Box PPV
Port Protection
Alaska 99950-0180
February 3, 2003

Local Boundary Commission
550 West 7th Ave Suite 1770
Anchorage AK 99501-3510

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to respond to the standards which include Port Protection and Point Baker in the Prince of Wales Model Borough, and asking that we be put in the Gustavus Model Borough.

Port Protection and Point Baker are roadless villages on the northern end of Prince of Wales Island, physically remote from the rest of the Island. They traditionally rely on small commercial fishing operations for income, supplemented by heavy use of subsistence resources. They have worked actively to stay off the logging road system, because of negative impact on ~~our~~ subsistence use areas from ferry traffic from Ketchikan or other towns. (The USFS has already found our deer population to be so negatively impacted that it will be inadequate to meet future needs). Many in both villages have fought logging.

The other villages on POW are different from us. Most are logging communities. They have very different land use values. They want different things to happen on the south end of the Island ie road improvements, ferry terminals, airports etc. These things won't benefit the north end of the Island. Instead they will put more destructive pressure on our subsistence

way of life, and we will be forced to pay for it! We will be powerless in a POW Borough because of our extreme minority position and also because we are disliked for our 25 year record of fighting against clearcut logging. Our subsistence way of life, protected by ANILCA, will be destroyed by development pressures.

For this reason, I feel the LBC has an obligation as part of its standards for social, cultural and economic interrelation, to consider ANILCA Title VIII regarding subsistence protection. Good data on subsistence use patterns is available from ADF&G Subsistence Division. I will show that we are closer in social, cultural and economic ties to the towns in the Glacier Bay Model Borough than we are to lower POW Island.

I will give you two examples to show why Port Protection and Point Baker cannot receive fair treatment in a POW Borough:

① Port Protection and Point Baker have a member group on the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council Board of Directors. SEACC scheduled a big Board meeting in Craig, and set up housing in advance with churches. The Mayor of Craig worked to get the housing taken away from SEACC members, and the meeting was driven out of Craig and had to meet elsewhere.

② There was a U.S.F.S. Public Hearing on the Roadless Wilderness Bill on the Tongass Forest held in Craig. I talked to a man from Craig who supported the Bill but was afraid to testify because he would endanger his job with the city.

He said no one from Craig dared to testify in support of roadless wilderness. (All the Craig testimony was against the Bill).

This is the political climate that prevails on lower POW Island. If you put Port Protection and Point Baker in a Borough with the lower part of the Island because it is geographically neat and maybe more convenient for the State, you will be doing us a grave and irreprehable injustice.

In the process of Boroization, our villages deserve the protection Congress gave us in ANILCA Title I Sec 101(c), Title VIII Sec 801(3) and Sec 802(1). I ask you to please re-evaluate your standards in this light, and put us in the Gustavus Model Borough with villages similar to us. (I think Port Alexander, Edna Bay and Meyers Chuck should be in it too). That way perhaps our tax revenues can go to fisheries enhancement projects + other common needs, rather than to "services" that won't even serve us.

Thank you for the chance to comment. I am sorry for its hand-written length, and appreciate your consideration of it.

Sincerely,

Gretchen V Goldstein.

cc. Port Protection Community Association
Point Baker Community Association
ADF+G Subsistence Division
USFS Subsistence Division
Sumner Strait Fish and Game Advisory Committee