PRIME QUESTIONS

- 1. What is the goal with PRIME? Is it fur seal conservation? Will PRIME accomplish this?
- 2. There appears to be a lot of opposition from STG, ADF&G and the industry. Will this opposition kill PRIME? Is it viable without STG on board?
- 3. What is the plan going forward for PRIME boundaries?
- 4. Why is the Nomination being pushed through the Western Pacific/Hawaii offices who have little knowledge of Alaskan issues?
- 5. Does the Tribal Government have the expertise and capacity to effectively be a comanager with the federal government? Does the tribe's lack of capacity mean the ONMS will be the de facto manager of the sanctuary? Florida Keys has been mentioned as an example, but there, the co-manager is a State government representing one of the largest states in the union.
- 6. How will the resident tribal member voice be included in the management of the sanctuary and not just a token membership on an Advisory Council or represented by nonresident non tribal member employees based in Anchorage?
- 7. How come the State of Alaska, which controls 3 miles around the islands, was not proposed as a co-manager?
- 8. The Florida Keys Advisory Council is constituted by a number of federal, state, and stakeholder entities. How can you reassure us that such a Council will not add another level of bureaucracy to an already difficult and slow regulatory process for issues affecting Saint Paul Island? For example, will regulatory processes through the Corps of Engineers, or NMFS, or other agencies, have to then be presented and approved by the Advisory Council?
- 7. How come the City who supported PRIME with a City Council resolution and the community wasn't notified of changes made to the nomination such as the 100 nm?
- 8. How come the community in the middle of Covid safety measures wasn't brought in earlier to the aborted NMFS/ADFG/ONMS trip planning process?
- 9. It is my understanding that communication with NMFS Alaska region and the NOAA sanctuary program is lacking. How do plan to address this and make sure they are included?
- 10. As a resident of Saint Paul Island and founder of ECO I understand the issues and am in full support of conservation of our natural and subsistence resources. The City Council is as well. Will PRIME accomplish this and protect our economy and fisheries that we depend on?
- 11. It seems like PRIME will be a project in the updated CEDS. Does the Aleut Community of St. Paul see PRIME as an economic activity for Saint Paul Island? If so, how is PRIME going to supplement loss in fisheries income from sales, support services and taxes? Has there been an numbers run regarding how much economic activity that PRIME may generate?
- 12. The naming convention of the "sanctuary" in Unangam tunuu is not grammatically correct. It should be Alaĝum Kanuuĝii. Is the plans to correct this? If it was not grammatically correct in English, I sure it would be corrected.

PRIME Statement on Behalf of the City

I understand the PRIME proposal has changed in fundamental respects, including lack of support from sister city of STG and the State of Alaska, and dropping of the 100 nm boundary and the City was not informed of these changes. As a result, the City Council resolution from December will be reevaluated by the City Council.

The City will reserve its support for when there is a Final Prime Proposal with final goals and objectives announced to the public and then determine whether the City support PRIME or not.

The City's support of course will depend on whether it is consulted as this proposal is developed and it agrees to the proposed sanctuary goals and objectives, which must protect existing and future economic activities as well as infrastructure development, and it is clear on whether the comanagement structure and Advisory Council, will not add a further level of bureaucracy and lengthen processes to get stuff done on Saint Paul Island.

Since consultation with the City about fundamental PRIME issues, including access to the harbor, has not taken place in the last 6 months and representations have been made on our behalf, we have lost confidence at this time in this process. Going forward consultation with the City must be continuous and any changes to the proposed sanctuary should be notified immediately to maintain community support and confidence.