source, for medicinal uses in teas and tinctures, and for commercial consumption in restaurants and food production.

Any reduction in vegetation management may reduce the availability of mushroom types that prefer disturbed sites. Changes in climate may also affect the availability of mushrooms, as mushrooms yields are highly variable depending on precipitation amounts and timing of precipitation (USDA Climate Hub 2024).

Other Wild Plants

Contributions to enjoyment, economic sustainability, and culture

Several plant species found growing within the boundaries of the Tongass National Forest are culturally important as traditional foods and medicinal resources. As mentioned above, wild plants are also used commercially and may be requested for special forest products (SFP) permits.

For example, Devil's club *(Oplopanax horridus*), the only member of the ginseng family growing in Alaska, has been considered a "cure-all" and has numerous applications. Devil's club is also an important spiritual plant, used to treat spiritual disease and stress, as administered by a shaman. The early leaves of devil's club are also an early spring food source (Garibaldi 1999).

In addition to devil's club, there are a number of other plant species that may be used as medicine, food, or in cultural ceremonies. The Forest Service will need to continue to work with local Tribes, as well as Native and non-Native subsistence users, to manage important plant species for sustainability.

Habitat and Occurrence

Devil's club occurs in riparian habitats, most often in the forest understory.

Other plant species may occur across a variety of habitats, including beaches and meadows, forested habitats, wetlands, and subalpine and alpine environments.

Conditions, species trends, and uses

Devil's club is considered globally secure with a very low risk of extinction or collapse due to a very extensive range, abundant populations or occurrences, and little to no concern from declines or threats, and is not ranked by the state (NatureServe 2024). Changes in climate may impact species found in forested ecosystems, with warmer and drier conditions at lower elevations and latitudes leading to

changes in environmental factors that impact overall growth of plants. Increasing temperatures and altered precipitation patterns may also alter the distribution of species. For more information on impacts to vegetation growth in forested ecosystems, see the Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Drivers, Stressors, and Climate Change assessment sections.

Since 2000, the Tongass National Forest has administered 16 commercial permits for foliage, other plant parts, and non-conventional special forest products (NRM TIM 2024), with five of those permits being for Devil's club. All five commercial permits for devil's club were granted to the same user in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2023 on the Hoonah Ranger District, and the process to administer the permit involved local Tribal notification. In addition to the 16 commercial SFP, four personal use SFP permits have been administered since 2000. Commercial permits have increased in frequency since 2000, as well as amounts of plant material requested (NRM TIM 2024).

Seaweed

Seaweeds are macroalgae and are found in the nearshore subtidal and intertidal areas along varied coastlines. They are not considered true plants as they lack structures such as roots, stems, and leaves that provide nutrients and water in true plants. Seaweeds instead have holdfasts that attach the algae to substrates, like rocks; a stipe that produces food and extends the algae towards the surface; and fronds, bladelets, or sporophylls that primarily produce food and reproductive tissue; and may sometimes have bulbs or gas-filled sacs that keep the algae floating in the water column or on the surface. The Forest Service does not manage the marine environment (subtidal and intertidal areas) where seaweed is found because the State generally holds title to submerged lands from the mean high tide line to a line three miles seaward. Even so, management direction and activities conducted on National Forest System lands may affect the health and availability of resources present in coastal and marine environments.

Contribution to enjoyment, and economic sustainability

Seaweed is important to nearshore ecosystems as refuge for many invertebrates and fishes and contributes important organics to ecosystems. Seaweed is also an important traditional food due to its high nutritional value, containing large amounts of Vitamins A and C, calcium, and iron (Newton & Moss 2009). Alaska has over five hundred species of seaweed. Primary species harvested include black seaweed (*Porphyra* species), ribbon seaweed (*Palmaria),* bull kelp (*Nereocystis luetkeana*), and giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*), as well as a variety of keep species that are also gathered or farmed, including sugar kelp (*Saccarina latissima*), bull kelp, and ribbon kelp *(Alaria marginata).*

Seaweed has been a source of food and materials for centuries, and most recently seaweed farming has gained popularity. Seaweed farming has possibilities for commercialization, food security, and climate change mitigation (USDA 2024). In addition to being a food source, seaweeds absorb more greenhouse gases from the water than eelgrass, mangroves, and salt marsh plants and, thus, can help combat local impacts of ocean acidification. They also absorb nitrogen and phosphorus, which in large quantities lead to harmful algal blooms (NOAA 2024).

Habitat and Occurrence

Bull kelp: This annual species grows on rocks from the low intertidal to subtidal zone and prefers semi-exposed habitats or high current areas. Offshores bull kelp beds can persist for many years.

Giant kelp: This perennial species forms beds in the extreme low intertidal to subtidal areas of semi-exposed habitats.

Ribbon kelp: This annual species is found on rocks in the mid to low intertidal zone from semi-protected to exposed currents. This species needs sufficient current to grow.

Sugar kelp: This perennial species attaches to rocks in the low intertidal to subtidal zone and prefers protected to semi-protected habitats.

Black seaweeds: Black seaweeds are annual species found in the mid- to low intertidal zones in areas with high wave action.

Ribbon seaweeds: Ribbon seaweeds grow in the lower intertidal zones from sheltered bays to exposed rocks.

Conditions, trends, and uses

Seaweeds do not have conservation rankings like plant or animal species. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has developed a Seaweed Specialist Group that aims to work on conservation assessments for all 112 kelp species, but as of 2023 that work had not been initiated yet.

The ADF&G Division of Commercial Fisheries oversees both wild kelp harvesting and kelp farming. In 2020, ADF&G considered kelp farming to be in its infancy with four farms in operation. In the past six years, the amount of aquatic algae biomass harvested from aquatic farming has increased from 19,590 pounds in 2018 (first year of available data) to up to over 872,000 in 2022, and a reduction to near 160,000 pounds in 2023 (ADF&G 2025)

Drivers and Stressors

A 2023 comparison study found that areas with longer observations of otter occupation had greater increases in kelp extent. The study findings suggest that as otters continue to expand their range in Southeast Alaska, kelp ecosystems are also likely to expand, barring other climatic or trophic disturbances (Hollarsmith et al. 2023).

Although seaweeds are known to be vulnerable to physical and chemical changes in the marine environment, the impacts of increased temperature and changing precipitation patterns in seaweed-dominated ecosystems remains unclear (Harley et al. 2012). While the impacts remain uncertain, a 2023 study found that warming temperatures may lead to a change in species distribution for seaweed, with giant kelp expanding as it is a thermally tolerant species (Hollarsmith et al. 2023).

Ocean acidification, which is a direct result of increased carbon dioxide levels, also poses a threat to kelp forests in Alaska. Acidification may harm the reproductive stages of kelp, and affect the abundance and diversity of other species, such as crustaceans and mollusks, that form the foundation of the kelp forest ecosystem. Negative effects to crustaceans and mollusks can lead to reduced biodiversity and altered food webs, which, in turn, can put the health and stability of kelp forests at risk (NOAA 2020).

Conifers (Cultural Trees)

Nine conifer species grow on the Forest, with Alaska yellow cedar (*Callitropsis nootkatensis),* western red cedar (*Thuja plicata),* western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), mountain hemlock (*Tsuga mertensiana*), Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis*), and shorepine (*Picea contorta*) being the most common species. Other less common species include subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa*), Pacific silver fir (*Abies amabilis*), and Pacific yew (*Taxus brevifolius*). Most of the conifer species have customary and traditional uses, such as the production of tools, bentwood boxes, baskets, rope, hats, fishing line, housing, and canoes. Certain conifers are also used in traditional medicine. Moreover, Alaska yellow cedar and western red cedar, have special cultural importance to the Alaska Natives in Southeast Alaska.

Contribution of use to enjoyment, social, and economic sustainability

Cedar

Tribes identified cedar as one of the most important resources for traditional and customary use, as the basis of Tlingit and Haida societies' artisitic traditions. Public feedback on the assessment, as well as the 2020 Homelands Petition (Organized Village of Kasaan et al. 2020*)* emphasized the importance of cedar to Tribes. Alaska yellow cedar and western red cedar are revered for their multitude of uses, durability, and spiritual significance. The revised Forest Plan could Emphasize the importance of cedar for Tribal uses and include direction for long-term use and protection of cultural trees to help address concerns over declining availability.

Western red cedar's straight grain and resistance to rot is preferred for canoes, poles, and other structures as it can withstand the harsh maritime climate. Alaska yellow cedar has many similarities to western red cedar but differs in its durability and is typically smaller in size. Monument trees, or trees that are suitable to be used for totems or canoes, are rare on the landscape due to the desired characteristics, including having long, clear trunks and being free of rot, knots, branches, or other defects.

The commercial harvest of cedar also provides a source of employment and labor income across Southeast Alaska. (Timber Assessment). Commercial products made from red cedar include roofing, siding, and decking material, while Alaska yellow cedar may be used for boats, utility poles, flooring, framing, marine decking and more (Tongass FEIS 2016).

Sitka Spruce

Sitka spruce, while a major component of timber harvest, is also recognized for its use in traditional tool making, and medicinal properties. Sitka spruce wood is valued for its high strength to weight radio and is used in making commercial products such as dimensional lumber, piano sound boards, guitar faces, oars, planking, and specialty items for custom-made or traditional boats.

Pacific Yew

Pacific yew is not typically part of large-scale timber harvest but is principally used for the production of non-timber forest products. Pacific yew is recognized for its fine-grained wood and material strength and was traditionally used to make bows and other tools. The sapwood of yew is light yellow and thin, while the heartwood is a bright orange or rose red and can be used to make tool handles, and canoe paddles among other uses, but has little commercial importance. (Tirmenstein 1990). Pacific yew is also recognized for its medicinal properties. The bark of Pacific yew contains the chemical compound taxol, which has been found to inhibit the growth of various types of cancer cells and is used in chemotherapy for breast, ovarian, lung, and other cancers (Tirmenstein 1990).

Habitat and occurrence

Alaska Yellow Cedar

In southeast Alaska, yellow cedar is widely distributed throughout the region, typically growing at higher elevations in the southern half of the Forest and at lower elevations in the northern half (Halofsky et al., DRAFT). In mixed forests, yellow cedar can be found growing in soils with better drainage. Yellow cedar is abundant on wet, poorly drained sites near bogs and peatlands.

Western Red Cedar

Western red cedar grows from sea level to 3,000 feet ranging from the southern tip of Southeast Alaska to its northern range limit near Petersburg, Alaska. It commonly occurs as a dominant or co-dominant tree on low-elevation moist sites. Western red cedar grows in the full rain of soil drainage classes, although they typically occur in soils that are somewhat poorly to well drained. Poorer drainage allows red cedar to compete with other conifers (DeMeo 1992).

Sitka Spruce

Sitka spruce occurs from southeast Alaska north to the head of the Lynn Canal at Skagway, Glacier Bay, and Yakutat Bay, and west to the Kenai Peninsula. Sitka spruce grows from sea level to about 3,000 feet in the coastal mountains, primarily growing below 1,500 feet. Sitka spruce is typically found in areas with soil disturbance, such as in riparian zones where streams and rivers deposit nutrient rich soil in flood events, beach zones, or areas with moderate to well drained soil (DeMeo 1992).

Pacific Yew

Pacific yew grows in a variety of cool and moist shaded habitats in coastal lowlands and mountains. It is at its northern limit of its range in southeast Alaska; only occurring on the southern end of Prince of Wales and near Ketchikan on Revillagigedo Island and the Misty Fjords National Monument Wilderness. In southeast Alaska, yews are typically found within 500 feet of saltwater. Yews are often found growing in the understory of open mixed conifer and hemlock – red cedar forests, on poorly drained soils. It often occurs in canyon bottoms, on moist forested flats near streams, and scattered at various upland sites (Tirmenstein 1990).

In 1976, a 705-acre Research Natural Area was established to represent a small island ecosystem containing the norther limit of Pacific yew.

Conditions and trends of species and associated use

Alaska Yellow Cedar

Alaska yellow cedar is considered globally secure and in the state of Alaska (NatureServe 2024). Past old-growth harvest of Alaska yellow cedar has reduced the availability of monument trees, though old-growth harvest has decreased greatly in the past three decades, with a corresponding drop in cedar harvest (see Forest Management and Timber Assessment for more information about timber harvest). Trees that regenerate in young growth stands lack the size, grain, and other desired characteristics that make them suitable for totem poles and canoes. In addition to commercial harvest, Alaska yellow cedar may be requested for free use, personal use, firewood, and special forest products permits.

In addition to industrial logging practices, changing climate may affect the presence of the species on the Tongass National Forest. As temperatures warm, and snowpack decreases as winter precipitation shifts from snow rain, Alaska yellow cedars' thin, shallow root structure is more vulnerable to the freeze-thaw cycles; this leads to an increase in yellow cedar die-off, known as yellow-cedar decline. Spring freezing injury is triggered by the freezing of shallow roots due to the lack of insulating snow. Under current climate change projections, the elevational range of Alaska yellow cedar is predicted to expand into

higher elevations. Projected increases in growing season temperatures and annual precipitation may alter the performance of existing populations.

Western Red Cedar

Western redcedar is considered secure globally and apparently secure in Alaska (NatureServe, 2024). Similarly to Alaska yellow cedar, past industrial old-growth harvest has reduced the availability of monument trees on the landscape. While old growth harvest has decreased greatly in the past three decades, many of the most easily accessible large red cedar trees have already been cut, requiring more difficult access to remaining monument trees. In addition to commercial harvest, western redcedar may be requested for free use, personal use, firewood, and special forest products permits. The current Forest Plan does not address management of cedar as cultural trees, or ways in which collaboration with local communities can ensure sustainability of this key resource for cultural uses, although there is one designated area for protection of a red cedar stand for community use. Outside of the Forest Plan, collaboration has increasingly focused on identifying and protecting monument trees during commercial harvest and prioritizing long-term sustainability of cedar for cultural uses. While collaboration and cedar management can improve without changed Forest Plan direction, adding plan components that explicitly guide management of cedar for sustainability of cultural uses over time, incorporating Indigenous knowledge and community needs, could help emphasize the importance of customary and traditional uses. Considerations could include protection and stewardship of, as well as access to, cultural trees to meet needs of each community.

Like Alaska yellow cedar, projected increases in growing season temperatures and annual precipitation may alter the performance of existing populations of red cedar. Models predict a substantial expansion of suitable habitat for western redcedar in coastal Alaska areas.

Sitka Spruce

Sitka spruce is considered globally secure and has no conservation ranking in the state of Alaska (NatureServe 2024). Models predict a decrease in the diameter, growth, and recruitment, and an increase in mortality of Sitka spruce with increasing temperatures and changing precipitation patterns (Ma 2019).

Pacific Yew

Pacific yew is considered globally secure, and vulnerable in the state of Alaska (NatureServe 2024). Studies addressing impacts of climate change on Pacific yew in Alaska are not available. However, there may be impacts to Pacific yew in Alaska as winter precipitation shifts from snow to rain (Drivers, Stressors, and Climate Change Assessment) because yew is mildly tolerant of frost, but a layer of snow is needed to protect the tree's roots from freezing. Changing precipitation patterns and increasing temperatures may also alter the range of Pacific yew. For more information on how climate may impact vegetation growth in forested ecosystems, see the Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Drivers, Stressors, and Climate Change assessments.

Other Species and types of Uses

The wildlife, fish, and plant species mentioned above only include those that have the largest reported uses, and for which Tongass National Forest management is emphasized. There are many other species that are harvested or otherwise used by the public, including many types of marine mammals, fish, shellfish, birds, and plants. Bears are one species associated with Alaska and the Tongass National Forest, which were not discussed here. Bears are hunted, though they are not identified as a species that is harvested heavily. Bear viewing and other wildlife viewing is discussed in the Recreation and Tourism assessment, as a recreational activity.

Uncertainties and Data Gaps

Subsistence users have always, and will continue to, move around to gather wild resources based on environmental factors, patterns of animal movement, social and economic considerations, and other factors. These changes may necessitate adaptive management to ensure subsistence resources continue to be available to Federally qualified subsistence users, as well as for other non-commercial uses, because federally qualified subsistence users may also participate in these harvests to help meet their subsistence needs.

Multiple drivers and stressors affect subsistence ways of life and subsistence harvest or management approaches. Regions contain different resources. Individuals and communities have different cultural or social practices and different needs related to their subsistence way of life. Differences are nuanced and not always apparent to managers. Therefore, the Tongass National Forest Land Management Plan needs to include flexible direction to sustain subsistence resources and the subsistence way of life as mandated in Title VIII of ANILCA. Inclusion of desired condition, and measurable objectives could improve the ability to gauge progress towards desired conditions. Management of lands need to focus on sustainable habitat and resource abundance to meet the needs of Federally qualified subsistence users, increase or maintain productive harvest areas to reduce competition among user groups, and maintain or increase access for subsistence harvesters.

Subsistence Engagement and Partnerships

The Tongass National Forest Subsistence Program participates in several outreach programs to increase public awareness and participation in the Federal Subsistence Management Program. Current engagement ranges from informational tools (Online Subsistence Dashboard) to youth courses (Federal Subsistence Board Policy and Procedures Course) and public workshops (Community Subsistence Workshops). Engagement activities are made possible through partnerships with the Sitka Conservation Society, University of Alaska Southeast, and Alaska Youth Stewarts.

The Tongass National Forest Subsistence Program also supports community capacity building and fisheries monitoring efforts (Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program) through partnerships. Subsistence resources also benefit from work conducted by the Tongass Fish and Watersheds Programs through community forest partnerships (stream restoration, monitoring, etc.)

Federal Subsistence Board Policy and Procedures Course

For over six years, Sitka Conservation Society, University of Alaska Southeast (Sitka campus) and the USDA Forest Service have partnered to increase public involvement in fish and wildlife regulatory processes through dual enrollment in a Federal Subsistence Board Policy and Procedures course offering. The course provides classroom instruction on fish and wildlife management processes and regulations and culminates with participants attending a Subsistence Regional Advisory Council or Federal Subsistence Board meeting to participate in the rulemaking process. Students participate in the meeting through the public testimony process and interact with Council and Board members to gain a better understanding of the process.

Community subsistence workshops

USDA Forest Service and Sitka Conservation Society have partnered to provide community subsistence workshops in rural communities on the Tongass. The workshop is a pared down version (4 hours) of the

youth Federal Subsistence Board Policy and Procedures course. Community members are presented with an overview of the Federal Subsistence Program, regulatory process, Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and Federal Subsistence Board structure, and proposal writing process. The goal of the workshops is to increase public awareness and participation in the Federal Subsistence Management Program, provide the community an opportunity to speak with staff, and allow staff to hear comments and concerns from rural communities across the forest.

Youth Harvest Events

The Alaska Youth Stewards and Subsistence Program staff from the Tongass National Forest partner to help Angoon youth gain experiential education, support cultural vibrancy, and provide for the subsistence needs of community elders.

Local harvesters along with Tongass National Forest and Alaska Youth Stewards staff take youth to harvest sockeye salmon as proxies for local elders. Each youth is walked through the State regulatory process to proxy harvest for subsistence prior to departure. Once on site, everyone works together to harvest sockeye salmon using a beach seine. Local tribal community members teach the youth how to process the fish and the youth distribute their harvest to local elders.

Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program

The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program was established to help provide information needed for management of subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands in Alaska. The program funds projects that address research priorities identified by management agencies and the public through the Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils.

Funding has been awarded to Alaska Native organizations, rural organizations, universities, Federal and State agencies, and private contractors. Past projects have included studies of the status of fish stocks, subsistence harvest and use patterns, and collection and analysis of traditional knowledge. The program prioritizes partnerships with Alaska Native and rural organizations to manage subsistence fisheries. During the 2022 to 2025 funding cycle, the USDA Forest Service partnered with five tribal organizations and ADF&G to provide annual project and staff funding for four years. After the completion of the four-year agreement partners may apply for four more years of funding. Continuing local monitoring may help meet some of the shared stewardship goals expressed by Tribes and other communities.

Subsistence Dashboard

The online subsistence dashboard was developed to increase public access to subsistence harvest data, regulatory maps, and special actions (USDA 2025). Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program annual escapement and harvest data is provided for current and past monitoring projects and daily for two staffed sockeye salmon weirs. Data provided for fisheries monitoring allows the public to evaluate the condition of individual fisheries and determine the strength of current sockeye salmon runs. Wildlife regulatory maps allow the public to view current closure and restriction areas and unit boundaries. Locations with harvest quotas are also available on the map along with the remaining harvest quota. This allows the public to view areas that have met or are close to meeting the harvest quota. Free georeferenced regulatory maps are also available for offline use on mobile devises.

Community Forest Partnerships

The Tongass National Forest subsistence program does not currently utilize community forest partnerships for subsistence monitoring. However, the Tongass Fisheries and Watersheds programs

engage with community forest partners to complete stream restoration and anadromous stream mapping and monitoring which benefits subsistence users on the Forest. The majority of Tongass National Forest subsistence funds support partnerships through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program to meet the Subsistence Regional Advisory Council's Priority Information Needs. Projects are competitively selected through an interagency Technical Review Committee and approved by the Federal Subsistence Board. Community forest partnerships may be a resource for completing subsistence fish and wildlife monitoring in the future.

Executive Summary—Key Takeaways

- Subsistence harvest of animals and plants for customary and traditional purposes is of critical importance to rural Alaska residents in Southeast Alaska.
- Some of the most common subsistence harvested wild resources are salmon, other fish species, deer, and berries. However, hundreds of species are hunted, fished or gathered, and cedar trees and certain medicinal plants have special cultural importance for Alaska Natives.
- There is not one subsistence way of life. In ANILCA Title VIII, Congress recognized the importance of the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses by rural residents of Alaska, including both Natives and non-Natives. Subsistence cultural practices and traditions vary by family, community, and tribal affiliation. Subsistence harvest of wild resources is important to many and provides critical food and calories, reduces the need for store bought food and associated costs, connects people to the land and nature, and provides resources used for clothing, homes, transportation, medicine, and art.
- The continuation of the opportunity for a subsistence way of life is important to the physical, economic, traditional, cultural, and social existence of rural Alaska residents (ANILCA Sec. 801).
- Rural residents who use wild resources are a valuable source of information about local customs and changing conditions. The Federal Subsistence Program has a long history of relying on traditional ecological knowledge, and such knowledge is viewed as an important component for making resource management decisions.
- Rural communities have traditional use areas for different resources. Changes to human population, tourism industry, outdoor recreation, changing technology, timber harvest, and environmental factors may affect their use.
- Under ANILCA Sec. 804, subsistence uses by rural Alaska residents have priority over other consumptive uses. This subsistence priority is managed through the Federal Subsistence Board rather than the forest planning process.
- The management of the Tongass National Forest can affect subsistence uses in a variety of ways, including:
    - Maintaining or improving ecosystem and subsistence habitats for fish, wildlife, and plants.
    - Providing access to subsistence use areas and traditional and cultural activities through permitting and maintenance of roads, water access facilities, cabins and camps.
    - Permitting or restricting other activities that may affect subsistence resources, such as infrastructure development, recreational activities, outfitters and guides, and tourism.

- Working with the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and Federal Subsistence Board to implement the federal subsistence priority and making appropriate in-season management decisions in times of resource scarcity or abundance.

- The Forest Plan will not supersede or direct Federal Subsistence Board actions. The Regional Forester has a seat on the Federal Subsistence Board, understands concerns by users, and how actions may affect users, which is important for framing future management by the Tongass National Forest.
- Ecosystem protection is critical for sustaining subsistence and other harvest. However, ecosystem protection alone is not sufficient to ensure sustainability of some subsistence resources since sustainability also depends on social, economic, and access issues.
- Potential impediments to subsistence and other harvest include lack of access, or difficult access to subsistence resources; changes in resource availability due to changing climactic regimes; vegetation management that disrupts habitat or hunting; competition with recreational or commercial uses; effects from the tourism industry, including pollution; and disruption of hunting and gathering activities from increased use of the forest.
- ANILCA 810 and the existing plan requires consideration of subsistence uses in project planning. Currently, the forest plan primarily repeats ANILCA clauses and does not provide direction specific to management of the Tongass National Forest or how it can best implement ANILCA's provisions.
- The existing Tongass Forest Plan does not provide clear direction regarding subsistence uses by local communities or specific areas important for harvest. It does not provide Tongass specific management direction, desired conditions, standards or guidelines, or guide partnerships or collaboration with subsistence users.
- Wild fish, wildlife, and plant resources are managed by multiple agencies with sometimes overlapping jurisdiction.
- Complicated regulations and overlapping jurisdictions can make navigating the regulatory process for subsistence harvest of resources difficult and confusing for the public to understand.

References

Alaback, P. B. 1982. Dynamics of understory biomass in Sitka spruce-western hemlock forests of southeast Alaska. Ecology 63:1932-1948

Alaback, P.B. 1984. Plant Succession Following Logging in the Sitka Spruce-Western Hemlock Forests of Southeast Alaska: Implications for Management. U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-173.

Alaska Berry Futures.2023. Berries in Alaska's Changing Environment Series. Website accessed on 4/1/2025 at https://sites.google.com/alaska.edu/alaska-berry-futures/berry-booklets

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). 2025. Aquatic Farming: Aquatic Plants Production Data. Website accessed on May 29, 2025 at: https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=fishingaquaticfarming.aquaticfarminfo_aquaticplants

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). 2024. Subsistence, community subsistence information system. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division. http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/sb/CSIS

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). 2024. 2023 Southeast Alaska salmon escapement summary. https://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/fishing/PDFs/commercial/southeast/meetings/2023_southeast_salmon_escapement_handout.pdf. Accessed December 18, 2024.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). 2019. Food production and nutritional values of noncommercial fish and wildlife harvests in Alaska. Division of Subsistence. Alaska Department of Labor. 2022. Population estimates. https://live.lab

Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. 2025. Economic Regions and Boroughs/Census Areas: Population 2020 to 2024. Accessed on August 5, 2025 at: https://live.laborstats.alaska.gov/data-pages/alaska-population-estimates.

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act Public Law 96-487 H.R.3979, 113th Congress Official Publications from the U.S. Government Publishing Office.

Alcantar, M. W. 2024. Characterizing Ocean Change Impacts on Three Marine Species Vital to Recreational, Subsistence, and Commercial Fisheries in Alaska. Doctoral dissertation. University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks.

Armstrong, R.H, and M. Hermans. 2004. Southeast Alaska's natural world. 224 pp.

Armstrong, B., M. Osborn, M. Smith, and N. Walker. 2016. Anadromous fish habitat. In the Ecological Atlas of Southeast Alaska. Audubon Alaska.

Bednarski, J., D. K. Harris, and S. C. Heinl. 2014. Northern Chatham Strait sockeye salmon: 2014 updated stock status, fishery management, and subsistence fisheries. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Regional Information Report 1J14-10, Douglas, Alaska.

Bellmore, J.R., R.A. Bellmore, J.B. Fellman, K.A. Fitzgerald. In press. Chapter 4: Climate change effects on freshwater ecosystems and salmon. In Halofsky, Jessica E.; Prendeville, Holly R.; Peterson, David L.; Parrish, Robert. eds. In Press. Climate change vulnerability and adaptation in the

Tongass National Forest. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXX. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Bennetsen, B. 2020. Tongass National Forest young-growth management guidelines for stands with a wildlife management objective. Exhibit 3 of the Tongass Young-Growth Management Strategy, USDA Forest Service, Tongass National Forest, Juneau, Alaska. 86 pages.

Brinkman, Todd. 2009. Resilience of a deer hunting system in Southeast Alaska: integrating social, ecological, and genetic dimensions. A dissertation presented to the faculty of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Brinkman, T.J., T. Chapin. G. Kofinas, and D. K. Person. 2009. Linking hunter knowledge with forest change to understand changing deer harvest opportunities in intensively logged landscapes. Ecology and Society 14(1): 36.

Cartwright, M.A. and J.M. Conitz. 2006. Klawock Lake sockeye salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) stock assessment project 2003 annual report and 2001-2003 final report, Fishery Data Series No. 06–64. Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Central Council of the Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska. 2021. Climate Change Action Plan: Socioeconomic impacts of climate change in Southeast Alaska; Salmon, cedar, shellfish.

Cerveny, L.K. 2005. Tourism and its effects on southeast Alaska communities and resources: case studies from Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, Alaska. Res. Pap. PNW-RP-566. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 147 p.

Chamberlain, J, R.D. Honor, K. Malcolm, S.P. Mahoney, J.R. Bellmore, M.C. Reeves, H. Wilmer, M.K. Gutgesell, L.A. Sill. 2025. Provisioning food and medicine from public forests in the United States. *Trees, Forests and People 19.*

Clark, J.H., A. McGregor, R.D. Meccum, P. Krasnowski and A.M. Carroll. 2006. The commercial salmon fishery in Alaska. Alaska Fishery Research Bulletin 12(1):1-146.

Clark, J.H and R. Thiessen-Bock. 2019. Estimate of total Alaskan salmon abundance by region, 2000-2015. Knowledge Network for Biocomplexity. Online dataset accessed on the website on December 19, 2024. https://knb.ecoinformatics.org/view/doi:10.5063/F1BR8QG4

Cobb, M.A. 2014. Using mark-recapture distance sampling to estimate sitka black-tailed deer densities in non-forested habitats of Kodiak Island, Alaska. Refuge Report No. 2014.5. Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kodiak, AK.

Colt, S., Dugan, D., and Fay, G. 2007. The regional economy of southeast Alaska: Final report. Alaska Conservation Foundation.

Computer Matrix, LLC. 2019. Transcripts of Roadless Rule ANILCA Subsistence Public Hearings. Transcribed for Tongass National Forest.

Conitz, J.M. 2008. Klawock Lake subsistence sockeye salmon project, 2006 annual report and 2004–2006 summary, Fishery Data Series No. 08–48. Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Conrad, S., and T. Thynes. 2024. Overview of the 2023 Southeast Alaska and Yakutat commercial, personal use, and subsistence salmon fisheries. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Management Report No. 24-19, Anchorage.

Crotteau, J. S., A. Z. Rue-Johns, J. C. Barnard. 2020. Effects on understory biomass and forage 8–10 years after precommercial thinning of Sitka spruce – western hemlock stands in southeast Alaska. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 32(4): 215-225.

Der Hovanisian, J., S. McPherson, E. Jones, P. Richards, R Chapell, B. Elliot, T. Johnson, and S. Fleischman, 2011. Chinook salmon status and escapement goals for stocks in Southeast Alaska. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Special Publication No. 11-19, Anchorage.

DeMeo, Thomas. 1992. Forest plant association management guide: Ketchikan Area, Tongass National Forest. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2018. Subsistence in Alaska: A Yar 2017 Update.

Dolitsky, A.B., 1992. Harvest, distribution and exchange of subsistence resources in Southeast Alaska (No. 4). Alaska-Siberia Research Center.

Dugan, D., Fay, G. and Colt, S., 2007. Nature-based tourism in southeast Alaska: Results from 2005 and 2006 Field Study. Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage.

EcoAdapt. 2014. A Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment for Aquatic Resources in the Tongass National Forest. EcoAdapt, Bainbridge Island, WA.

Fall, J.A. and M.L. Kostick. 2018. Food Security and Wild Resource Harvests in Alaska. Alaska Department of Fish and Game Division of Subsistence. July 2018.

Fall, J. A. 2016. Regional patterns of fish and wildlife harvests in contemporary Alaska. Arctic. Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 47-64.

Farmer, C.J and M.D. Kirchhoff. 2007. Ecological classification of deer habitat in the Tongass National Forest, Alaska. *Northwestern Naturalist.* Vol. 88. Issue 2.

Flitcroft, R., J. Munyon, S. Claeson, A. Johnson, M. Moore, E. Tucker, K. Prussian, S. Jacobsen and H. Lombard. 2022. Forest legacies and climate realities: spatial and temporal variation in fish populations and habitat characteristics on the Tongass National Forest, Alaska. Pacific Northwest Research Station General Technical Report PNW-GTR-1009. December 2022.

Fowler, P.A. and R.S. Chapell. 2021. Overview of the sport fisheries for King Salmon in Southeast Alaska through 2020. A report to the Alaska Board of Fisheries. Alaska Department of Fish and Game Division of Sport Fish and Commercial Fisheries, Special Publication No. 21-10. November 2021.

Garibaldi, A. 1999. Medicinal Flora of the Alaska Natives. Alaska Natural Heritage Program, Environment and Natural Resources Institute. University of Alaska, Anchorage.

Garibaldi A and N.J. Turner.2004. Cultural keystone species: Implications for ecological conservation and restoration. Ecology and Society, Vol 9.

Garza, D.A. 2005. Common edible seaweeds in the Gulf of Alaska. Fairbanks, Alaska: Alaska Sea Grant College Program, University of Alaska Fairbanks. NOAA National Sea Grant NA16RG2321.

Goldenstein, M.I., A.J. Poe, E. Cooper, D. Youkey, B.A. Brown and T.L. McDonald. 2005. Mountain goat response to helicopter overflights in Alaska. Wildlife Society Bulletin 2005, 33(2): 688-699.

Goldsmith, S., Haley, S., Berman, M., Kim, H.J. and Hill, A., 1999. Economics of Sport Fishing In Alaska. Grant, G.E., S.L. Lewis, F.J. Swanson, J.H. Cissel, and J.J. McDonnell. 2008. Effect of Forest Practices on Peak Flows and Consequent Channel Response: A State-of-Science Report for References and Lists - 4 Prince of Wales Landscape Level Analysis Project Final EIS References and Lists – Chapter 4 ▪ 385 Western Oregon and Washington. General Technical Report. PNW-GTR-760. Portland, Oregon: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 76p

Guthrie III, C.M., and R.L. Wilmot. 2004. Genetic structure of wild chinook salmon populations of Southeast Alaska and Northern British Columbia. *Environmental Biology of Fishes. 69(1): 81-93.*

Halofsky, E., H. Prendeville, D. Peterson, and R. Parrish, Robert. eds. DRAFT. Climate change vulnerability and adaptation in the Tongass National Forest. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXX. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Halupka, K.C. , M.D. Bryant, M.F. Wilson, and F.H. Everest. 2000. Biological characteristics and population status of anadromous salmon in Southeast Alaska. United States Forest Service. General Technical Report. PNW-GTR-468. 255 pp.

Harley, C.D.G., K.M. Anderson, K.W. Demes, J.P. Jorve, R.L. Kordas, T.A. Coyle, and M.H. Graham. 2012. Effects of climate change on global seaweed communities. Journal of Phycology. 48: 1064-1078.

Hasbrouck, T.R. 2023. Deer management report and plan, Game Management Unit 2: Report period 1 July 2016–30 June 2021, and plan period 1 July 2021–30 June 2026. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Species Management Report and Plan ADF&G/DWC/SMR&P-2023-16, Juneau, AK.

Hollarsmith, J. A., J. Cornett., E. Evenson, and A. Tugaw. 2023. A century of canopy kelp persistence and recovery in the Gulf of Alaska. Annals of Botany 133, pp. 105-111.

Holmes, R.A., Brookover, T.E., Schwan, M.W., Hoffman, S.H., Chadwick, R.E., Fleming, D.F., Ericksen, R.P., Johnson, R.E., McCurdy, S., Glynn, B.J. and Jaenicke, M.J., 2003. Area management report for the sport fisheries of Southeast Alaska, 2002. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage.

Johnson, A.C. and L. Cerveny. 2022. Old Growth Wood for Cultural Uses: Sustaining native lifeways in Southeast Alaska. Science Findings, Pacific Northwest Research Stations, Issue 252, October 2022.

Johnson, A.C., J.R. Bellmore, S. Haught and R. Medel. 2019. Quantifying the monetary value of Alaska National Forests to commercial Pacific salmon fisheries. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 39: 1119-1131.

Johnson, A.C., J. Noel, D.P. Gregovich, L.E. Kruger and B. Buma. 2019. Impacts of submerging and emerging shorelines on various biota and indigenous Alaskan harvesting patterns. Journal of Coastal Research, 35(4), 765–775.

Johnson, A. and L. Kruger. 2019. Sea Levels Rise and Glaciers Retreat: Changing Subsistent Lifestyles in Southeast Alaska. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. Science Findings, Issue 221, November 2019.

Johnson, A., A. E. Clavijo, G. Hamar, D.-A. Head, A. Thoms, W. Price, A. Lapke, J. Crotteau, L. K. Cerveny, H. Wilmer, 2021. Wood products for cultural uses: sustaining Native resilience and vital lifeways in Southeast Alaska, USA. Forests 12(1).

Kahklen, K. and W. Hartsog. 1999. Results of Road Erosion Studies on the Tongass National Forest. Unpublished report. 47 pp. On file with: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, 2770 Sherwood Lane, Suite 200, Juneau, AK 99801.

Kanouse, K.M and E. Fritz. 2020. Freshwater resource investigations near Greens Creek Mine. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Section. Technical Report No. 19-01.

Kaufmann, M. R.; Graham, R. T.; Boyce, D. A., Jr.; Moir, W. H.; Perry, L.; Reynolds, R. T.; Bassett, R. L.; Mehlhop, P.; Edminster, C. B.; Block, W. M.; Corn, P. S. 1994. An ecological basis for ecosystem management. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM 246. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 22 p.

Kerns, B.K., D. Pilz, H. Ballard, and S.J. Alexander. 2003. Compatible Management of Understory Forest Resources and Timber. Pages 337-381 in Monserud, R.A., R.W. Haynes, and A.C. Johson, editors, Compatible Forest Management. Managing Forest Ecosystems, vol 8. Springer, Dordrecht.

Kimmerer, R. W. 2000. Native knowledge for native ecosystems. Journal of Forestry 98:4–9.

Kissner, P.D. 1975. A study of Chinook salmon in southeast Alaska. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Sport Fish. 27 p.

Kovach, R.P., S.C. Ellison, S. Pyare and D.A. Tallmon, 2015: Temporal patterns in adult salmon migration timing across southeast Alaska. Glob. Change Biol., 21(5), 1821–1833.

Kriener, Ryan. 2010. 2010 Wheeler Creek Chinook Salmon Study, Tongass National Forest. United States Forest Service Internal Report. 12 p.

Langdon, S.J. 2021. The significance of sharing resources in sustaining indigenous Alaskan communities and cultures. Sealaska Heritage Institute Box of Knowledge Series. Juneau, AK. 81 pages.

Langdon, S.J. 2011. Economic and Cultural Value of Subsistence Activity: Concepts, Methods, and Issues. Lefebvre, K.A., E. Fachon, E.K. Bowers, K.G. Kimmel, J.A Snyder, R. Stimmelmayr, J.M. Grebmeier, S. Kibler, D.R. Hardinson, D.M. Anderson, D. Julis, J. Murphy, J.C. Gann, D. Cooper, L.B. Eisner, J.T. Duffy-anderson, G. Sheffield, R.S. Pikcart, A. Mounsey, M.L. Willis, P. Stabeno, E. Siddon, 2022. Paralytic shellfish toxins in Alaskan Arctic food webs during the anomalously warm ocean conditions of 2019 and estimated toxin doses to Pacific walruses and bowhead whales. Harmful Algae, 114, 102205.

Langdon, S.J. and R. Worl. 1981. Distribution and exchange of subsistence resources in Alaska. ADF&G Div. of Subsistence, Tech. Paper No. 55. Juneau, AK. 126 pages.

Lefebvre, K.A., E. Fachon, E.K. Bowers, D.G. Kimmel, J.A. Snyder, R. Stimmelmayr, J.M. Grebmeier, S. Kibler, D. Ranson Hardison, D.M. Anderson, K. Kulis, J. Murphy, J.C. Gann, D. Cooper, L.B. Eisner, J. T. Duffy-Anderson, G. Sheffield, R.S. Pickart, A. Mounsey, M.L. Willis. E. Siddon. 2022. Paralytic shellfish toxins in the Alaskan Arctic food webs during the anomalously warm ocean conditions of 2109 and estimated toxin doses to Pacific walruses and bowhead whales. *Harmful Algae*. Volume 114. May 2022.

Lew, D.K. and Larson, D.M., 2012. Economic values for saltwater sport fishing in Alaska: a stated preference analysis. North American journal of fisheries management, 32(4), 745-759.

Lindgren, J.W and E.M. King. 2024. Aquatic biomonitoring at Greens Creek Mine. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Section, Technical Report No. 24-07.

Litaker R.W, Matweyou J., Kibler S, Tester, P. 2020. Implementation of Community Based PSP Testing for Subsistence and Recreational Shellfish Harvesting in Southwestern Alaska. NPRB Project 1616 Final report. 20 pp.

Littell, J.S. and A.C. Johnson. DRAFT. Chapter 2. Historical and Future Climate in Southeast Alaska. In: Halofsky, Jessica E.; Prendeville, Holly R.; Peterson, David L.; Parrish, Robert, eds. Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation in the Tongass National Forest. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-XXX. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Ma, W., X. Zhou, J. Liang, & M. Zhou. 2019. Coastal Alaska forests under climate change: what to expect?. Forest Ecology and Management, 448, 432-444.

Mazza, R. and L.E. Kruger, editors. 2005. Social Conditions and Trends in Southeast Alaska. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-653. USDA Forest Service. September 2005.

McCoy, K. 2017. Sitka black-tailed deer pellet-group surveys in Southeast Alaska, 2016 report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Wildlife Management Report ADF&G/DWC/WMR-2017-2, Juneau, AK.

McIntyre, L., Miller, A., & Kosatsky, T. 2021. Changing trends in paralytic shellfish poisonings reflect increasing sea surface temperatures and practices of indigenous and recreational harvesters in British Columbia, Canada. Marine drugs, 19(10), 568.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. 2005. Ecosystems and human wellbeing: synthesis. Washington, DC: Island Press. 137p.

Montgomery, David R. 1994. Road surface drainage, channel initiation, and slope instability. Water Resources Research 30(6): 1925–1932.

Moore J. M.J., Flitcroft R.L., Tucker E., Prussian K.M., Claeson S.M.2024. Same streams in a different forest? Investigations of forest harvest legacies and future trajectories across 30 years of stream habitat monitoring on the Tongass National Forest, Alaska. PLoS ONE 19(7): e0301723. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0301723

Munro, A. R. 2023. Summary of Pacific salmon escapement goals in Alaska with a review of escapements from 2014 to 2022. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Manuscript No. 23-01, Anchorage.

Murphy ML, Koski KV. 1989. Input and depletion of woody debris in Alaska streams and implications for streamside management. N Am J Fish Manage. 1989 Sep 1;9(4):427–436.

Nature Conservancy. 2007. The coastal forests and mountains ecoregion of southeastern Alaska and the Tongass National Forest. A conservation assessment and resource synthesis. Editors John W. Schoen and Erin Dovichin. Chapter 9. Subsistence. Accessed on website:

http://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/alaska/seak/era/cfm/Pages/CA-AKCFM.aspx on April 19, 2024.

NatureServe. 2024. NatureServe Explorer. Website accessed on 04/02/2025 at https://explorer.natureserve.org/

Newton, R.G. and M.L. Moss. 2009. Haa Atxaayí Haa Kusteeyíx Sitee, Our Food is our Tlingit Way of Life; Excerpts from oral interviews. USDA Forest Service Alaska Region R10-MR-50, May 2009. Revision.

NOAA Fisheries. 2024. Seaweed Aquaculture. Website accessed on 12/02/2024 at https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/aquaculture/seaweed-aquaculture.

Organized Village of Kasaan, Organized Village of Kake, Klawock Cooperative Association, Hoonah Indian Association, Ketchikan Indian Community, Skagway Traditional Council, Organized Village of Saxman, Yakutat Tlingit Tribe, Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska, Craig Tribal Association, Wrangell Cooperative Association, Angoon Community Association. 2020. Petition for USDA Rulemaking to Create a Traditional Homelands Conservation Rule for the Long-Term Management and Protection of Traditional and Customary Areas in the Tongass National Forest.

Pahlke, K.A. 2010. Escapements of Chinook Salmon in Southeast Alaska and Transboundary Rivers in 2008, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Sport Fish, Fishery Data Series No. 10-71. 91 pp.

Person, D.K. 2010. Wolves in Southeast Alaska, Presentation to the Alaska Board of Game, November 5, 2020 [video]. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation. https://vimeo.com/92984376 (Accessed April 2025).

Person, D. 2009. Habitat use and survivorship of Sitka black-tailed deer in Southeast Alaska: a regional meta-analysis and synthesis. Federal aid annual research performance report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation.

Person, D.K and A.L. Russell. 2008. Correlates of mortality in an exploited wolf population. Journal of Wildlife Management 72(7):1540-1549.

Piston, A. W., and S. C. Heinl. 2021. Operational Plan: Southeast Alaska pink salmon escapement index surveys, 2021–2023. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Regional Operational Plan ROP.CF.1J.2021.03, Douglas.

Porter, B. 2001. Game management unit 2. In: Hicks, M., ed. Deer. Study 2.0. Douglas, AK: Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation: 35–52.Reid

Risdahl, Gregory. 2021. USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region, 2021, Subsistence Program.

Schoen, E.R., K.G. Howard, J.M. Murphy, D.E. Schindler, P.A.H. Westley, and V.R. von Biela. 2023. Divergent responses of western Alaska salmon to a changing climate. NOAA Technical Report ORA Arctic Report Card 2023.

Schoen, J.W., and M. Kirchhoff. 2007. Sitka black-tailed deer (Odocoileus hermonius sitkensis). In The coastal forests and mountains ecoregion of Southeastern Alaska and the Tongass National Forest:

A conservation assessment and resource synthesis, ed. J.W. Schoen and E. Dovichin. Anchorage, AL: Audubon Alaska and The Nature Conservancy.

Sill, L.A. and D. Koster. 2017. The harvest and use of wild resources in Sitka, Alaska, 2013. Alaska Department of Fish and Wildlife, Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 423. March 2017.

Sill, L.A and T. Lemons. 2021. The subsistence harvest of pacific herring spawn in Sitka Sound, Alaska, 2019. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Technical Paper No. 274. January 2021.

Sisk, J. 2016. The Southeast Alaska salmon industry: historical overview and current status. In The Ecological Atlas of Southeast Alaska. Audubon Alaska.

Southeast Alaska Regional Advisory Council. 2020. Meeting Materials, March 24-26, 2020.

Spurkland, T. and K. Iken. 2011. Kelp Bed Dynamics in Estuarine Environments in Subarctic Alaska. Journal of Coastal Research 27(6A): 133-143.

Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska-Subpart B, Federal Subsistence Board Membership, 36 C.F.R. § 242 (2024). 50 C.F.R. § 100 (2024).

TCW Economics. 2010. Economic Contributions and Impacts of Salmonid Resources in Southeast Alaska. Trout Unlimited Alaska Program. ag.com/AK/2010AK_Economic_Contributions_and_Impacts_of_Salmonid_Resources_in_South east_Alaska.pdf.

Thornton, T.F. 2008. Being and place among the Tlingit. University of Washington Press, Seattle, in association with Sealaska Heritage Institute, Juneau, AK. 247 pages.

Tirmenstein, D. 1990. Gaultheria shallon. In: Fire effects information system (FEIS). Ft. Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Retrieved June 3, 2025, from, https://www.fs.usda.gov/database/feis/plants/shrub/gausha/all.html

Tongass National Forest. 2020. Tongass National Forest Young-Growth Management Strategy. Exhibit 3: Tongass National Forest young-growth management guidelines for stands with a wildlife management objective.

Tongass Timber Reform Act. H.R. 987 (1988-1990) https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/house-bill/987.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Climate Hub website. 2024. Climate change and wild foods in Alaska. Website. https://www.climatehubs.usda.gov/hubs/northwest/topic/climate-change-and-wild-foods-alaska. Accessed on 12/02/2024.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service. 2025. Tongass National Forest Subsistence Dashboard. Tongass National Forest, Subsistence Program. https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/89110993bb8c4c47bb7e2306d05f26e2/

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service. 2024. Summaries of public feedback received during SASS, Cabin Strategy, and 2024 plan revision community workshops. Unpublished reports.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2016. Final Environmental Impact Statement: Tongass Land and Resource Management Plan (No. R10-MB-769e,f).

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Alaska Region. 2010. Subsistence Hunting and Fishing. Program/Partnership Paper. July 2010.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2006. Nontimber forest product opportunities in Alaska. PNW-GTR-671. Pilz, D., S.J. Alexander, J. Smith, R. Schroeder, and J. Freed. May 2006.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1991. Forest Service Manual 2000 – National Forest Resource Management. Forest Service Website. Retrieved April 1, 2025, from https://www.fs.usda.gov/about-agency/regulations-policies/manual/2090-handbooks

United States Department of Agriculture and United States Department of the Interior. 2021. Order No. 3403, Joint Secretarial Order on Fulfilling the Trust Responsibility to Indian Tribes in the Stewardship of Federal Lands and Waters. Accessed on April 1, 2025 at https://www.doi.gov/document-library/secretary-order/so-3403-joint-secretarial-order-fulfilling-trust-responsibility

United States Department of Agriculture and United States Department of the Interior. 2022. Federal Subsistence Policy Consultation Summary Report. Accessed on April 1, 2025 at https://www.bia.gov/sites/default/files/dup/tcinfo/final-subsistence-consultation-summary-report_6.10.22_508.pdf

United States Department of Agriculture and United States Department of the Interior. 2022. Federal subsistence policy consultation summary report. Accessed on April 1, 2025 at https://www.bia.gov/sites/default/files/dup/tcinfo/final-subsistence-consultation-summary-report_6.10.22_508.pdf

United States Department of the Interior. 2024. Transfer of the Office of Subsistence Management to the Office of the Secretary Accessed on April 1, 2025 at https://www.doi.gov/document-library/secretary-order/so-3413-transfer-office-subsistence-management-office-secretary

Wilmer, H., A.R. Kaminski, K. Wendel, N. Grewe, T. Hruska, L.K. Cerveny, J. R. Bellmore, C.L. Meek & K. Nelson, 2024. Southeast Alaskans Want Food Sovereignty and Reimagined Rural Futures. Society and Natural Resources.

Wilson, L. 2023. Alaska salmon fisheries enhancement annual report 2022. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Regional Information Report No. 5J23-04, Juneau.

Willson, M. F., & K. C. Halupka. 1995. Anadromous fish as keystone species in vertebrate communities. Conservation Biology, 9(3), 489-497.

Wolfe, R.J. 2004. Local traditions and subsistence: a synopsis from twenty-five years of research by the State of Alaska. Technical Paper 284. Alaska Department of Fish and Game Division of Subsistence, Juneau, AK.

Wyllie de Echeverria, V.R. and T.F. Thornton. 2019. Using traditional ecological knowledge to understand and adapt to climate and biodiversity change on the Pacific coast of North America. Ambio 48(12): 1447-1469

Young, A.J.N, S. G. Hinch, S. J. Cooke, J. Popp. 2022, Learning from Indigenous Knowledge Holders on the State and Future of Pacific Wild Salmon. FACETS 7: 718-740.