

## Government-to-Corporation Consultation

Chugach AK Corporation: Confirmed for 10AM

Cook Inlet Regional: **Same Time? TBD**

**Useful Background Documents:** Signed MOU, FAQ's, Communication Plan, letters to the AK Native Corporations

### **Topic:** Roadless

- CIRI and CAC want the Chugach NF to be included in the rulemaking so is this consultation considering changing the decision to include the Chugach (or not)? **Or** are we consulting specific to the rulemaking as it relates to the Tongass (though I will capture their concerns about not including the CNF in this rulemaking effort)?
  - \*My read of the emails indicate that the consultation will be about the Chugach NF not being included in the proposed rule
- The ANC's expressed disappointment they were not consulted in advance of the revised scope decision.
  - The State's request (petition) was for an exemption from the 2001 Roadless Rule on the Tongass. The Secretary reached an agreement with the Governor that we would work with the State on a specific Roadless rule, and not an exemption. In an effort to notify the Tribes and Corps ahead of the public announcements, we assumed a State(wide) Specific Rule making effort that would include the Chugach.
  - Right after we sent the letters we met with the State to finalize MOU. The State clarified their position that **their interests were only with the Tongass**. We agreed to move forward with a Tongass specific rule, and unfortunately, had to send follow up letters to tribes and Corps. Again this effort was the Secretary's response to a petition from Governor Walker.
- If the Chugach is not included, in the future, can the State revisit their decision to request to include us? Did the State consult with Tribes on this rulemaking?
  - With this being a State of AK petition, the state should probably be asked these questions. Not sure if the State consulted with Tribes or has engaged with the Governor's Tribal Advisory Council. **\*Need share-able info from someone who participated in the MOU meeting with the state**. Otherwise, we just need to defer to the state on this and similar questions
- They imply that possibly the CNF, specifically the Forest Supervisor, made the decision not to include the CNF and that's why they are consulting at the forest level.
  - We need to reiterate that this was NOT our decision or petition, but that after the invitations to consult were sent out, clarification provided indicated this effort on their behalf was only for the TNF.
- Rulemaking scope and who the decision-makers are, in case both these Regional Corps would elevate and request consultation above my level to the Sec or Chief).

- Secretary: TBD
- Chief: TBD

- \*Melinda's suggested language or anticipated language

DRAFT