

0237

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

REGULATORY MEETING

VOLUME III

TELECONFERENCE - ALASKA
APRIL 14, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Anthony Christianson, Chairman
- Charles Brower, Public Member
- Rhonda Pitka, Public Member
- Sara Boario, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Sarah Creachbaum, National Park Service
- Tom Heinlein, Bureau of Land Management
- Gene Peltola, Bureau of Indian Affairs
- David Schmid, U.S. Forest Service

- Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office

Recorded and transcribed by:
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
329 F Street, Suite 222
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-227-5312; sahile@gci.net

0238

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Teleconference - 4/14/2022)

(On record)

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Operator. I just want to check and make sure, Tina, are you recording this now, court reporter.

REPORTER: Sue, I am. Go ahead.

MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. Okay. Well, this is Sue Detwiler, Assistant Regional Director for the Office of Subsistence Management. I'm -- this is day three of the Federal Subsistence Board 2022 to 2024 wildlife regulatory meeting and I'm just going to go through a roll call here to see who we have online.

Starting with Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Good morning, Sue. Good morning, everyone. I'm present.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Sarah.

BLM. Thomas Heinlein.

MR. HEINLEIN: Good morning everyone. Tom is present.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario

MS. BOARIO: Good morning, Sue, and everyone. I am on.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: Good morning, Sue, and all. I am here.

MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Dave.

BIA. Gene Peltola.

0239

1 MR. PELTOLA: Good morning, everyone.
2 BIA is on.
3
4 MS. DETWILER: Great.
5
6 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.
7
8 MS. PITKA: Good morning, I'm on.
9
10 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Rhonda.
11
12 Public Member Charlie Brower.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 MS. DETWILER: Not on yet.
17
18 Chair Anthony Christianson, are you on.
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 MS. DETWILER: Okay, so we're still
23 waiting on members Charlie Brower and Anthony
24 Christianson. I'll move on to legal counsel,
25 Department of Interior Regional Solicitor's Office.
26 Ken Lord, are you on.
27
28 MR. LORD: Good morning.
29
30 MS. DETWILER: Good morning.
31
32 USDA Office of General Council, Jim
33 Ustasiewski.
34
35 (No response)
36
37 MS. DETWILER: Liaison to the Board,
38 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Ben Mulligan and
39 or Mark Burch.
40
41 MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Sue. This
42 is Ben.
43
44 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Ben.
45
46 Regional Advisory Council Chairs.
47 Starting with Region 1, Southeast, Don Hernandez.
48
49 MR. HERNANDEZ: I am here.
50

0240

1 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Don.

2

3 Region 2, Southcentral. Gloria
4 Stickwan, Vice Chair, standing in for Greg Encelewski.
5 Gloria, are you on?

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Region 3, Kodiak
10 Aleutians, Della Trumble, are you on.

11

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes, good morning.

13

14 MS. DETWILER: Good morning, Della.

15

16 Bristol Bay, Nanci Morris Lyon.

17

18 MS. MORRIS LYON: Good morning, I'm
19 here.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Good morning.

22

23 YKDelta, Ray Oney.

24

25 MS. PATTON: Good morning, Sue and
26 everyone. This is Eva. And I will be presenting on
27 the YKDelta RAC's behalf if Ray is not able to connect.
28 No phone lines are going through yet in Alakanuk yet
29 today. Thank you.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Eva.

32

33 Western Interior, Jack Reakoff.

34

35 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff's here.

36

36 Good morning.

37

38 MS. DETWILER: Good morning.

39

40 Seward Peninsula, Louis Green.

41

42 MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa Pilcher,
43 Council Chair [sic] for the Seward Peninsula RAC. I
44 still don't believe Louis will be able to join us
45 today. I will be representing him instead.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Nissa.

48

49 Region 8 Northwest Arctic, Thomas

50

0241

1 Baker.

2

3 MS. MCDAVID: Good morning, Sue. This
4 is Council Coordinator Brooke McDavid. Chairman Baker
5 will not be available this morning.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Brooke.

8

9 Region 9 Eastern Interior, Sue
10 Entsminger.

11

12 MS. MCDAVID: This is Brooke McDavid
13 again. Sue will be joining us later today.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

16

17 And North -- North Slope, Gordon
18 Brower.

19

20 MS. PATTON: Good morning, again. This
21 is Eva Patton, Council Coordinator. And our Chair
22 Gordon Brower will be joining us a little later this
23 morning for the North Slope region proposals. Thank
24 you.

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Eva.

27

28 So we are still missing Public Member
29 Charlie Brower and Anthony Christianson, Chair, are you
30 on.

31

32 (Pause)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Good morning,
35 everybody. Can you hear me now Sue.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Yes, good morning. Ton,
38 we just finished going through the roll call and we
39 have eight -- or seven of 8 members. Charlie Brower
40 has not signed on yet but other than that we have seven
41 members online.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
44 I was stuck in that one room.

45

46 (Laughter)

47

48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I could hear
49 you guys but you couldn't hear me. So welcome

50

0242

1 everyone. Welcome to the Federal Board meeting here
2 this morning. We'll go ahead and get started since we
3 have a quorum and we'll hope that Charlie can join us
4 soon. This is the third day of our Federal Board
5 meeting and we hope to have a productive day and get
6 through most of the agenda that we can today.

7

8 We'll start this morning off with
9 public testimony on non-consensus agenda items. And so
10 if there's any public that would like to speak to non
11 -- I mean non-agenda items, sorry not non-consensus,
12 non-agenda items, this is the time. There are agenda
13 items that will be available for discussion later but
14 this is for items for the public that may not be on the
15 -- or I mean topics that may not be on the agenda. So
16 at this time we'll go ahead and open up the floor for
17 any public comments on non-agenda items.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 OPERATOR: And to ask a question,
22 please press star, one. Please ensure that your phone
23 is unmuted and record your name clearly when prompted
24 and to withdraw your request please press star, two.
25 Again, that is star, one to ask a question or comment.

26

27 MR. BROWER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 MR. BROWER: Hello.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 MR. BROWER: Hello.

36

37 (Pause)

38

39 REPORTER: Hi Charlie, I can hear you.

40

41 MR. BROWER: Okay. Okay, I'm online.

42

43 REPORTER: Yes, yes you are.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Charlie, this is Sue
48 Detwiler. The Chair may have dropped off or may be on
49 mute but we were just waiting to see if there were any

50

0243

1 public comments on non-agenda items.

2

3 OPERATOR: You have a question or
4 comment from Bill. Your line is open.

5

6 MR. SHERWONIT: Hi. Thank you. I'm
7 Bill Sherwonit. I guess this is actually related to an
8 agenda item but if I could just have a (indiscernible -
9 breaks up) I'm just kind of popping in for the meeting
10 -- and I'm interested in addressing Proposals 22-46 and
11 56, and I guess my question is looking at the online,
12 what you've covered so far, I guess I would just like
13 to confirm or not that No. 46 will likely be taken up
14 this morning. That's my question. Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
17 Maybe Sue or Lisa, you can answer that for him. Thank
18 you.

19

20 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay, this is Lisa.
21 I'm not hearing Sue so I'll jump in. Lisa Grediagin
22 for the record. My understanding is he's asking if
23 WP22-46 will be taken up this morning, and, you know,
24 it's hard to give a definitive answer on when the Board
25 will take up specific proposals because they're just
26 going in order and it's hard to know how long some
27 proposals will take. But it seems pretty likely, given
28 the order of proposals, that that one will come up this
29 morning. But it's definitely on the non-consensus
30 agenda so the Board will be considering that proposal,
31 you know, individually, and there will be a time for
32 public testimony on that one. But to be able to give
33 an exact time on when the Board will be addressing that
34 proposal is, you know, beyond the scope of my
35 authority.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
40 Lisa.

41

42 OPERATOR: Next question comes from
43 Robert, your line is open.

44

45 MR. JEWELL: Hi, Robert Jewell,
46 Cordova. I'm one of the co-sponsors for subsistence
47 fishing on the Copper River, Cordova, myself and my co-
48 sponsor are at work so we're not going to be able to
49 attend but I wanted to make a comment about the last
50

0244

1 comments made. Currently, a Board Member spoke up, Sue
2 Entsminger, about coming down here and no one wants
3 this and I would totally disagree. The person cherry-
4 picked. When we had our conference call with them we
5 said we would show them everything, they never
6 contacted us, never reached out and I'm just really
7 frustrated. I'm curious why all these special
8 interests get priority over rural Alaskan residents to
9 obtain subsistence fish. I'm sorry I couldn't call in
10 during the proper time but I just wanted to get my
11 comments stated.

12

13 Thank you all for what you're doing.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
16 Appreciate you taking the time to call in.

17

18 OPERATOR: No further questions or
19 comments on the phone at this time.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
22 thank you, Operator, appreciate it. Sue, or Board is
23 there any information sharing this morning before we
24 get started with the agenda, this opportunity for the
25 Board to bring up anything for -- discuss anything
26 before we get started with the next proposal.

27

28 MR. SCHMID: Mr. Chair, this is Forest
29 Service.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Dave, you
32 have the floor.

33

34 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, I don't know if the
35 last speaker is still with us. I believe it was Mr.
36 Jewell and I'm not sure whether he was aware that that
37 action that he was referencing will be taken up by the
38 Board. It's near the tail end of our agenda, as well
39 that was 21-10, I believe. But there may be another
40 opportunity to comment on that before the proposal is
41 actually deliberated on.

42

43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
46 Dave, for that clarification and point. Thank you.

47

48 All right, hearing no more Board
49 discussion or information we'll go ahead, Sue, and
50

0245

1 we'll call on the next order of business for wildlife
2 proposals today and call on the Staff to provide the
3 analysis.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you, Mr.
8 Chair. We're in the Bristol Bay non-consensus agenda
9 items, wildlife proposals and closure reviews so we are
10 on WP22-40 and that will be presented by Robbin LaVine.

11

12 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
13 and members of the Board. For the record my name is
14 Robbin LaVine and I'll be presenting the analysis for
15 WP22-40. It begins on Page 280 of Volume I of your
16 meeting materials. If you will recall this was pulled
17 from the consensus agenda.

18

19 Proposal WP22-40 was submitted by the
20 Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and
21 it requests that Federally-qualified subsistence users
22 be allowed to use a snowmachine to position wolves and
23 wolverines for harvest on Federal public lands in Units
24 9B, 9C, 17B and 17C provided the animals are not shot
25 from a moving snowmachine.

26

27 The regulatory history is important for
28 understanding WP22-40. So I'm going to apologize in
29 advance if it's rather lengthy. Again, this is really
30 critical for you to understand all the various
31 different working parts of this proposal.

32

33 In 2016 Wildlife Proposal 16-48
34 requested that Federally-qualified subsistence users be
35 allowed to use snowmachines to position a caribou, wolf
36 or wolverine for harvest in Unit 23. The Board adopted
37 the proposal with modification to allow this method of
38 harvest on BLM land only as the regulatory language for
39 this agency does not specifically prohibit the use of
40 snowmachines to position animals for hunting. The
41 Board also noted at this time this harvest method is
42 allowed on some State managed lands. In 2017 Wildlife
43 Proposal 18-24 requested pretty much the same thing as
44 16-48, that Federally-qualified subsistence users be
45 allowed to use a snowmachine to position caribou,
46 wolves and wolverines for harvest in Unit 17 provided
47 the animals were not shot from a moving vehicle. The
48 same proposal, 148, was submitted to the Board of Game.
49 During its fall 2017 meeting, the Bristol Bay Regional

50

1 Advisory Council opposed 18-24, however, in February
2 2018, the Alaska Board of Game adopted Proposal 148
3 with modification limited to the taking of a caribou
4 only shot from a stationary snowmachine with further
5 clarification describing exactly how the snowmachine
6 may be used for assistance, and I'll read that language
7 in just a minute. During the April 2018 Federal
8 Subsistence Board meeting, the Bristol Bay Regional
9 Advisory Council requested Proposal 18-24 be taken off
10 the consensus agenda and some public testimony was
11 received in support of 18-24. The Board deliberated
12 the proposal on record and rejected it, citing concerns
13 over a lack of clarity and consistency among existing
14 regulations. In 2020, the Bristol Bay Regional
15 Advisory Council submitted Proposals WP20-26 and 20-27.
16 Wildlife Proposal 20-26 requested that Federally-
17 qualified subsistence users be allowed to use a
18 snowmachine to position wolves and wolverine for
19 harvest on BLM managed lands only in Units 9B, 9C, 17B
20 and 17C. Proposal 20-27 also submitted by the Bristol
21 Bay Regional Advisory Council requested a unit-specific
22 regulation for Unit 17 allowing use of a snowmachine to
23 assist in the taking of a caribou and allowing caribou
24 to be a shot from a stationary snowmachine using the
25 regulatory language adopted by the Board of Game on the
26 aforementioned Proposal 148 back in February of 2018.
27 That regulatory language read:

28
29 In Unit 17 a snowmachine may be used to
30 assist in the taking of a caribou and caribou may be
31 shot from a stationary snowmachine. Assist in the
32 taking of a caribou means a snowmachine may be used to
33 approach within 300 yards of a caribou at speeds under
34 15 miles an hour in a manner that does not involve
35 repeated approaches or that causes a caribou to run. A
36 snowmachine may not be used to contact an animal or to
37 pursue a fleeing caribou.

38
39 During the April 2020 Board meeting,
40 the Board took up Proposal 20-27 discussed and adopted
41 it. The Board then considered Proposal 20-26, the wolf
42 and wolverine proposal. The Board deferred Proposal
43 20-26 and suggested further consideration of the
44 proposal by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council
45 working group to, and here's the direction:

- 46
47 1. Expand the analysis to include all
48 Federal lands in Units 9B, 9C, 17B and 17C, so not just
49 BLM lands only.
50

0247

1 2. Identify specific language that may
2 reduce complexity between State and Federal
3 regulations, and;

4
5 3. Anticipate and address regulatory
6 conflicts between the proposed regulatory language and
7 agency-specific regulations.

8
9 The working group met several times via
10 teleconference. At the February 2021 Bristol Bay
11 Regional Advisory Council meeting, the working group
12 reported to the Council they were in agreement to
13 expand the analysis to include all Federal lands in the
14 units and not just BLM lands, but did not request a --
15 a suggest in specific language. Upon the working group
16 recommendation the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory
17 Council submitted this proposal, WP22-40 for the 2022
18 regulatory cycle. However, the working group met again
19 in May and suggested further clarifications of the
20 term, position, using the same regulatory language as
21 proposed in WP20-27, the caribou proposal. And at the
22 fall 2021 Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council the
23 Council developed their recommendation accordingly.
24 You can find the Council recommendation on Page 295 of
25 your meeting materials.

26
27 Other notable events include that the
28 same proposal was submitted to the Board of Game by the
29 local AC. Proposal 23 suggested the use of snowmachine
30 to position wolves or wolverine for harvest in Unit 17
31 only provided they are not shot from a stationary
32 snowmachine. The Board of Game took up this proposal
33 in early 2022 but took final action after the Bristol
34 Bay Regional Advisory Council held their winter
35 meeting.

36
37 Currently the wolf population in Units
38 9 and 17 is believed to be stable. Less is known about
39 the resident wolverine population and this change in
40 regulation could result in increased biological
41 vulnerability.

42
43 The OSM preliminary conclusion -- or
44 actually the OSM conclusion is to support Proposal 22-
45 40 with modification to utilize the same regulatory
46 language as Wildlife Proposal 20-27 and to include all
47 Federal public lands in Unit 17. The modification
48 should read in both Unit 9 and 17, unit-specific
49 regulations:

50

0248

1 On Federal managed lands a snowmachine
2 may be used to the assist in the taking of a wolf or
3 wolverine and a wolf or wolverine may be shot from a
4 stationary snowmachine. Assist in the taking of a wolf
5 or wolverine means a snowmachine may be used to
6 approach within 300 yards of a wolf or wolverine at
7 speeds under 15 miles per hour in a manner that does
8 involve repeated approaches or that causes the animal
9 to run. A snowmachine may not be used to contact an
10 animal or to pursue a fleeing animal.

11
12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13
14 I'm ready for questions.

15
16 (Pause)

17
18 MS. LAVINE: I would note that once
19 again the materials for Wildlife Proposal 22-40 can be
20 found on Page 280, beginning on Page 280 of Volume I of
21 your meeting materials. Remember this was on a
22 consensus agenda, and I will also note that there were
23 no public -- written public comments on this item.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ms.
26 LaVine. I just got dropped off there but came back on
27 and so did we do the public testimony.

28
29 MS. LAVINE: I just got to the point
30 Mr. Chair, -- through the Chair. I just got to the
31 point where I noted there were no written public
32 comments on this proposal.

33
34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ms.
37 LaVine. We'll go ahead and move on to open up the
38 lines for any public comment that may be online.
39 Operator, at this timethis is when we would make
40 available for anybody who would like to speak.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 OPERATOR: Thank you. As a reminder,
45 to ask a question or give a comment or testimony, press
46 star, one.

47
48 (Pause)

49
50

0249

1 OPERATOR: No questions on the phone at
2 this time.

3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
5 appreciate that, Operator. We'll go ahead and move on
6 to Regional Advisory Council recommendations.

7
8 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 For the record, Nanci Morris Lyon, Bristol Bay Regional
10 Advisory Council Chairman. Yeah, this proposal has
11 been a long hard fought battle for us and we thought we
12 had it conquered and then we realized that we were not
13 capturing the intent. So the comments that we have on
14 this proposal at our deliberation that caused us to
15 request it to be moved off the consensus agenda are as
16 follows.

17
18 The Bristol Bay Regional Advisory
19 Council requests that 22-40 be removed from the
20 consensus agenda and for Board action to be deferred on
21 this proposal. During the winter 2022 meeting the
22 Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council took up WP22-40
23 stating there were parts of the OSM modified regulatory
24 language that did not capture the Council's intent.
25 Some Council members spoke with hunters from the
26 region. Hunters did not support the proposed
27 regulatory language and expressed concern with the
28 speed parameters and prohibition against hunters making
29 numerous approaches. This regulatory guidance is not
30 realistic for harvesting a wolf. A hunter would not be
31 able to (indiscernible - muffled) traveling at or under
32 15 miles an hour awhile attempting to take a wolf. By
33 the time a hunter is within 300 yards a wolf will hear
34 you and run. The Council expressed concern that at
35 speeds of 15 miles an hour it is impossible to
36 (indiscernible - muffled) up on a wolf. In order to
37 effectively and efficiently harvest a wolf, a hunter
38 will generally have to make numerous approaches before
39 the hunter is able to harvest a wolf.

40
41 WP22-40 could also impact subsistence
42 activities and the subsistence economies. Many hunters
43 sell the hides from wolves and use those funds to
44 purchase fuel to hunt caribou.

45
46 The language before the Board will
47 reduce harvest opportunities in the field.

48
49 Finally, the Council noted that the
50

0250

1 Alaska Board of Game was scheduled to address a similar
2 proposal known as Proposal 23 during the winter 2022
3 meeting. The Council expressed interest in the Board
4 of Game action on this proposal and expressed support
5 for keeping regulations align on State and Federal
6 land. The Council recognizes the complexity and the
7 widespread ramification the regulation may have. We
8 are asking that the Board defer action on the proposal
9 until more information can be gathered and more user
10 groups can be fully informed and their input
11 considered.

12

13 On January 24th, 2022 at the central
14 Southwest Board of Game meeting the Board of Game
15 passed Proposal 23 as amended to include Unit 17 and
16 included language that allows the use of snowmachines
17 to approach within 300 yards of wolf or wolverine at
18 speeds less than 15 miles an hour and prohibited
19 repeated approaches. The Board of Game also expressed
20 intent to define position at the following statewide
21 meeting. On March 7th at the statewide meeting, the
22 Board of Game passed Proposal 271 as amended which
23 removed the restrictions on distance speed and repeated
24 approaches for harvesting wolf or wolverine. The
25 language that the State finally adopted was as follows:

26

27 A snowmachine may be used to approach
28 and pursue wolves and wolverines but may not come in
29 contact with live animals.

30

31 And that basically concludes the
32 Board's comments for this proposal.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
35 questions for the RAC Chair.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
40 thank you. We'll go ahead and move on to summary of
41 tribal comments and I believe that's you Robbin.

42

43 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff, Western
48 Interior Regional Council.

49

50

0251

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, sorry,
2 there's more on this one, sorry, I'm just looking at my
3 agenda. Thank you, Jack for intercepting, you have the
4 floor.

5
6 MR. REAKOFF: That's fine. So at the
7 fall meeting WIRAC supported WP22-40 as modified by OSM
8 and at the time the Council felt that the refined
9 language recommended by OSM and the working group
10 addressed the Federal Subsistence Board's previous
11 concerns on this issue and was an equitable
12 accommodation of both agency-specific and Federal
13 subsistence regulatory systems. The Council also noted
14 that Unit 19 residents who lived within Western
15 Interior region would be affected by this proposal.
16 But subsequently the Board of Game promulgated Proposal
17 271 and then the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee met
18 in regards to this proposal and so we opposed it as
19 written. And so the -- with the restrictions of
20 approaching wolf and wolverine at 15 miles an hour,
21 that -- we wanted to see that the caribou regulation
22 was divided out -- that it was adequate for caribou but
23 not for wolf and wolverine harvest and so as Nanci's
24 saying there, the Council's previous comment are now
25 qualified by the State Board of Game action and so at
26 this point we supported the proposal but at this point
27 I would agree with Nanci.

28
29 Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
32 Jack. any questions for Jack.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
37 Regional Advisory Council Chairs like to speak to this.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
42 Thank you to the two Chairs there and we'll go ahead
43 and move on. Thank you to Nanci and Jack. We'll go
44 ahead and move on to Orville, you have the floor.
45 Tribal Native Liaison consultation.

46
47 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
48 Federal Subsistence Board members. Orville Lind,
49 Native Liaison for OSM. During the August 19th
50

0252

1 consultation sessions we did not have no comments or
2 recommendations on this.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
7 Orville. We'll go ahead and move on to the State
8 Liaison representative.

9

10 MR. MULLIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
11 Ben Mulligan here for the day. For the record, ADF&G
12 supports the proposal with modification that would
13 align State and Federal regulations. I will note for
14 the record since -- we just checked in yesterday with
15 our Board of Game regulatory specialist and
16 unfortunately we don't have our final regulatory
17 language available for your guys' review for this
18 discussion or else we would have provided that to you
19 to help make your discussion a little easier. My
20 apologies.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
23 Any questions for the State.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
28 we'll go ahead and move on to ISC comments.

29

30 MS. LAVINE: Thank you. Good morning,
31 Mr. Chair. Again, this is Robbin LaVine, Subsistence
32 Policy Coordinator and the InterAgency Staff Committee
33 Chair. For Wildlife Proposal 22-40 the InterAgency
34 Staff Committee provided the standard comment.

35

36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
39 Robbin. That'll open up the floor for Board discussion
40 with Council Chairs and State.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
45 Board action. The floor is open for Board action.

46

47 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National
48 Park Service.

49

50

0253

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
2 the floor.

3
4 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 I move to defer Wildlife Proposal 22-40 to use
6 snowmachines to position wolves and wolverine in Units
7 9B, 9C, 17B and 17C. If I get a second, I will explain
8 why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

9
10 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

11
12 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. During the
13 most recent meeting and today, the proponent asked the
14 Board to defer Wildlife Proposal 22-40 to allow the
15 Council another regulatory cycle to formulate language
16 defining positioning of wolves and wolverine. The
17 Council noted a discrepancy between traditional harvest
18 methods and the OSM modification to allow for the use
19 of snowmachine to assist in the take of wolverine and
20 wolf. In deference to the Council, I intend to support
21 my motion to defer Wildlife Proposal 22-40.

22
23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
26 Board discussion, comments or discussion.

27
28 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Gene, you have
31 the floor.

32
33 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 BIA's very much in support of deferring this proposal
35 for further clarification of verbiage to be considered
36 by the Board. My question would be, up until what
37 point are we deferring, would it be the winter meeting
38 coming up next winter, or temporarily, I was wondering
39 - although I made the motion to support I also would
40 like to get clarification, possibly an amendment, to at
41 what point we would defer to.

42
43 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
46 Gene. Any other Board questions or comments.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50

0254

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
2 question.

3
4 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
7 Gene.

8
9 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Yes, so not hearing any discussion about deferral date
11 I would like to make an amendment to the motion that we
12 defer to the January upcoming winter Board meeting.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Is there
15 concurrence by the maker of the motion?

16
17 MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes, Mr. Chair.

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Any
20 opposition from the Board to defer this to our winter
21 meeting.

22
23 (No opposition)

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no
26 objection to the deferral motion carries to defer this
27 to the winter meeting. Okay, we'll go ahead and move
28 on, Staff, if you'd call upon the next wildlife
29 proposal and the analysis. Thank you.

30
31 MS. HOLMAN: Mr. Chair, can you hear
32 me?

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
35 the floor.

36
37 MS. HOLMAN: Okay. Mr. Chair. Members
38 of the Board. My name is Kendra Holman and I'm a
39 Wildlife Biologist with the Office of Subsistence
40 Management. Wildlife.....

41
42 MS. GREDIAGIN: Mr. Chair, this is Lisa
43 Grediagin. I'm sorry to interrupt but could you just
44 clarify on the record the vote for WP22-40, I never
45 heard a vote and I'm hearing from other Staff they
46 didn't hear a vote for that one as well.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: When you have a
49 motion on the floor and you second it, if there's no
50

0255

1 opposition from the Board then it's unanimous consent
2 that we move forward, for the record. No opposition.

3

4 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay, thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

7

8 MS. GREDIAGIN: Thank you for that
9 clarification.

10

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
13 Lisa. We'll get back to the Staff for presentation.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 MS. HOLMAN: Okay, Mr. Chair. So this
18 is Wildlife Proposal WP22-41 that was submitted by the
19 Togiak National Wildlife Refuge and the Yukon Delta
20 National Wildlife Refuge and can be found on Page 300
21 of your meeting books. This proposal requests that the
22 Federal in-season manager be delegated authority to
23 open and close seasons, announce harvest limits, and
24 set sex restrictions for caribou in all portions of
25 Unit 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A and 19C via
26 delegation of authority letter, which is appendix 1 and
27 can be found on Page 327 of your meeting books.

28

29 The proponent states that the summer of
30 '19 and 2020 population estimates of the Mulchatna
31 Caribou Herd was 13,500 caribou which represents a five
32 -- a 50 percent decline from the previous five years
33 and is below the State's minimum population objective
34 of 30,000 caribou. The proponent notes that the
35 2019/2020 Federal and State seasons were shortened due
36 to conservation concerns. The 2020/21 season was also
37 shortened providing for a bulls only harvest in August
38 and September while the rest of the season remained
39 closed. This request will help to conserve and recover
40 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and provide flexibility
41 needed to make harvest management decisions in a timely
42 manner. The proponents recognize that the request will
43 reduce harvest opportunity in the short-run but that
44 conserving the Mulchatna Caribou Herd now will increase
45 harvest opportunity in the future. The proponents also
46 state that the -- that harvest of other resources such
47 as moose may increase the response to this proposal.

48

49 Until 2014 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd

50

0257

1 unknown, decreased range quality, predation,
2 particularly by brown bears on the calving grounds, ice
3 events, deep snow and harvest pressure may all have
4 contributed to the decline. Given the recent
5 substantial decline to the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
6 population conservation measures are warranted.

7
8 Reported caribou harvest has declined
9 in correlation with the caribou population from almost
10 4,000 to 2,000 -- in 2000 to 28 caribou in the 20/2021
11 season. Reported harvest numbers can be found on
12 Figure 5 -- in Figure 5 on Page 318 of your meeting and
13 within Table 2 which starts on Page -- also starts on
14 Page 318 of your meeting book.

15
16 Household harvest surveys as well as
17 law enforcement information and observations indicate
18 actual harvest is much higher than reported harvest,
19 although the magnitude of unreported harvest is
20 unknown.

21
22 While this change may decrease harvest
23 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users
24 in the short-term, it may help to conserve the
25 Mulchatna Caribou Herd to ensure further harvest
26 opportunities. If this request is approved the Federal
27 in-season manager would be delegated authority to open
28 and close seasons, announce harvest limits and set sex
29 ratios across the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.
30 Conservation benefits of adopting 22-41 are uncertain.
31 Delegating authority to an in-season manager to provide
32 management flexibility, which is critical in responding
33 to achieving herd conditions in a timely manner.

34
35 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
36 Council.

37
38 I'd be happy to address any questions.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
41 questions from the Board.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
46 hearing none, did we get any public comment during this
47 proposal.

48
49 MS. HOLMAN: Mr. Chair, this is Kendra
50

0258

1 Holman again. And we did not receive any written
2 public comments on this proposal.

3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
5 Kendra. And at this time we'll go ahead to move on to
6 the online. Operator, if there's any public online
7 that would like to speak to this agenda item this is
8 their time to do so.

9
10 Thank you.

11
12 (Pause)

13
14 OPERATOR: No questions on the phone at
15 this time.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
18 you. We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council
19 recommendations.

20
21 MS. MORRIS LYON: Mr. Chair, for the
22 record Nanci Morris Lyons, Bristol Bay Regional
23 Subsistence Advisory Council.

24
25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
26 the floor.

27
28 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 Bristol Bay Regional Subsistence Advisory Council was
30 in support of WP22-41. The Council agrees with having
31 one in-season manager for streamlining the process as
32 well as being responsive to the needs of the caribou
33 population and the subsistence users.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
38 other Regional Advisory Council.

39
40 MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair, this is Eva
41 Patton on behalf of the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta
42 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Eva, you
45 have the floor.

46
47 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48 Members of the Board. For the record, Eva Patton,
49 Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta

50

0259

1 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And, again,
2 unfortunately phone lines in Alakanuk have been down as
3 well as internet. I was able to connect with somebody
4 from Alakanuk and they're communicating with me just
5 within the community. So these are the challenges
6 rural communities face and having meetings by
7 teleconference but I will be providing the Council's
8 recommendation.

9

10 And, again, the Council had requested
11 that this proposal moved to the non-consensus agenda to
12 address some further concerns that the Council has with
13 the viability of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and wish to
14 be able to share this concern and potential
15 conservation strategies, both with the Board and with
16 the other Councils within the range of this herd,
17 Bristol Bay and the Western Interior Regional Advisory
18 Councils.

19

20 So at their fall meeting in 2021, the
21 Council voted to support Proposal WP22-41 and the
22 Council supports the Refuge manager's delegated
23 authority for flexibility to engage conservation
24 measures as needed to manage the Mulchatna Caribou
25 Herd. The Council is very concerned about the decline
26 in the herd and supports the manager having the ability
27 to open or close the hunt and set harvest and sex
28 restrictions in order to maintain a viable population
29 for subsistence harvest opportunity in the future. The
30 Council requested that the Refuge manager work closely
31 with local communities and include their observations
32 in management decisions for the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.
33 People from the villages are always out on the land and
34 observing and have in-depth historical knowledge of
35 this herd over the years.

36

37 Further, at the Council's recent winter
38 meeting in March 1st, 2nd and 3rd, the Council heard
39 reports -- updated reports on the status of the
40 Mulchatna Caribou Herd and was very, very concerned
41 about, you know, the 50 percent reduction in the herd
42 size and deliberated further about conservation or
43 management actions that they would like for the Refuge
44 manager to consider and for the Board to consider in
45 support of the Refuge manager with the delegated
46 authority.

47

48 So the Council had deliberated a
49 request for a five year moratorium on hunting the
50

50

0260

1 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. And, again, because they're
2 very concerned about the dramatic decline of this herd
3 and an incredibly important subsistence resource for
4 numerous communities throughout the range of the herd,
5 and the Council has endeavored to ensure that the herd
6 will be able to recover so it will remain a subsistence
7 resource in the future. And, therefore, the Council is
8 requesting a full closure to any harvest of the
9 Mulchatna Caribou Herd until it rebounds to an
10 established stable population objective of at least
11 30,000 caribou. And the Council further requests to
12 establish jointly with the Federal Subsistence Board or
13 the Federal land managers a five year moratorium to
14 close to the harvest of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd or
15 until that population objective of that 30,000 caribou
16 has been met in order to help that herd rebound to once
17 again be able to reach a population size that can
18 sustain subsistence harvest into the future.

19
20 So the Council's recommending to close
21 all State and Federal lands. They did provide comment
22 to the Board of Game as well. Requesting to close all
23 Federal lands to the harvest of Mulchatna Caribou Herd
24 throughout their migratory range and that includes all
25 portions of Units 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 17C
26 remainder, 18, 18 remainder, 19A and 19B, and to
27 maintain a sex ratio of 30 bulls to 100 cows that would
28 ensure herd productivity and they're asking for
29 continued outreach hunting regulations, closures,
30 education and incentives for caribou conservation
31 measures and improve knowledge of and compliance with
32 harvest reporting requirements.

33
34 So, again, as you heard in the
35 analysis, the herd has reduced to approximately half
36 its size in the past few years and as a result of this
37 decline, conservation measures were implemented in the
38 past two seasons by both State and Federal managers.
39 And since receiving management authority, the Togiak
40 Refuge manager in collaboration with Staff from Alaska
41 Department of Fish and Game have determined that there
42 is no harvestable surplus that would allow the herd to
43 grow, and, therefore, the Council is requesting this
44 hunting moratorium in the interest of allowing time for
45 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd to recover and a closure
46 across the entire range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
47 is warranted.

48
49 A hunting moratorium will help send a
50

0261

1 clear message to all communities across the range of
2 the herd about the dire situation of the herd's
3 population size and need to work together on
4 communications and outreach to build support for these
5 conservation efforts for a sustainable subsistence
6 harvest opportunity in the future. This Council has
7 experience with success of a similar hunting moratorium
8 efforts in the past for moose on both the Lower Yukon
9 and Kuskokwim Rivers and now those moose populations
10 have rebounded to provide once again for ample
11 subsistence harvest opportunity and the Council
12 believes the same can be achieved for the Mulchatna
13 Caribou Herd.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the
16 Board.

17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva.
19 Any questions for Eva.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
24 was there any other Regional Advisory Council.

25
26 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
27 Jack Reakoff, Western Interior Regional Advisory
28 Council.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
31 floor, Jack.

32
33 MR. REAKOFF: So the Western Interior
34 Regional Advisory Council supported WP22-41. The
35 Council supports the delegated authority and an in-
36 season manager to help manage and conserve the herd.
37 This delegation of authority was initially put into
38 place by approval of a temporary special action request
39 submitted by the Western Interior Council and Yukon
40 Delta Regional Advisory Council. The Council believes
41 that it should remain in place becoming part of the
42 codified Federal regulations.

43
44 Further comment. The Western Interior
45 Regional Advisory Council was very concerned about the
46 Mulchatna Caribou Herd way back in the early-2020. If
47 you look at the data there, the herd, bull/cow ratios
48 were going completely into the toilet as far back as
49 below management objectives as far back as 2000/2001.
50

0262

1 That herd got down to one large bull per 100 cow. The
2 herd went into reproductive failure. So that's what
3 happened to the herd. I talked to herders, reindeer
4 herders in Scandinavia, they don't breed reindeer
5 unless they're eight years old for breeding cows and
6 they -- they have 15 cows per one large bull, no six --
7 I asked them about younger bulls, no, way. This
8 population has been staggering for years. It was
9 starting to recover and through comments from the Yukon
10 Delta Subsistence Staff let the Western Interior
11 Council know that there was exceptionally high harvest
12 of caribou in the winter of 2018/19. Under further
13 investigation we decided that -- had a discussion with
14 the YKDelta RAC, that there was a significant winter
15 harvest occurring and that's where the most recent
16 decline, especially in the western component. We did
17 not deliberate.

18

19 Our meeting was before the Yukon
20 Delta's meeting, we were meeting about a week before
21 them, we would have probably went along with this
22 moratorium idea but I can't speak to that. The Council
23 has not deliberated that.

24

25 But I do feel that extreme measures of
26 conservation need to be put into place. An in-season
27 manager needs to be given delegation of authority
28 because it's predominately federal public lands and
29 this herd is under -- it's in a real critical
30 condition. It needs to have conservation of --
31 especially the cow component and large bull component
32 at this time.

33

34 So those would be my comments to the
35 Federal Subsistence Board and I would entertain any
36 further questions.

37

38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
41 Jack. Any questions for Jack.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
46 Jack. Any other Regional Advisory Councils who would
47 like to speak to this.

48

49 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chair. Members of

50

0263

1 the Board. For the record my name is Nissa Pilcher,
2 I'm the Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula
3 Council.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
6 floor, Nissa.

7

8 MS. PILCHER: Hello. The Seward
9 Peninsula supported WP22-41. The Council supports
10 closing the Mulchatna Caribou Herd to protect the herd
11 until the population is healthy enough to support
12 harvest. The delegation of authority will allow timely
13 decisions to be made to respond to changing conditions
14 of the herd.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
19 other Regional Council who would like to speak to this.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no more
24 Regional Advisory Councils, we'll go ahead and move on
25 to tribal, Alaska Native Corp comments. Native
26 Liaison.

27

28 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 Orville Lind. Native Liaison, OSM. There were no
30 comments or recommendation on this.

31

32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
35 Orville. We'll go ahead and move on to Alaska
36 Department of Fish and Game. State Liaison.

37

38 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
40 supports giving the State in-season manager the
41 flexibility to manage the Mulchatna Herd by allowing
42 them to open and close the season, announce harvest
43 limits and set sex restrictions. The Togiak National
44 Wildlife Refuge has been a partner in research,
45 monitoring and education when it comes to the land has
46 been a partner towards the longstanding common goal of
47 conserving the herd throughout its range.

48

49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0264

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
2 questions for the State.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
7 We'll move on to ISC comments.

8
9 MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
10 This is Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Proposal 22-41 the
11 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard
12 comment.

13
14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
17 That opens the floor for Board discussion with the
18 Council Chairs and State Liaison.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
23 open for Board action on this proposal.

24
25 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, the U.S. Fish
26 and Wildlife Service moves to adopt Wildlife Proposal
27 22-41. Following a second I will explain why I intend
28 to support my motion.

29
30 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

31
32 MS. BOARIO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
33 Chair. I intend to support 22-41 that requests that the
34 Togiak Refuge Federal in-season manager be delegated
35 authority to open and close seasons, announce harvest
36 limits and set sex restrictions for caribou in all or
37 portions of Unit 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18 and 19A
38 and 19B via delegation of authority letter. Adoption
39 of this proposal will delegate authority to manage the
40 herd by delegation of authority letter that has been
41 supported by the Western Interior Council, Bristol Bay
42 Council, Seward Peninsula Council. We recognize the
43 Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Council's interest in a
44 moratorium to protect the herd for future generations
45 and we share their concern about reduction in the herd
46 size and in response the manager has closed the hunt in
47 2021 and 2022. The delegation of authority letter
48 provides management flexibility for the Togiak Refuge
49 Manager to continue to work closely with local
50

0265

1 communities and to include their knowledge and
2 observations in management decisions as well as
3 education and outreach materials.

4
5 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
8 further Board discussion, comments, questions.

9
10 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
13 Gene, you have the floor.

14
15 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
16 do appreciate the comments provided by the Regional
17 Advisory Councils. The Bureau of Indian Affairs have
18 been very supportive of delegated authority with regard
19 to management of this herd at the field level.

20
21 In response to the YKDelta's request
22 for a five year moratorium.

23
24 Although it might not specifically be
25 what the YKDelta would be pleased with, although if the
26 Board was to adopt this, it would be well within the
27 purview of the in-season manger, i.e., the Refuge
28 manager of Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, to work at
29 a local level and exercise that delegation of authority
30 to open and close, so something similar could be
31 accomplished. My concern would be that the Board try
32 to tack something on at this juncture that, one that
33 may be inappropriate because it did not go through the
34 public process. Although, specifically, YK's concern,
35 something similar could be accommodated by working with
36 the in-season manger for the herd.

37
38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
41 Gene. Any other Board comments, questions, discussion.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
46 question.

47
48 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

49
50

0266

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call,
2 please, Sue.

3
4 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 The motion is to adopt WP22-41. I'll start out with
6 Sara Boario, Park -- Fish and Wildlife Service.

7
8 MS. BOARIO: The Fish and Wildlife
9 Service supports the motion.

10
11 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

12
13 BIA, Gene Peltola.

14
15 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports.

16
17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

18
19 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park
20 Service.

21
22 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
23 supports.

24
25 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

26
27 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

28
29 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

30
31 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

32
33 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

34
35 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service
36 supports. Thank you.

37
38 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

39
40 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

41
42 MS. PITKA: Hi, I support.

43
44 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

45
46 Public Member Charlie Brower.

47
48 MR. BROWER: Support.

49
50

0267

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Charlie.

2

3 Chair Anthony Christianson.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Mr. Chair,
8 the motion passes unanimously.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Sue
11 we'll call on Staff for the next WP proposal. Thank
12 you.

13

14 MS. DETWILER: This should be Wildlife
15 Closure Review 22-05 presented by Kendra Holman.

16

17 MS. HOLMAN: Again, this is --
18 hello, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. My name is
19 Kendra Holman and I'm a Wildlife Biologist with the
20 Office of Subsistence Management. This closure review
21 can be found on Page 1048 of your meeting books.

22

23 Unit 9C -- the closure location is
24 within Unit 9C, that portion draining into the Naknek
25 River from the south. Public lands are closed in
26 December for hunting of moose except by Federally-
27 qualified subsistence users hunting under these
28 regulations.

29

30 The regulatory history for this area.
31 In the 1990s ADF&G emergency orders closed the December
32 antlerless moose in all or parts of the Naknek drainage
33 in Unit 9C. In '92 they proposed that the harvest
34 limit be changed from one moose to one bull in the
35 entire drainage. As a result of this action the Naknek
36 drainage was divided into hunt areas when the December
37 hunts were closed except to Federally-qualified
38 subsistence users. This area draining into the Naknek
39 River from the north and the area that drains into the
40 river from the south. Additionally, this action closed
41 Federal public lands for moose harvest during December
42 except for qualified -- Federally-qualified users. In
43 '95 the fall season was extended and Federal
44 registration permit required during the August -- in
45 2006 the antlerless harvest was eliminated but a
46 Federal registration permit was required for both fall
47 and winter season. In 2008 a Unit 9 moose working
48 group was established to better understand the
49 conflicts in the region and develop management

50

1 strategies and recommendations. In 2011 and 2012
2 regulations were liberalized as the recommendations on
3 -- on the recommendations of the working group. In
4 2016 it was determined that the registration permit is
5 required for both fall and winter seasons. To close a
6 -- the closure was reviewed with a determination -- and
7 the closure was reviewed with the determination to
8 maintain status quo.

9

10 Since the early 2000 -- 20th Century,
11 the moose of the Alaska Peninsula gradually expanded
12 their range southward. This expansion was accompanied
13 by a dramatic population increase until the 1960s when
14 the population began to decline.

15

16 Moose population status and trends in
17 Unit 9 is difficult for several reasons including low
18 moose density and snow and weather conditions are
19 frequently inadequate for surveys. In 1991 the Alaska
20 Peninsula and Becharof National Wildlife Refuge began
21 conducting aerial surveys of moose. The surveys
22 provided the bull/cow and calf/cow ratios for the total
23 density estimates. Figures 1, 2 and 3 on Pages 1056
24 and 1057 of your meeting books show this information.

25

26 Alaska resident moose harvest in Units
27 9B and 9C occur by registration permit RM272. The non-
28 resident moose harvest in Unit 9B and 9C occurs under
29 registration RM282. While reported moose harvest can
30 be parsed out by subunit it's not possible to
31 distribute it by hunt area. Therefore, the number of
32 moose reported harvest only within the closure area is
33 not available although reported moose harvest within
34 Unit 9C provides some insight.

35

36 In 2020 to 2019 [sic] total reported
37 harvest moose harvest of Unit 9C averaged 29 moose
38 ranging from 16 to 43 moose per year. Between 2010 and
39 2015 80 to 90 percent of the Unit 9 moose harvest
40 occurred in September. Figure 4 on Page 1058 of your
41 meeting book shows the breakdown of moose harvest in
42 Unit 9C by local and non-local years from 2000 to 2019.
43 Local users is defined as those with a customary and
44 traditional use determination.

45

46 If this closure is rescinded, non-
47 Federally-qualified users would be able to harvest
48 moose on Federal public lands within that portion of
49 Unit 9C draining into the Naknek River from the south
50

0269

1 in December. It may also result in the increase moose
2 harvest though increase are expected to be small.
3 Moose density within the closure areas below State
4 management harvest levels for moderate density moose
5 population. Moose densities within the closure are
6 very low and the population trend is uncertain. The
7 conservative approach is to maintain the closure until
8 the moose densities increase and the population
9 exhibits an increasing trend.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Member of the
12 Board.

13

14 I'd be happy to address any questions.

15

16 (Pause)

17

18 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue,
19 did you drop off the line. Do we need to hand off to
20 Rhonda while you get back online.

21

22 (Pause)

23

24 MS. PITKA: Hello.

25

26 (Pause)

27

28 MS. PITKA: Hi, this is Rhonda, am I
29 taking over now?

30

31 MS. DETWILER: I'm not hearing Tony,
32 Rhonda. He may have just dropped off or he's trying to
33 get back into -- back into this room. I think the next
34 step that we were at was written comments or actually
35 Board questions on the Staff presentation and written
36 comments.

37

38 MS. PITKA: Okay. So can we get a
39 summary of the written public comments. Thank you for
40 that, Sue, I appreciate it.

41

42 MS. HOLMAN: So this is Kendra Holman.
43 There were no written comments received on this
44 proposal.

45

46 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much. At
47 this time I'd like to open the floor to public
48 testimony. Operator, is there anybody cued up for
49 questions.

50

0270

1 OPERATOR: This is the Operator. As a
2 reminder, to ask a question or give a comment or
3 testimony please press, star, one.

4
5 (Pause)

6
7 MS. PITKA: This is pretty funny but
8 actually I thought that I got dropped from the call
9 because I couldn't hear anything after awhile. So it
10 was just Tony and not me.

11
12 (Pause)

13
14 OPERATOR: No questions or comments.

15
16 MS. PITKA: If we don't have any public
17 comments I would like to -- Operator, were there any
18 public comments.

19
20 OPERATOR: No questions over the phone
21 at this time.

22
23 MS. PITKA: Thank you. Okay, so we are
24 at Regional Advisory Council recommendations. Bristol
25 Bay.

26
27 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame
28 Chair. Nanci Morris Lyon Bristol Bay for the record.

29
30 So the Council recommended for original
31 closure that, although local residents desired an
32 antlerless moose season, the Council questioned whether
33 this population could sustain a cow harvest. In order
34 to protect the herd and to provide priority to
35 Federally-qualified subsistence users the Council
36 believed that a bull harvest only should be allowed and
37 that Federal lands draining into the Naknek River from
38 the south should be closed to Federally-qualified
39 subsistence users. The Council believes that this
40 would result in a greater numbers of bulls available
41 for subsistence users and a larger cow base for herd
42 expansion in the future. When the -- then the closure
43 was then put in place and we support maintaining status
44 quo on WCR22-05. The Council believes that there
45 appears to be available moose for harvest in December,
46 however, the population may not be high enough for the
47 elimination of the closure to be sustainable. The
48 Council agrees that maintaining the subsistence
49 priority should continue.
50

0271

1 And I'd just like to point out, too, if
2 you look at the graph on Page 1058 we've had some push
3 back in the area, some guided hunters who also use
4 these areas for their hunts. You can see recovery
5 happening, however, it has not completed yet, so we're
6 totally in favor of maintaining this status quo and
7 protecting what harvestable surplus there is for our
8 subsistence hunters.

9
10 Thanks.

11
12 MS. PITKA: Thank you so much, I
13 appreciate that. Next Regional Advisory Council or was
14 that it.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 MS. DETWILER: I believe that was it,
19 Madame Chair.

20
21 MS. PITKA: Oh, perfect, okay, then we
22 are on to the tribal, Alaska Native Corp comments for
23 consultation. Orville Lind.

24
25 MR. LIND: Good morning. Good morning,
26 Madame Chair. Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM.
27 During the consultation session there were no comments
28 or recommendations.

29
30 Thank you, Madame Chair.

31
32 MS. PITKA: Thank you, Orville, I
33 appreciate it. Now we are on to Alaska Department of
34 Fish and Game comments.

35
36 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Madame Chair.
37 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
38 supports the elimination of this closure. Current
39 moose population in this area is stable with a density
40 for which there is no conservation concern. In looking
41 at the movements of collared cow moose in the area this
42 indicates that there's enough movement through the
43 trend count areas that multiple bccs should be pooled
44 and that is what we do here at ADF&G. Pooling with
45 nearby Park border and King Salmon River count areas
46 from 2018 to 2020 resulted in counts of 192, 220, 221
47 respectively, and a density of .8 moose per square
48 mile. Cow/calf ratios were 49, 34 and 22 per 100 cows.
49 This data indicates a stable population of moderate
50

0272

1 density.

2

3

4 There was a proposal at the Board of
5 Game earlier this year and given the data the Board of
6 Game chose to increase the moose season length in GMUs
7 9B and 9C for resident Alaskan hunters that extended
8 the moose hunt in those units for five days in the fall
9 and 15 days in the winter.

9

10 Thank you, Madame Chair.

11

12 MS. PITKA: Thank you for your
13 comments. Right now we're at the InterAgency Staff
14 Committee comments.

15

16 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair
17 and members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine. And
18 for Wildlife Closure Review 22-05 the InterAgency Staff
19 Committee provided the standard comment.

20

21 Thank you, Madame Chair.

22

23 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much. I
24 appreciate that. We are at Board discussion with
25 Council Chairs and State Liaison.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello.

28

29 MS. PITKA: Hi, Tony. Right now we're
30 at Board discussion and deliberation on WCR22-05.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
33 Rhonda.

34

35 MS. PITKA: I wasn't hearing any so our
36 next step would be Federal Subsistence Board action and
37 now you're online so you can take this over.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
42 Rhonda, appreciate it. Board action is -- the table is
43 open for Board action.

44

45 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, the Fish and
46 Wildlife Service moves to maintain status quo for
47 Wildlife Closure Review 22-05 which keeps Unit 9C
48 closed to the taking of moose except by Federally-
49 qualified subsistence users. Following a second I will
50

0273

1 explain why I intend to support my motion.

2

3

MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

4

5

MS. BOARIO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6

Moose densities within Unit 9C closure area remain low and the population trend is uncertain. Maintaining the closure as supported by the Bristol Bay Council will continue to provide a conservative approach until moose densities increase continues to provide a subsistence opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users.

10

11

12

13

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, very much. Appreciate that. Any questions, comments or discussion from the Board.

16

17

18

19

(No comments)

20

21

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question.

22

23

24

MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

25

26

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All in favor of the motion say aye.

27

28

29

IN UNISON: Aye.

30

31

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same sign.

32

33

34

(No opposing votes)

35

36

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, motion carries unanimously. Sue, please call on the Staff for the next WP proposal analysis.

37

38

39

40

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

So that concludes the Bristol Bay non-consensus items, now we're moving into the YKDelta and we'll start with WP22-44 presented by Tom Plank.

42

43

44

45

MR. PLANK: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Tom Plank and I am a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management. And I will be presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-44 submitted by the

46

47

48

49

50

1 Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuge requesting that the fall
2 moose season in the Kuskokwim hunt area of Unit 18 be
3 extended from September 1st through the 30th, to
4 September 1st to October 15th, and that a may be
5 announced season be established from December 1st to
6 January 31st with a harvest limit of one antlered bull
7 by Federal registration permit. This is beginning on
8 Page 1063 of your book.

9
10 The proponent states that the average
11 moose harvest since 2017 for the RM615 hunt within Zone
12 2 has been 78 moose, which is below the quota of 110
13 moose. The proponent further states that extending the
14 season in Zone 2, which is predominately Federal public
15 lands, will allow for additional hunting opportunities
16 for Federally-qualified subsistence users and the
17 announcement of a may be announced winter season would
18 allow the harvest of any remaining fall quota.

19
20 Federal public lands in the Kuskokwim
21 hunt area have been closed to non-Federally-qualified
22 users since 1991. Between 2004 and 2008 the Federal
23 Subsistence Board and State Board of Game enacted a
24 harvest moratorium to promote growth of the Unit 18
25 moose population. Since 2009 moose harvest in the
26 Kuskokwim hunt area has been managed by quotas. And in
27 2017 ADF&G and the Yukon Delta Refuge began managing
28 this hunt in two zones. Zone 1 is primarily non-
29 Federal lands and quotas are set by ADF&G. Users can
30 easily access Zone 1 by boat along the main stems of
31 the Kuskokwim River and quotas are quickly met. Zone 2
32 is primarily Federal lands and the Yukon Delta Refuge
33 sets quotas. Zone 2 is much more difficult to access
34 and quotas are not usually met.

35
36 For regulatory year 2020/21 emergency
37 special action request, WSA20-05 extended the season
38 seven days.

39
40 Of note, the Alaska Board of Game
41 extended the State season in Zone 2 until October 15th
42 at their January 2021 meeting through adoption of
43 Proposal 7 as amended. The extended close date of
44 October 15th was recently updated and enacted for the
45 2021/22 season and Wildlife Special Action WSA21-03 was
46 approved by the Board in August 2021 which extended the
47 fall moose season to October 15th in Zone 2 to align in
48 2021/22 season with the current State regulations.

1 During the 1990s moose populations in
2 the Kuskokwim River drainage were low and hunting
3 pressure limited growth of the population. The 2004 to
4 2008 moratorium was effective in establishing a
5 harvestable population and since then the moose
6 population has continued to grow. Currently ADF&G
7 estimates 4,000 moose in the Kuskokwim hunt area which
8 exceeds population objectives. Bull/cow ratios are
9 high as are cow/calf ratios, which indicate a growing
10 moose population.

11
12 Since 2011 reported harvest has
13 averaged 183 moose per year, although harvest has
14 increased as the moose population and, therefore,
15 harvest quotas have increased. Federally-qualified
16 subsistence users account for 95 percent of the moose
17 harvested and demand far exceeds moose availability.

18
19 As previously mentioned ADF&G and the
20 Yukon Delta Refuge cooperatively manage the Kuskokwim
21 hunt areas in two zones. Prior to adopting a fixed
22 season, quotas in Zone 1 were quickly met and seasons
23 closed early by State emergency order. Under the fixed
24 season, Zone 1 was open for 11 days in 2020 and open
25 for nine days in 2021. However, since 2017 average
26 harvest in Zone 2 has only been 78 moose, which is well
27 below the quota of 110 moose. Harvest from 2019 to
28 2020 when the season was extended seven days and a
29 harvest increase of 20 percent with 90 moose harvested
30 in 2020. This could be an indication that the season
31 extension was effective for 2020. Zone 2 consists of
32 tributaries to the Kuskokwim River and requires
33 specialized boats to access as well as longer travel
34 times and more fuel. The unmet quota in Zone 2 is
35 likely a function of difficulties in access rather than
36 the lack of need for moose meat.

37
38 If WP22-44 is adopted, the moose season
39 in the Kuskokwim hunt area of Unit 18 would be extended
40 15 days closing October 15th instead of September 30th
41 and a winter season would be announced if the fall
42 harvest quota was not met. This would increase hunting
43 opportunities for Federally-qualified subsistence users
44 and could increase total moose harvest in the area. If
45 water levels are too low in the fall to access Zone 2 a
46 winter season could be announced providing easier
47 access via snowmachine which would also address the
48 concerns expressed in WP22-43. Alternatively if the
49 harvest quota is met in the fall then the Yukon Delta
50

0276

1 National Wildlife Refuge Manager would not announce a
2 winter season.

3
4 The OSM's conclusion is to support
5 Proposal WP22-44 with modification to clarify the
6 regulatory language and to delegate authority to the
7 Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge Manager to
8 announce the winter season via delegation of authority
9 letter only.

10
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
12 Board.

13
14 I'd be happy to field any questions.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.
17 Any questions from the Board.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Did
22 we receive any public comment during this proposal.

23
24 MR. PLANK: This is Tom Plank with the
25 OSM again. There were no written public comments
26 submitted. Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.
29 With that we'll move on to the Operator. Is there
30 anybody online who would like to be recognized at this
31 time to provide public comment for this agenda item.

32
33 OPERATOR: As a reminder to ask a
34 question or comment please press, star, one.

35
36 (Pause)

37
38 OPERATOR: No questions over the phone
39 at this time.

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
42 We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council Chair
43 recommendation.

44
45 MS. PATTON: Good afternoo -- good
46 morning, Mr. Chair, and members of the Board. This is
47 Eva Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim
48 Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and I will
49 be providing the Council's recommendation on behalf of
50

0277

1 Chair Raymond Oney.

2

3

4 The YKDelta RAC supports WP22-44.
5 Moose harvest quotas for Zone 2 of the Kuskokwim hunt
6 area are often not met due to difficulty in reaching
7 upper river tributaries of this area. Extending the
8 fall season may allow for easier access when water
9 levels rise with the fall rains. Also, moose are not
10 moving around as much with warmer temperatures.....

11

12 (Teleconference interference -
13 participants not muted)

14

15 MS. PATTON:in the early season.
16 The Council has heard requests from local communities
17 and tribes in this area that an extended season would
18 give hunters a better opportunity to be successful.
19 The winter, may be announced season, will also help
20 subsistence users meet their moose harvest needs if the
21 harvest quota is not met during the fall hunt.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Eva.
26 Any questions from the Board.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Are there any
31 other Regional Advisory Council Chairs who would like
32 to speak to this.

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff, Western
35 Interior Regional Advisory Council.

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
38 floor, Jack.

39

40 MR. REAKOFF: So Western Interior
41 Regional Advisory Council opposed Proposal WP22-43 and
42 we support 22-44. The reason we opposed WP22-43 is
43 access to Zone 1 is easy and the quotas are met
44 rapidly. The Council is also concerned about the
45 really low bull/cow ratios. The Council believes the
46 moose population in Zone 1 can't support additional
47 harvest.

48

49 We support WP22-44 because by December
50 -- December 15th, 60 percent of moose have lost their

0278

1 antlers, timing for the announced hunt should consider
2 this information. The Council supported the proposal,
3 as submitted, to align with the Yukon Delta Regional
4 Advisory Council's recommendation. Western Interior
5 deliberated a winter hunt proposal with the State Board
6 of Game and we were informed by Glenn Stout, Area
7 Biologist for the Koyukuk that 60 percent of bull moose
8 have lost antler by December 15th, and that's a
9 consideration in this winter hunt opening date.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
14 Jack. Any questions for Jack.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any other
19 Regional Advisory Council wish to speak to this.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
24 Hearing none, we'll move on to the tribal, Alaska
25 Native Corporation comments. Orville.

26

27 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
28 Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the
29 consultation session there were no comments or
30 recommendations on Wildlife Proposal 22-44.

31

32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
35 Orville. We'll go ahead and move on to Alaska
36 Department of Fish and Game. Mr. Mulligan.

37

38 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
39 record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports the
40 aspect of the proposal that would align the Federal and
41 State fall moose season but opposes the proposed winter
42 season. We do recognize that the moose population in
43 the Kuskokwim hunt area continues to increase, however
44 additional opportunity for a winter hunt has the
45 potential to increase harvest to a level that would
46 decrease bull to cow ratios quickly and curbing that
47 positive trend in the population.

48

49 Thank you, sir.

50

0279

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.
2 Ben. We'll go ahead and move on to InterAgency Staff
3 Committee comments.

4
5 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
6 This is Robbin LaVine. The InterAgency Staff Committee
7 provided the following comment.

8
9 Adoption of Proposal 22-40 [sic] would
10 provide additional harvest opportunity for Federally-
11 qualified subsistence users through the extension of
12 the fall moose season in the Kuskokwim hunt area of
13 Unit 18 from September 1st through 30th to September
14 1st through October 15th, and a winter may be announced
15 season will be established from December 1st through
16 January 31st with a harvest limit of one antlered bull
17 by Federal registration permit.

18
19 The winter hunt will not increase the
20 quota and, instead, will potentially allow for the
21 current quota to be met. Additional harvest opportunity
22 is warranted given the current quota was not met in
23 2020 and 2021 during the fall moose hunt in Zone 2
24 despite extending the season into October by special
25 action. Therefore, a winter season was proposed by the
26 Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge allowing
27 additional harvest opportunity may help to meet the
28 quota in Zone 2, which is primarily Federal public
29 lands and it's difficult -- which is difficult to
30 access and in an area where quotas have not been met.

31
32 Residents of the Yukon Kuskokwim region
33 have repeatedly expressed a need for additional hunts.
34 In addition the caribou season has been closed for the
35 last two years in the local area which has placed an
36 additional burden on subsistence users. After the mid-
37 2000 moose hunting moratorium the U.S. Fish and
38 Wildlife Service along with partner agencies promised
39 more hunting opportunities once the moose population
40 increased. This hunt proposal is an effort to fulfill
41 those promises.

42
43 The InterAgency Staff Committee
44 recognizes the support of this proposal from the Yukon
45 Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council and the
46 suggestion by the Western Interior Regional Advisory
47 Council to consider the timing of the winter, may be
48 announced season, with respect to when moose shed their
49 antlers. The Refuge manager already has delegated
50

0280

1 authority to establish an annual quota and to close the
2 season once the quota is met. The fall hunt requires
3 the use of a State registration permit under Federal
4 regulations. The adoption of this proposal would
5 require the creation and issuance of a Federal
6 registration permit for the winter season. Delegating
7 this additional authority to the in-season manager to
8 announce the winter season would provide management
9 flexibility and simpli -- simplify unit-specific
10 regulations.

11

12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
15 Robbin. Any questions for ISC.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
20 open the floor for Board discussion with Council Chairs
21 or State Liaison.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
26 we'll open up the floor for Federal Board action on
27 this agenda item.

28

29 MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, the U.S. Fish
30 and Wildlife Service moves to adopt Wildlife Proposal
31 22-44 as modified by OSM. Following a second I will
32 explain why I intend to support my motion.

33

34 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, second.

35

36 MS. BOARIO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
37 Chair. I intend to support my motion to extend the
38 fall moose season in the Kuskokwim hunt area of Unit 18
39 from September 1 to 30, to September 1 to October 15
40 and that a may be announced season be established from
41 December 1 through January 31 with a harvest limit of
42 one antlered bull by Federal registration permit.
43 Adoption of this proposal will offer additional
44 subsistence harvest opportunity to Federally-qualified
45 users with more harvest opportunities in Zone 2 of the
46 Kuskokwim hunt area by extending the fall season for
47 easier access when water levels rise with the fall
48 rains. Also moose are not moving around as much with
49 warmer temperatures early in the season. We support
50

0281

1 the modification by OSM to delegate authority to the
2 Yukon Delta National Wildlife manager to announce the
3 winter season. The manager already has delegated
4 authority to set quotas. While the Council supported
5 the proposal as originally submitted without the OSM
6 modification, the ability of the manager to open a
7 winter, may be announced hunt, provides a tool for
8 managers to use to provide additional opportunity for
9 Federally-qualified subsistence users. A bulls only
10 hunt will alleviate concern for overharvest of the
11 population especially when current quotas are not being
12 met.

13

14 This proposal provides additional
15 subsistence opportunity while taking measures to ensure
16 conservation when needed.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
21 Board comments, questions or discussion.

22

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
27 question.

28

29 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All those in
32 favor of the motion say aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed same
37 sign.

38

39 (No opposing votes)

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
42 unanimously, thank you. Sue, can we move on to the
43 next one please.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Wildlife Proposal
46 22-45 also presented by Tom Plank.

47

48 MR. PLANK: Hello, again, Mr. Chair and
49 members of the Board. For the record my name's Tom

50

1 Plank, I'm a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of
2 Subsistence Management. I will be presenting a summary
3 of the analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-45 submitted
4 by ADF&G requesting to create specific harvest
5 regulations for Alaska hare in Units 18, 22 and 23.
6 And this is starting on Page 1094 in your books.
7

8 The proponent states that the once
9 abundant Alaska hare in Units 18, 22 and 23 is now at a
10 very low density and has a patchy distribution
11 throughout the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Seward Peninsula
12 and Northwest Arctic Alaska -- Northwest Alaska region.
13 The Alaska hare is sometimes called jackrabbits, Tundra
14 hare, or Arctic hare. The Alaska hare is called the
15 Tundra hare in Federal regulations, but Alaska hare
16 appears to be the dominant term in contemporary usage
17 including in State regulations. The Alaska hare is a
18 different species than the snowshoe hare despite being
19 lumped together in Federal regulations. And you can
20 see the comparison chart table on Page 1100.
21

22 Federal subsistence regulations for the
23 hares in Unit 18 and 23 have not changed since 1990
24 when the Federal Subsistence Management Program began.
25 At that time, a year-round season with no harvest limit
26 was adopted from State regulation. Federal subsistence
27 regulations for hare in Unit 22 were established in
28 1990 and in 1995 the Board adopted a proposal to
29 shorten the season for hares in Unit 22 from July 1st
30 to June 30th to September 1st to April 15th with intent
31 to close the season for hares during the mating,
32 breeding and birthing seasons. ADF&G submitted
33 Proposal 15 and 43 for the Alaska Board of Game's
34 consideration during the January 2020 meeting noting
35 very low densities and patchy distribution of Alaska
36 hares in the units. ADF&G requested the reduction of
37 season and harvest limits in Units 18, and 22 and for
38 consistency the Board of Game adopted an identical
39 management structure in Unit 18, 22 and 23 for the
40 Alaska hare consisting of a harvest limit of two per
41 day with a total of six per season and an August 1st to
42 May 31st season that required hunters to salvage the
43 hide or meat for human usage.
44

45 Alaska hares are among the most poorly
46 understood game species in Alaska. Anecdotally,
47 abundance is well below historical levels throughout
48 the range of the species. In 2018 ADF&G initiated a
49 multi-year study to evaluate movement and mortality as
50

0283

1 well as long-term capture techniques.

2

3 Little is known about the harvest of
4 Alaska hare. Household surveys -- household harvest
5 surveys indicate that it is harvested throughout the
6 communities of western and the southwestern Alaska.

7

8 If this proposal is adopted the Alaska
9 hare season will be reduced, although hunters will
10 still have the opportunity to harvest hares during
11 winter when they are out engaging in other subsistence
12 or recreational activities. The change in daily and
13 overall harvest limits may be effective in reducing
14 harvest, which could translate into an improvement in
15 the conservation status of these populations.

16

17 Any positive effects these changes have
18 on the Alaska hare populations will benefit subsistence
19 users in the long-term despite the immediate reduction
20 in subsistence opportunity.

21

22 The proponent requested a season which
23 would be more restrictive than exist in State
24 regulations. If adopted, as requested, Federally-
25 qualified subsistence users would still be able to
26 harvest Alaska hare in August and May under State
27 regulations.

28

29 So the OSM conclusion is to support
30 Proposal WP22-45 with a modification to shorten the
31 season to August 1st to May 31st and to modify the
32 definition of hare in Federal regulation.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
35 Board.

36

37 I'd be happy to field any questions.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.
40 Any questions for Tom.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Hearing
45 none, any public comment received during this proposal
46 Tom.

47

48 MR. PLANK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
49 is, again, Tom Plank with OSM. There were no written
50

0284

1 comments received for this proposal.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom.
At this time is there any public online that would like
to be recognized at this time. This is their time to
be recognized for this.

7

8

9

10

(Pause)

11

12

13

14

15

16

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
hearing no public online, I'm going to go ahead and
call for a few minute break before we get to the
Regional Advisory Council. We'll go ahead and take a
few minute break here and reconvene at 11:00 o'clock.

17

18

Thank you.

19

20

(Off record)

21

22

(On record)

23

24

25

26

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll go ahead
and make sure, Sue, that we do have a quorum and we're
ready to get started. Thank you.

27

28

29

30

MS. DETWILER: Okay. This is Sue
Detwiler. I'll just quickly go through the -- and make
sure we have a quorum of the Board members.

31

32

Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

33

34

35

MS. CREACHBAUM: I am present, Sue.
Thank you.

36

37

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

38

39

BLM, Tom Heinlein.

40

41

MR. HEINLEIN: Present.

42

43

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

44

45

Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

46

47

MS. BOARIO: Present.

48

49

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

50

0285

1 Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

2

3 MR. SCHMID: I'm here, Sue.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

6

7 BIA, Gene Peltola.

8

9 MR. CHEN: Hi, Sue, this is Glenn Chen.
10 Gene is just right outside the conference room, he'll
11 be back in shortly.

12

13 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

14

15 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

16

17 MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm here.

18

19 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

20

21 Public Member Charlie Brower.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 MS. DETWILER: And, Chair Anthony
26 Christianson. It looks like we have seven out of eight
27 on.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
30 We'll go ahead and get back to the order of business,
31 we were just concluding public testimony online and now
32 we have a series of RAC that will be up next and so
33 we'll call on the first RAC, you have the floor.

34

35 OPERATOR: Okay, this is the Operator,
36 one moment and I'll get us connected.

37

38 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 Members of the Board. This is Eva, are you able to
40 hear me?

41

42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
43 the floor.

44

45 MS. PATTON: Okay, thank you. Thank
46 you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. This is Eva
47 Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim
48 Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and I will
49 be providing the Council's recommendation on behalf of
50

0286

1 Chair Raymond Oney.

2

3

4 The YKDelta RAC supports WP22-45 with
5 the OSM modification. The Council supports reducing
6 the harvest limit for Alaska hare due to observed low
7 population levels and lack of biological data for the
8 species. The Council discussed seeing few jackrabbits,
9 which they're called locally in the YKDelta region,
10 referring to Alaska hare, that they see few Alaska
11 hare, jackrabbit tracks anymore in the areas where they
12 used to be abundant and the decline has been a common
13 observation around communities across the YKDelta
14 region. Council members noted that Alaska hare used to
15 be abundant in snares around 30 years but perhaps fast
16 moving snowmachines made it easier to track them down
17 and based on these local observations reducing the
18 harvest limit now is warranted.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

The Council requested more data but noted it is hard to study something when it is so scarce and the Council supports the OSM season date and modification so that the Federal season will not be more restrictive than the State season.

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Sue, would you call on the next RAC, thank you.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. DETWILER: Yes. We have four additional Regional Councils that may wish to comment and the next one would be Seward Peninsula.

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chair and members of the Board. For the record, my name is Nissa Pilcher, Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Council. I'll be speaking on their behalf.

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. PILCHER: All right. The Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council voted to support as modified by OSM. The Council supports this proposal for the conservation of the Alaska hare as the population has been reported as low.

47

48

49

50

Thank you.

0287

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: The next Council would
4 be Western Interior.

5

6 MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff, Western
7 Interior Regional Advisory Council. We deferred this
8 proposal to the regions that would have Alaska hare.
9 So I misstated last night last regarding these
10 proposals -- I was cooking dinner, so, sorry -- and
11 that's what the Council decided to do.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 MS. DETWILER: Northwest Arctic.

16

17 MS. MCDAVID: Mr. Chair. For the
18 record, Brooke McDavid, Northwest Arctic Council
19 Coordinator. The Northwest Arctic Council supported
20 WP22-45. The Council noted that they have not seen the
21 Alaska hare in the region recently. People used to
22 teach their young children to hunt them since they were
23 easy to catch. The Council supports maintaining the
24 opportunity to still harvest some Alaska hare when they
25 are available. They are good eating and providing
26 subsistence opportunities to help address food security
27 is important.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: And the North Slope.

32

33 MS. PATTON: Good morning, Mr. Chair
34 and members of the Board. This is Eva Patton, Council
35 Coordinator for the North Slope Subsistence Regional
36 Advisory Council. And Chairman Gordon Brower is not
37 able to connect at the moment so I will provide their
38 recommendation.

39

40 The North Slope Subsistence Regional
41 Advisory Council supports WP22-45 with modification to
42 change the harvest limit for Alaska hare to 15 per
43 season and support the longer season as recommended by
44 OSM.

45

46 And the Council supported a reduction
47 in harvest and seasons to help conserve the Alaska hare
48 but expressed concern that only six Alaska hares per
49 year is not enough for making traditional cultural

50

0288

1 garments like parkas or blankets and the Council
2 considered going from a no limit on the hare to six per
3 year as too drastic of a change, but that that perhaps
4 15 hares per year would provide for subsistence needs
5 as well as conservation. Hares are an important
6 resource for food security and traditional cultural fur
7 sewing practices. The Council highlighted the
8 importance of making fur parkas, mittens and ruffs,
9 especially for children and elders. March is the
10 optimum time to harvest hare for their fur and making
11 the longer season in the OSM preliminary conclusion as
12 preferred.

13

14 The Council did also stress that
15 because Alaska hare are not commonly seen in the North
16 Slope region or specifically around Point Hope in Unit
17 23 that there is likely confusion between Alaska hare
18 versus snowshoe hare and the Council reiterated the
19 importance of making it very clear that these
20 regulations are targeting Alaska hare only and not the
21 more abundant snowshoe hare. They suggested using
22 pictures and range maps to highlight the differences
23 between the two species so that the local communities
24 aren't unnecessarily restricting harvest of an
25 important subsistence resource where snowshoe hares are
26 plentiful.

27

28 And their suggested modifications can
29 be found on Page 1106 requesting the two hare per day,
30 15 per season, and, again, in support of the OSM
31 modification for a longer season.

32

33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, those were
36 the Councils that made recommendations. Thank you.

37

38 (Pause)

39

40 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, I'm not sure
41 whether you have dropped off again or if Rhonda Pitka's
42 on. I think that would move us to the next stage of
43 tribal, Alaska Native Corporation comments.

44

45 Are you on, Mr. Chair.

46

47 MS. PITKA: I'm on Sue. Let's go to
48 Regional Advisory Council comments.

49

50

0289

1 MS. DETWILER: Oh, sorry, Rhonda, yeah,
2 I think I misspoke. We just finished with the five
3 Regional Advisory Council recommendations and we're
4 ready to go to the tribal corp -- tribal and Alaska
5 Native Corporation comments.

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.

8
9 MS. PITKA: I'm sorry, I misheard that
10 also. Okay, tribal and Alaska Native comments.
11 Orville Lind.

12
13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: And I'm back on
14 now too.

15
16 MR. LIND: Thank you, Madame Chair.
17 Orville Lind, Native Liaison for OSM. During the
18 consultation sessions we had no comments or
19 recommendations on that proposal.

20
21 Thank you, Madame Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Can you guys
24 hear me, Sue?

25
26 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

27
28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, I tried
29 to speak a couple of times and you guys weren't hearing
30 me. Thank you. Sorry about that. We'll move on to
31 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

32
33 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
35 supports this proposal and also supports the
36 modification to match the State season of August 1st to
37 May 31st as it still addresses the conservation
38 concerns we have and that local residents have also
39 expressed along the way and while aligning the State
40 and Federal regulations to reduce hunter confusion.

41
42 Thank you, sir.

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
45 We'll move on to ISC Committee comments.

46
47 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48 This is Robbin LaVine. And for this proposal the
49 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard
50

0290

1 comment.

2

3

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Robbin. We'll move on to the Board discussion with the
Council Chairs, State Liaison.

7

8

9

(No comments)

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
we'll open up the floor for Board action on this
proposal.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. BOARIO: Mr. Chair, the U.S. Fish
and Wildlife Service moves to adopt Wildlife Proposal
22-45 as modified by OSM to establish specific seasons
and harvest limits for Alaska hare in Units 18, 22 and
23. Following a second I will explain why I intend to
support my motion.

22

23

MR. PELTOLA: BIA, second.

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MS. BOARIO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
Chair. I intend to support my motion to establish
specific seasons and harvest limits for Alaska hare in
Units 18, 22, and 23 in deference to the Yukon
Kuskokwim Delta and Seward Peninsula RACs. The
analysis presents evidence for the need to establish
specific regulations for Alaska hare in these units
distinct from those for snowshoe hare.

33

34

35

36

37

Local knowledge indicates a reduction
in the amount of Alaska hares over the recent years.
Reducing the amount of harvest is a biological
appropriate means of aiding population recovery.

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Finally, OSM's modification to put the
definition of hare in Federal regulations will clarify
any confusion that may arise from the use of different
terms referring to Alaska hare such as Tundra hare.

0291

1 The YKDelta RAC supports reducing the
2 harvest for Alaska hare due to observed low population
3 levels and the Seward Peninsula RAC supports
4 conservation of the Alaska hare. This population has
5 been reported as low. And we recognize the North Slope
6 Council's request that we make it very clear that these
7 regulations are targeting Alaska hare only and not the
8 snowshoe hare which is more abundant in that region.

9
10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Is
13 there any further Board discussion, comments or
14 questions on this.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, we'll
19 call for the question.

20
21 MR. PELTOLA: Question, BIA.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
24 We'll go ahead and do roll call on this one, Sue.
25 Thank you.

26
27 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. Mr.
28 Chair, the motion is to adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-45
29 as modified by OSM. I'll start with Sara Boario, Fish
30 and Wildlife Service.

31
32 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
33 supports the motion.

34
35 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Sara.

36
37 BIA, Gene Peltola.

38
39 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports for reasons
40 previously articulated in the motion.

41
42 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

43
44 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

45
46 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
47 supports.

48
49 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

50

0292

1 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

2

3 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

6

7 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

8

9 MR. SCHMID: Forest Service supports.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

12

13 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

14

15 MS. PITKA: I support, thank you.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

18

19 Public Member Charlie Brower.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MS. DETWILER: Chair Anthony

24 Christianson.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I support.

27

28 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, thank you. So the
29 vote passes -- motion passes with seven votes and one
30 -- one person not present.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
33 We'll go ahead and move on to the next wildlife
34 proposal and call on the Staff to present.

35

36 Thank you.

37

38 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. So
39 we're moving out of the YKDelta into Western Interior
40 and the first -- the one proposal is WP22-46 presented
41 by Tom Plank.

42

43 MR. PLANK: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
44 of the Board. My name is Tom Plank, I'm a Wildlife
45 Biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management. I
46 will be presenting a summary of the analysis for
47 Wildlife Proposal WP22-46 submitted by the Gates of the
48 Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
49 requesting that brown bear harvest limits for the
50

1 portion of Unit 24B within Gates of the Arctic National
2 Park be increased from one bear to two bears. And this
3 one would be found in your first volume of the
4 consensus on Page 361.

5
6 The proponent submitted this proposal
7 because residents have observed brown bear populations
8 growing and believe the harvest to be far below
9 sustainable year -- yield. The Commission states that
10 the proposal would afford Anaktuvuk Pass residents
11 hunting brown bear additional harvest opportunities.

12
13 In 2020 the Alaska Board of Game
14 adopted Proposal 72 at their March 2020 meeting to
15 increase the brown bear harvest limit to two bears in
16 Unit 24B under State regulations. The Commission also
17 submitted Wildlife Proposal WP22-56 to increase the
18 brown bear harvest limit to two bears in Unit 26A, that
19 portion within the Gates of the Arctic National Park.
20 Using the extrapolated data from similar habitats and
21 units, the estimated brown bear population for the
22 northern portion of Unit 24 and southern portion of
23 Unit 24 are 450 bears and 180 to 320 bears
24 respectfully. Gates of the Arctic National Park has an
25 estimated density of 33.4 bears per 1,000 kilometers.
26 The units brown bear population is thought to be stable
27 or slowly increasing, however, reproductive output for
28 Gates of the Arctic is among the lowest in Alaska,
29 limited food resources and a short growing season are
30 likely a contributing factors to this pattern.

31
32 The three year mean reported harvest is
33 15 bears, including 14 bears harvested on average in
34 the northern portion of the unit and one bear in the
35 southern portion. 51 percent of the harvest was by
36 Alaska residents. The total estimated harvest has
37 consistently been below two percent of the estimated
38 bear population per year. This harvest rate is well
39 below the State management objective and sustainable
40 harvest rate is estimated at five to six percent of the
41 estimated bear population per year or 39 of 56 bears
42 per year could be sustained for all of Unit 24.

43
44 If adopted, this proposal would align
45 Federal regulations within Gates of the Arctic National
46 Park with State harvest limits which would simplify
47 regulations and lead to less confusion for users in
48 Unit 24B. Current harvest rates are well below the
49 State recommended sustainable harvest for Unit 24.

0294

1 Alaska residents can already harvest two bears in Unit
2 24B under State regulations. Adoption of this proposal
3 is not expected to have a substantial impact to current
4 harvest levels and should have minimal impact to the
5 brown bear population given the low level of harvest in
6 the area but would increase harvest opportunities for
7 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

8

9 The OSM's conclusion is to support
10 WP22-46.

11

12 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
13 Board.

14

15 I'd be happy to field any questions.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
18 questions for Staff.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right. Any
23 public comments received during this proposal period.

24

25 MR. PLANK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26 Again, this is Tom Plank with OSM. There were three
27 written public comments, all opposing citing concerns
28 over low density and the low reproductive rates of
29 bears in the Gates of the Arctic National Park and
30 Preserve. The commenters are concerned of an increased
31 potential for overharvest.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
36 Operator, at this time if there is anybody online who
37 would like to speak to this proposal this is the
38 opportunity for them to speak to this agenda item.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 OPERATOR: As a reminder if you would
43 like to make a public testimony please press, star, one
44 at this time.

45

46 (Pause)

47

48 OPERATOR: No questions or comments on
49 the phone at this time.

50

0295

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
2 We'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council
3 recommendations.

4
5 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
6 Jack Reakoff, WIRAC.

7
8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
9 floor, Jack.

10
11 MR. REAKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 The Council deliberated this proposal, WP22-46 and the
13 Council states the brown bears are a vital subsistence
14 resource and especially in the Gates of the Arctic
15 Park, especially when the caribou aren't available, and
16 that brown bear population within the Gates of the
17 Arctic National Park is currently quite high and the
18 proposal provides additional subsistence opportunity.

19
20 I'm the Vice Chair of the Gates of the
21 Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission and the Gates of
22 the Arctic National Park is an 8.2 million acre Park.
23 And the primary and beneficiaries of this proposal
24 would be Anaktuvuk Pass. When we had a meeting in mid-
25 April of 2019 several people were stating that there
26 are a lot more brown bears around than there used to be
27 and that the caribou migrations have been coming later
28 and later. So there's -- the reason for an addi -- for
29 a two harvest bag limit because not all hunters
30 harvest, there's specific hunters that actually will
31 target brown bears and know how to skin them and how to
32 cut them and like to eat the meat and there's hunters
33 that don't. It's not like everybody in Anaktuvuk's
34 going to be hunting these bears but it did give the --
35 would give the people who do do the hunting share this
36 meat throughout the community additional harvest
37 opportunity. And so the Gates of the Arctic
38 Subsistence Resource Commission submitted the proposal
39 for the community.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
44 Jack. Appreciate that. And we will take a second here
45 to take a step back, we did have one public comment
46 online and at this time, Operator, if you want to make
47 that line available for them we will give them an
48 opportunity to testify today.

49
50

0296

1 Thank you.

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 OPERATOR: Bill, your line is open.

6

7 MR. SHERWONIT: Okay, thank you. My
8 name is Bill Sherwonit. I've spoken to you a couple
9 times. I'm happy to have a chance to talk. I've been
10 following the discussions today. I live in Anchorage,
11 Alaska and I am not a -- I do not practice a
12 subsistence lifestyle, I am not a hunter. However, I
13 would like to speak a few words on behalf of brown
14 bears or grizzlies that inhabit Gates of the Arctic
15 National Park. Although I'm speaking here for Proposal
16 46, I -- this will also apply for Proposal 22-56. I
17 will not be able to be around but you can apply my
18 comments to that proposal as well.

19

20 So I live in Anchorage. I have a long
21 relationship with Gates of the Arctic National Park
22 that goes back to the 1970s. Gates of the Arctic is --
23 and the Central Brooks Range. I was introduced --
24 obviously that was before the -- the '70s was before
25 there was a Gates of the Arctic National Park but the
26 Central Brooks Range and then later Gates of the
27 Arctic, are one of the special places in my life. I
28 have a special relationship and -- and one of the --
29 with the wilderness. And in my -- I've had encounters
30 with grizzly bears a number of times during my times up
31 in the Brooks Range and in Gates of the Arctic National
32 Park and I'm presenting the perspective of someone for
33 whom grizzly bears enliven the landscape and enrich my
34 experience.

35

36 So I am speaking in opposition to the
37 expansion of the hunt. And while you folks may not --
38 or you may wonder what my expertise is or why -- why
39 you should pay any attention to me, I will instead
40 refer to the fact that the InterAgency Staff Committee
41 spoke in opposition to this proposal and I would -- I
42 simply hope that your discussion will include the
43 perspectives of that Committee. While the Fish and
44 Game representative said that there are no problems
45 with -- no concerns about overharvest of the bear, in
46 fact, that Committee did express conservation concerns
47 for this brown bear partly because of the low
48 reproductive rate that was previously mentioned.

49

50

0297

1 I guess my argument is that I -- I
2 think based on the Committee's information and my own
3 limited -- admittedly limited perspective, I don't see
4 a need for an increase in the bear harvest and I would
5 say that the conservation concerns for brown bears or
6 grizzlies within Gates of the Arctic outweigh the need
7 for increased harvest by subsistence residents. I
8 would also point out that Gates of the Arctic National
9 Park has much different perspectives and values than
10 the State Department -- the Alaska Department of Fish
11 and Game. And the fact that the Alaska Board of Game
12 has approved such an increase in harvest is no rational
13 or no good reason for an expansion of the hunt within
14 Gates of the Arctic National Park.

15
16 So I guess that's all I have to say for
17 now. I -- I appreciate you hearing the perspectives of
18 someone who lives a long ways away from the area of
19 concern but as I've mentioned, and I really need to
20 emphasize that, though, I don't live there those --
21 those places and the animals that reside within them
22 have a special meaning to me.

23
24 And I thank you for your time.

25
26 OPERATOR: There are no further
27 comments or testimonies on the phone at this time.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. We
30 were on Regional Advisory Councils -- so, thank you for
31 taking the time to call in today. Are there any other
32 Regional Advisory Councils.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
37 none we'll go ahead and move on to tribal, Alaska
38 Native Corp comments.

39
40 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
41 Orville Lind, Native Liaison, OSM. There were no
42 comments or recommendations on Wildlife Proposal 22-46.

43
44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
47 We'll call on Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

48
49 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

0298

1 For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
2 supports this proposal. As previously stated,
3 Federally-qualified users can and do currently hunt
4 brown bears in the remainder of GMU 24B under the more
5 liberal State regulations. The Department estimated a
6 population of 450 bears in northern GMU 24 and a range
7 of 320 to 480 in the remainder of the unit. Based on
8 estimated sustainable harvest rates of five to six
9 percent within the GMU a minimum annual harvest of 39
10 to 56 bears can be sustained for all of the game
11 management unit. The three year mean harvest from
12 regulatory '16 to '18 in northern GMU 24B was 14 bears.
13 There has been one brown bear reported harvested in the
14 southern portion of GMU 24B during the same regulatory
15 period. Based on this harvest history, harvest is not
16 anticipated to increase to unsustainable levels.

17
18 And, as always, the Department has a
19 history of supporting the alignment of State and
20 Federal regulations to reduce user confusion.

21
22 Thank you, sir.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
25 Any questions for the State.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
30 to InterAgency Staff Committee.

31
32 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
33 InterAgency Staff Committee provided the following
34 comment for Wildlife Proposal 22-46.

35
36 While adoption of Proposal 22-46 would
37 provide additional opportunity for Federally-qualified
38 subsistence users conservation concerns also exist for
39 this brown bear population. Brown bear densities and
40 reproductive out put within Gates of the Arctic
41 National Park and Preserve are among the lowest in
42 Alaska. Limited food resources and a short growing
43 season are likely major factors contributing to these
44 demographic patterns. Based on a reported subsistence
45 use within the region there does not appear to be a
46 subsistence need to justify doubling the harvest limit
47 from one to two brown bears within Gates of the Arctic
48 portion of Game Management Unit 24B. According to
49 harvest survey reports within Anaktuvuk Pass, only four
50

0299

1 to 10 percent of households use brown bears and across
2 Game Management Unit 24, on average, only 15 bears were
3 harvested per year between 2016 and 2018 and, on
4 average, only half the harvest was by Alaska residents.

5
6 Reported brown bear harvest has
7 remained consistently low over the last 20 years, not
8 reflecting an increasing subsistence need and low
9 density and recruitment within the brown bear
10 population across GMU 24B increases the risk of
11 overharvest.

12
13 The ISC acknowledges the concerns for
14 the conservation of brown bear populations within Gates
15 of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. This
16 proposal contradicts the affected land management
17 agency's mission where harvesting predators is not
18 permitted when there is no documented subsistence
19 needs.

20
21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22
23 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair, this is
24 Chairman Reakoff.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
27 the floor, Jack.

28
29 MR. REAKOFF: In response to the
30 InterAgency Staff Committee. As I stated, and I
31 appreciate you recognizing that there's only a certain
32 -- certain households that harvest brown bears, four to
33 10 percent. That's exactly why we submitted this
34 proposal, because those households, with caribou coming
35 later and later every year, those households harvest
36 bears for basically a wider range of households than
37 that. They share this bear meat. The perception is
38 that brown bears are inedible, and that's a very common
39 misperception. Here in the upper drainages of the
40 Koyukuk River and Brooks Range, brown bears dig
41 (indiscernible) referred to as masso, and those roots
42 give -- impart the bear with a very mild flavor and
43 when bears are harvested in late fall they have a
44 really high fat content and fat is very valuable in the
45 subsistence economy. So the reality is there are
46 specific individuals that will utilize the additional
47 bag limit to harvest for the community, they're stating
48 to us that there's actually more bears and so there's
49 more bears arriving. So the bear population is very
50

0300

1 healthy, it's not that they're eliminating the bears
2 around the community for predation control, they're
3 looking for additional meat resources when they are
4 having hardship with caribou coming later in the year,
5 with migrations coming later.

6
7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
10 Jack. Any other questions, comments or Board
11 deliberation, this is the time.

12
13 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
16 floor, Gene.

17
18 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
19 I'm not sure who the author of the ISC comments were
20 but this comment is specifically for the author of the
21 comments written. I think an opposing statement is a
22 very strong statement and I would like to understand
23 how they came to this position, especially the part, it
24 says: When there is no documented subsistence need.
25 So I'd like to get clarification on that terminology
26 which is utilized and what led up to that statement.

27
28 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
31 Gene. I think that was a question for Staff.

32
33 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, BIA for
34 clarification. That was specifically addressed to the
35 author, not necessarily the ISC as a whole because the
36 ISC, as a whole, did not prepare that ISC comment, the
37 author of the statement, I'd like to have clarification
38 of how they determined there was no documented
39 subsistence need.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I was
44 just getting at, is the clarification for the question
45 and thank you, Gene. So that would be to the author of
46 the proposal [sic], thank you. Is someone from the ISC
47 available to contact the author to answer the question?
48 Thank you.

49
50

0301

1 MS. LAVINE: One moment, Mr. Chair,
2 this is Robbin LaVine, and I am the InterAgency Staff
3 Committee Chair. If you'll just pause for a moment we
4 may have someone who is able to respond to you.

5
6 (Pause)

7
8 MS. LAVINE: Regardless of authorship,
9 as you know, the InterAgency Staff Committee comes
10 together and reviews and edits these comments as a
11 group and so I'll just put that out there. And, thank
12 you, Mr. Chair.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
15 Robbin.

16
17 (Pause)

18
19 MS. LAVINE: And we do have an ISC
20 member on hand to respond to Board Member Peltola's
21 question. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22
23 MS. JOCHUM: Hello, this is Kim Jochum,
24 ISC member for the National Park Service. I'm happy to
25 respond to the question. So, yeah, we have information
26 or, you know, from -- from the past comm -- community
27 harvest surveys that were conducted over the years in
28 that region so that data is what was used for that
29 comment in the analysis overall. So there's no -- from
30 -- from our understanding and interpretation of the
31 data available there's no documented unmet subsistence
32 need or hasn't -- hasn't been in the past. Does that
33 help, thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

36
37 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Gene, you
40 have the floor.

41
42 MR. PELTOLA: I'm not totally pleased
43 with the response but if that's the best we can now I
44 thank you for the effort.

45
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
47 other Board questions, comments or deliberations for
48 this proposal, now is the time. Thank you, Staff.

49
50

0302

1 (No comments)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no more discussion we'll call for Federal Board action on this.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chairman, National Park Service.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the floor, thank you.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The National Park Service moves to adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-46 with the modification to only adopt this proposal for one full regulatory cycle, 2022 to 2024. Following a second I will explain why I intend to support my motion.

MS. PITKA: Second.

MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. Wildlife Proposal 22-46 requests that the brown bear harvest limit for that portion of Unit 24B within Gates of the Arctic National Park be increased from one to two bears. The analysis of this proposal points out the sensitive conservation status of this species. Brown bear densities with 33.4 bears per 1,000 square kilometers and reproductive output within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve are among the lowest in Alaska. Limited food resources and a short growing season are likely major factors contributing to these demographic patterns. According to harvest survey reports within Anaktuvuk Pass, only four to 10 percent of the households use brown bears. Additionally, across all of Unit 24 on Anaktuvuk -- oh, I'm sorry -- additionally across all of Unit 24, on average, only 15 bears were harvested per year between 2016 and 2018, and, on average, only half of the harvest occurred by Alaska residents. Although brown bear harvest has remained consistently low over the last few decades, low density and recruitment within the brown bear population across 24B increases the risk of overharvest.

We do recognize the hardship of our Subsistence Resource Commission submitting this proposal and supporting Western Interior Regional Advisory Council, therefore, although we do have a strong conservation concern for this species in that

0303

1 region we move to adopt this proposal for two years,
2 one full regulatory cycle only, to support these
3 identified immediate needs of the Gates of the Arctic
4 Subsistence Resource Commission and the Western
5 Interior Regional Advisory Council.

6
7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
10 other further questions or comments from the Board.

11
12 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
15 the floor, Gene.

16
17 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 Hearing the motion and looking at the total situation,
19 the proposal was submitted by the SRC and supported by
20 the Western Interior, I understand the Park Service's
21 concerns about potential for overharvest, therefore
22 their modification to one full regulatory cycle or two
23 years, although in supporting the motion I'm inclined
24 to support with a caveat and I'll explain why I'll have
25 my caveat, is that:

26
27 1. The current trajectory of caribou in
28 the region is not the greatest.

29
30 2. Bear can supplement a protein diet,
31 red meat -- utilizing red meat and if caribou aren't
32 available, bears is a species which can be utilized by
33 subsistence users.

34
35 Park Service lands are a bit more
36 restrictive than some other Federal conservation unit
37 -- Program lands with regards to subsistence harvest.
38 With that being said, I move to drop the previous
39 modification of one full year -- I mean one full
40 regulatory cycle or two years only.

41
42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43
44 MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, I'll second
45 that -- was that a motion.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So there's
48 a.....

49
50

0304

1 MR. PELTOLA: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:motion to
4 amend the original motion to the language included
5 there by Gene and seconded by Rhonda. Any further
6 discussion on the motion.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, this is Sue
9 Detwiler. I'm sorry, could someone state what the
10 motion with the modification is.

11

12 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, BIA. My
13 motion was to drop the temporary limitation of one
14 regulatory cycle or two years, and let the motion
15 proceed, if my modification is accepted to go through
16 as a permanent change to the regulations because there
17 are checks and balances within the Federal system to
18 address the concerns, I believe, of a conservation
19 agency.

20

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
22 Gene. Any other questions for Gene.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: There's been a
27 motion made and seconded to amend the original motion
28 to take off the language as stated. Any further
29 questions on the motion.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for
34 the.....

35

36 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair, question on the
37 amended motion.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
40 called. We'll do roll call on the motion to change the
41 original motion, Sue, please.

42

43 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Let's see, we'll
44 start with the maker of the original motion.

45

46 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park
47 Service.

48

49 MS. CREACHBAUM: The National Park

50

0305

1 Service opposes the modification to the National Park
2 Service's modification.

3

4 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

5

6 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

7

8 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service

9 is opposed.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

12

13 Gene Peltola, BIA.

14

15 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Tom Heinlein, BLM.

18

19 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM is opposed.

20

21 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

22

23 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

24

25 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service
26 supports the modification offered by BIA to the
27 original motion.

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

30

31 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

32

33 MS. PITKA: I support, thank you.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

36

37 Public Member Charlie Brower.

38

39 MR. BROWER: I support.

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

42

43 Chair Christianson.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Okay, so the motion
48 passes with five votes yea, three nay, and that is the
49 motion to amend to remove the time limit modification.

50

0306

1 So.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes. Okay,
4 then.....

5

6 MS. DETWILER:that motion has
7 passed so we would go back to the original proposal.

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, we'll go
10 back to the original motion at this time, with the
11 changed language of the modification that passed to
12 include dropping the modified language to what Gene
13 stated in this motion that passed, so now the original
14 motion shall read -- I'll have Staff read it and then
15 we'll go ahead and vote on it.

16

17 Thank you, Sue.

18

19 MR. LORD: Mr. Chair, you need a second
20 on it still.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, we didn't
23 have a second to the maker of the motion.

24

25 MR. LORD: No, sir.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So now we need
28 a second to the original motion since it was a modified
29 motion.

30

31 REPORTER: Yes, there was a second.

32

33 MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, I'll second
34 that motion, the main motion.

35

36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
37 Rhonda and thank you Ken for the process clarification.
38 Any further discussion on this proposal, as stated --
39 maybe for the record we can have the Staff read into
40 the record what the motion and that has now been
41 seconded. Thank you.

42

43 MS. DETWILER: Okay, Mr. Chair, I'll
44 take a stab at that. The motion is to adopt the
45 proposal as submitted.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Without
48 modifications, right?

49

50

0307

1 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

2

3

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. I
4 just wanted to get that on the record. Okay. And
5 we'll now go ahead and do roll call vote for the
6 original motion now to be reflective of the original
7 proposal. Thank you. Sue.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. And I'm
10 sorry but I can ask who -- who was the maker of that --
11 the original motion on this.

12

13 REPORTER: The Park Service.

14

15 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA. The
16 original motion was made by the National Park Service.
17 BIA made a motion to modify it and we're back -- and
18 now we're going back and voting.

19

20 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Okay, I got it,
21 right, so it goes, yeah, back to Park Service, I
22 understand thank you. So -- yeah, so starting with
23 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

24

25 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
26 opposes.

27

28 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

29

30 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service
31 supports.

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

34

35 Gene Peltola, BIA.

36

37 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports.

38

39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

40

41 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

42

43 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM opposes.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

46

47 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

48

49 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service

50

0308

1 supports.

2

3

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

4

5

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

6

7

MS. PITKA: I support, thank you.

8

9

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

10

11

Public Member Charlie Brower.

12

13

MR. BROWER: I support.

14

15

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

16

17

And, Chair Christianson.

18

19

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

20

21

MS. DETWILER: Thank you. The vote is six yeas and two nays and so the motion is adopted so the proposal passes as submitted.

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, thank you. Thank you, Staff. We'll go ahead and break at this time for lunch. I know we did have, yesterday, scheduled a time to be determined to look at a proposal we were looking at yesterday but I think what we will do just for the order of time today is just keep going as we are going and put that to the last on the agenda. If nobody objects to that we'll just give it as much time as we can and we will just continue on down the line and use that proposal as the last order of this agenda item.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

(No opposition)

37

38

39

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: So we'll come back at 1:30 and pick up where we're leaving off now. Thank you. Recess until 1:30.

40

41

42

(Off record)

43

44

(On record)

45

46

47

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Hello, Sue, I'm on.

48

49

50

0309

1 MS. DETWILER: Great, thank you. Mr.
2 Chair, I just want to confirm with Tina that the
3 recording has started now.

4
5 REPORTER: Sue, I am recording. Thank
6 you.

7
8 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. So Mr. Chair
9 we haven't gone through a roll call yet so I'll just
10 quickly go through and see which Board members are on.

11
12 Sarah Creachbaum from Park Service.

13
14 MS. CREACHBAUM: Good afternoon, Sue
15 and everyone, I'm here.

16
17 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

18
19 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

20
21 MR. HEINLEIN: Good afternoon, I'm on.

22
23 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

24
25 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara, I
26 heard you on, are you still on.

27
28 MS. BOARIO: Yep, I'm here Sue, thanks.

29
30 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

31
32 Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

33
34 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, good afternoon, Sue,
35 I'm here.

36
37 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

38
39 Gene Peltola, BIA.

40
41 MR. PELTOLA: Good afternoon all, BIA's
42 on board.

43
44 MS. DETWILER: Thanks Gene.

45
46 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50

0310

1 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie
2 Brower.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 MS. DETWILER: Chair Anthony
7 Christianson, I just heard you. So it looks like we
8 have six of eight Board members on right now.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, Sue,
11 we'll just give everybody another minute or two and
12 hope they chime in.

13
14 (Pause)

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, Sue, I
17 think Charlie was going to be a little bit late this
18 afternoon so maybe if we could just check and see if
19 Rhonda's on.

20
21 (Pause)

22
23 MS. DETWILER: Robbin, is there any way
24 to check with the Operator to see if Rhonda is in the
25 participants room and not able to get into the
26 speaker's cue.

27
28 OPERATOR: Hello, this is the Operator.
29 So I don't see anyone with the host passcode but,
30 Rhonda, if you are on and you have a guest passcode
31 please press star, zero.

32
33 (Pause)

34
35 OPERATOR: And, Rhonda, if you're on
36 please press star, zero.

37
38 (Pause)

39
40 OPERATOR: So it does not look like
41 she's joined the call yet.

42
43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
44 Operator.

45
46 (Pause)

47
48 OPERATOR: At this time I still don't
49 see a host passcode.

50

0311

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
2 Operator. Sue, we'll just give her another minute and
3 then we'll go ahead and get started. Thank you.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

6

7 (Pause)

8

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
10 we'll just go ahead and get started this afternoon.
11 Thank you for everybody coming back. Again, Sue, we'll
12 just check if she's on and then we'll get started with
13 the next order of business where we left off before
14 lunch.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
19 left off before lunch with a Western Interior proposal.
20 We completed that and now we're moving into the Seward
21 Peninsula proposals and wildlife closure reviews and we
22 will start out with Proposal WP22-47 which will be
23 presented by Brian Ubelaker.

24

25 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Can
26 everybody hear me all right?

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
29 the floor.

30

31 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. As
33 Sue said my name is Brian Ubelaker and I'm a Wildlife
34 Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I
35 will be giving you a summary of the analysis for
36 Wildlife Proposal WP22-47 which was submitted by the
37 Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group. And this
38 analysis begins on Page 1109 of your meeting books.

39

40 Proposal WP22-47 requests that caribou
41 calf harvest be permitted in Unit 22. The proponent
42 states that the intent of this proposal is to allow for
43 the harvest of orphaned calves and that this change
44 would align Federal and State regulations.

45

46 In 2016 the Board of Game established
47 the current registration permit hunt for caribou in
48 Unit 22 with a harvest limit of 20 caribou per year.
49 Then in 2018 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted

50

1 regulations to require a State registration permit for
2 Federal users in Unit 22. In January of 2020 the Board
3 of Game adopted a proposal to allow calf harvest in
4 Units 22, 23 and 26A. Also in 2020 the Federal
5 Subsistence Board established a year-round bull season
6 and allowed calf harvest in Unit 23. The justification
7 for this change to allow calf harvest was to permit the
8 taking of orphaned or injured calves.

9
10 Caribou calves of the Western Arctic
11 Caribou Herd are typically born in May or June, are
12 typically weaned by October and usually stay with their
13 mother for the first year of their life. If a calf is
14 orphaned after they are weaned they have a much greater
15 chance of survival than if they are orphaned before
16 they are weaned, provided they stay with the herd.

17
18 The current population estimate of
19 188,000 places the Western Arctic Caribou Herd in the
20 preservative declining management level as determined
21 by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group. Some
22 harvest recommendations of this level include no calf
23 harvest, limiting cow harvest by residents and
24 restricting harvest to residents only. Factors leading
25 to the declining population are not known for sure but
26 it is believed cow mortality and decreased calf
27 recruitment are factors.

28
29 Residents of Unit 22, on average,
30 account for 17 percent of the Western Arctic Caribou
31 Herd harvest. From 2016 to 2019 reported harvest
32 averaged 377 caribou per year, of which, 74 percent
33 were bulls and 26 percent were cows. It is unknown how
34 many cows have been harvested as that is not a
35 reportable category. The majority of Unit 22 harvest
36 occurs in the winter when caribou are found on the
37 Seward Peninsula.

38
39 If calf harvest is allowed it may
40 present a minimal conservation concern as most hunters
41 do not specifically target calves. However, it would
42 allow the harvest of orphaned calves who may die
43 otherwise. One consideration of this point is that it
44 is difficult to tell if a calf is orphaned or not as
45 caribou herds tend to be quite spread out. Orphaned
46 calves that stay with the herd are much more likely to
47 live than a single calf on its own. Adoption of this
48 proposal may also reduce wanton waste. It has been
49 mentioned at RAC meetings that rural residents have
50

0313

1 discovered calves that have been shot and left to lay
2 in the field. It is believed these were shot
3 mistakenly by hunters who realized too late their
4 unintended harvest and then left it in the field rather
5 than bringing back an illegal harvest and face
6 repercussions. This would also align Federal and State
7 regulations. Currently, Federal regulations are more
8 restrictive than State regulations.

9
10 Therefore, OSM's conclusion is to
11 support Proposal WP22-47.

12
13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14
15 I'd be happy to answer any questions
16 anyone may have.

17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
19 questions.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
24 any public comment received during this proposal.

25
26 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair. The
27 Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group submitted one
28 comment. At their December 15, 2021 they voted 15 to 2
29 in support of this proposal. Their intent behind
30 submitting it was to allow the harvest of calves who
31 would die because they are alone. This type of harvest
32 is already allowed on State land and on Federal land in
33 Unit 23 and this proposal will align Federal and State
34 regulations.

35
36 Thank you.

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
39 Operator, at this time is there any public online who
40 would like to speak to this proposal, now is the time
41 for them to speak to this agenda item.

42
43 OPERATOR: As a reminder -- thank you
44 -- as a reminder to ask a question please press star,
45 one.

46
47 (Pause)

48
49 OPERATOR: No questions or testimonies
50

0314

1 on the phone at this time.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

4 We'll go ahead and move on to the Regional Advisory

5 Council recommendation.

6

7 MS. PATTON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair

8 and members of the Board. For the record, this is Eva

9 Patton, Council Coordinator for the Yukon Kuskokwim

10 Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. And

11 currently phone lines are still down in Alakanuk and

12 I'll be providing the RAC recommendation on behalf of

13 Chairman Raymond Oney.

14

15 The YKDelta RAC Subsistence Council

16 supports WP22-47. The Council supports reducing

17 regulatory confusion by aligning the more restrictive

18 Federal regulation with the more liberal State

19 regulation so that subsistence hunters will not be

20 cited for taking an orphaned caribou calf. Council

21 members noted that while people do not target calves in

22 the Yukon Delta region, if one were orphaned it would

23 die anyway.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the

26 Board.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

29 And, Sue, can you call on the next RAC please.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Yes. That would be

32 Western Interior.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 MS. DETWILER: After Western Interior

37 would be Seward Peninsula.

38

39 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of

40 the Board. For the record my name is Neesa Pilcher, I

41 am the Council Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula

42 Council. I'll be providing the Council's

43 recommendation for Chairman Louis Green at this time.

44

45 The Council chose to support WP22-47.

46 The Council voted to support this proposal as it

47 increases harvest opportunity for Federally-qualified

48 subsistence users. However, as hunters do not

49 specifically target calves, no impacts to the calf

50

0315

1 population or herd recruitment are expected.
2 Supporting this proposal will also align State and
3 Federal regulations.

4
5 If Jack isn't online as well I can give
6 the Western Interior recommendation as well as -- if I
7 can be given a moment to find it.

8
9 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
10 Jack Reakoff.

11
12 MS. PILCHER: Thank you.

13
14 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is
15 Jack Reakoff.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
18 the floor Jack.

19
20 MR. REAKOFF: Okay. The Western
21 Interior Regional Advisory Council supported Proposal
22 WP22-47. Council recognizes while most people do not
23 target calves, the harvest of calves made orphaned --
24 or who are vulnerable to predation available for
25 harvest. It's an unusual event but it does happen.

26
27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
30 Next Sue.

31
32 MS. DETWILER: Yes, I wasn't sure if
33 Seward Peninsula was finished, and after Seward
34 Peninsula would be Northwest Arctic Council.

35
36 MS. MCDAVID: Mr. Chair. Members of
37 the Board. This is Brooke McDavid, the Northwest
38 Arctic Council Coordinator. I'll be presenting on
39 behalf of Chairman Baker.

40
41 The Northwest Arctic Council opposed
42 WP22-47. The Council opposes allowing the harvest of
43 caribou calves because they are the future stock of the
44 herd. The Council received feedback from local elders
45 that calves should not be hunted in order to sustain
46 and grow the caribou herd and strongly encouraged
47 opposition to this proposal so that calves would not be
48 targeted.

49
50

0316

1 Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. DETWILER: And next, finally, the North Slope Subsistence Regional Council also had a recommendation.

MR. BROWER: Yeah, good afternoon this is Gordon Brower, Regional -- North Slope Regional Advisory Council Chair. And the Council did support WP22-47 with modifications to only allow harvest of orphaned calves on 1134. And I personally, you know, witnessed, you know, calves, not the yearling type one that are capable to be away from its mother but those that are still being weaned by a -- by a cow. And we've seen -- and I -- and personally observed, you know, like red foxes and other predators continually harass some of these orphaned, very young ones so we talked about that a little bit and, you know, in our own history, too, our people up here have harvested calves before for clothing and that's -- and probably same as other tribes in other areas. But this -- this intent here is just to look at and probably on the humane side of things because sometimes a hunt can allow a calf to get orphaned or a predator may have got the cow or something like that. So the Council supported inserting orphaned in front of calves, may be taken in the regulatory language to make it clear that the intent was not to target -- not to target calves but rather to legalize subsistence harvest if a calf was injured or orphaned. Council members discussed that an orphaned caribou likely would not -- would likely not survive based on some of the things we described and their meat and hides would not go to waste. The opportunity to hunt the orphaned calf would be beneficial in providing soft meat for elders and making traditional clothing.

However, the Council considers conservation and insuring the growth of the herd as a priority and it is very concerned about the decline of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. The Council does not want to send the wrong message with a regulation about the harvest of calves when they are essential to conservation as they are the future of the herd.

The modified regulation should read as referenced on Page 1135 of the Federal Subsistence Board book to see where orphaned would be inserted into the regulation.

0317

1 That concludes the North Slope's
2 recommendations.

3
4 (Pause)

5
6 MR. BROWER: Was I on or am I off
7 or.....

8
9 MS. DETWILER: Yes.

10
11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you're on
12 Gordon Brower, sorry. This is Anthony Christianson,
13 thank you for your comment today. My phone is just not
14 responding.....

15
16 MR. BROWER: Oh, okay.

17
18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:yeah, I
19 heard you loud and clear. Next Sue. Thank you,
20 Gordon.

21
22 MR. BROWER: Okay.

23
24 MS. DETWILER: That concludes the
25 Regional Council recommendations. The next step would
26 be the tribal, Alaska Native Corporation comments.

27
28 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
29 of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine standing in for
30 Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or
31 recommendations during the consultation for this
32 proposal.

33
34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. No
37 comments received during this, then we'll move on to
38 the State Liaison please.

39
40 MR. MULLIGAN: Good afternoon, Mr.
41 Chair. For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish
42 and Game supports this proposal as it will reduce
43 hunter confusion by aligning State and Federal
44 regulations.

45
46 You know the Department heard
47 discussions at the community level that calves would
48 not intentionally be targeted but opportunistically
49 harvested if abandoned, orphaned or injured. With herd
50

0318

1 animals it can often be difficult to determine which
2 cows have attending calves, as a result maternal are
3 occasionally harvested unintentionally leaving a calf
4 orphaned. In general, the removal of these calves
5 through human harvest would be largely compensatory in
6 nature and not consume a significant portion of the
7 harvestable surplus of the herd.

8

9 Thank you, sir.

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
12 questions for Ben.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
17 hearing none we'll move on to InterAgency Staff
18 Committee recommendation.

19

20 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 This is Robbin LaVine. And the InterAgency Staff
22 Committee provided the following comment.

23

24 Adoption of Wildlife Proposal 22-47
25 would provide additional harvest opportunity for
26 Federally-qualified subsistence users, though most
27 rural residents do not target calves. Because of this,
28 any additional harvest of calves due to adoption of
29 this proposal is not expected to affect the
30 conservation status of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.
31 Additional harvest opportunity may also be warranted
32 given that calf harvest is already allowed under State
33 hunting regulations and allowing such harvest may help
34 to minimize wanton waste when calves are mistakenly
35 shot while also allowing for the harvest of orphaned
36 calves.

37

38 The ISC recognizes the concerns
39 regarding calf harvest by brought up by the Northwest
40 Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, however,
41 as previously mentioned the minimal amount of calf
42 harvest already occurring does not indicate that
43 allowing such harvest under Federal regulations would
44 cause a conservation concern for the Western Arctic
45 Caribou Herd and, therefore, such harvest does not
46 violate recognized principles of fish and wildlife
47 conservation and is consistent with ANILCA, Section
48 .805(c).

49

50

0319

1 One topic that the ISC would like to
2 bring to the attention of the Board is that in December
3 2021 the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, the
4 proponent of WP22-47 voted to change the management
5 status for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd to the
6 preservative declining level. This was in response to
7 the recent population estimate for the herd being
8 counted at 188,000 animals, a decline from the 2019
9 estimate of 244,000 caribou. One of the
10 recommendations that may be included under this
11 management level is the prohibition on calf harvest.

12
13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
16 Robbin. Any questions for ISC.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right.
21 Hearing none, we'll move on then and open up the floor
22 for Board discussion on this agenda item.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
27 We'll go ahead and move on, no Board deliberation
28 questions, we'll open up the floor for Board action.
29 Thank you.

30
31 MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
32 Tom Heinlein, BLM.

33
34 (Pause)

35
36 MR. HEINLEIN: Hello, can you hear me?

37
38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I could
39 hear you.

40
41 MR. HEINLEIN: Okay. Mr. Chair, Tom
42 Heinlein, Bureau of Land Management. I move to adopt
43 Proposal WP22-47 and if I get a second I'll explain why
44 I intend to vote in support of my motion.

45
46 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

47
48 MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. Adoption of
49 this proposal will provide Federally-qualified
50

0320

1 subsistence users with more harvest opportunities while
2 also helping to reduce wanton waste by allowing the
3 harvest of calves mistakenly shot by hunters. It will
4 also allow for the harvest of orphaned calves. Since
5 most Federally-qualified users do not target calves the
6 impact on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd should be
7 negligible and the harvest of calves is already allowed
8 under State regulations. Adoption of this proposal
9 would give Federally-qualified subsistence users the
10 same opportunities afforded under State regulations and
11 is consistent with the recommendations of the Seward
12 Peninsula, Yukon Kuskokwim Delta and Western Interior
13 Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
18 other Board questions or comments.

19

20 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
23 floor, Gene.

24

25 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26 One thing -- we've had a lot of discussion about
27 caribou here in this meeting and also prior in the
28 month with another administrative action we took, one
29 thing I wanted to point out is that earlier on in the
30 month when we addressed the caribou regulatory
31 scenario, we invoked one of the four criteria on the
32 preservative management under the Western Arctic
33 Caribou Herd Management Plan. And the very first one
34 listed, it specifically addresses this and I appreciate
35 the ISC pointing that out in their comment section on
36 this proposal.

37

38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
41 Gene. Any other Board questions or comments.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
46 call for the question.

47

48 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

49

50

0321

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Sue,
2 please.

3
4 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to
5 adopt Wildlife Proposal 22-47. Starting with Mr.
6 Heinlein, BLM, your vote.

7
8 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM votes to support.

9
10 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

11
12 BIA, Gene Peltola.

13
14 MR. PELTOLA: Bureau of Indian Affairs
15 votes to oppose, and since it is in opposition to the
16 Regional Advisory Council I'd like to stipulate the
17 .805(c) aspect of it. When the Board votes -- in a
18 prior administrative action invoked the Western Arctic
19 Caribou Herd Management Plan at preservative
20 management, it also calls for a prohibition on calf
21 harvest and based on the management plan criteria for
22 preservative management we feel that it violates
23 recognized principles of fish and wildlife conservation
24 identified in the Western Arctic Caribou Herd
25 Management Plan recommendations.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

30
31 Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara Boario.

32
33 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
34 supports.

35
36 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

37
38 Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

39
40 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
41 supports.

42
43 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

44
45 Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

46
47 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service
48 supports with the justification provided by BLM.
49 Thanks.

50

0322

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

2

3 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

4

5 MS. PITKA: I vote to oppose using the
6 same justification that the BIA put forward.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

9

10 MS. PITKA: This herd has been in
11 decline and I don't think that this is -- that this
12 action is warranted. Thank you.

13

14 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

15

16 Public Member Charlie Brower, are you
17 on.

18

19 MR. BROWER: Yes, I am. I oppose, same
20 reason that BIA gave. Thank you.

21

22 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

23

24 And Chair Christianson.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I oppose.

27

28 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So we have four
29 ayes and four nays so the motion does not pass.

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
32 And we'll go ahead and move on to the next proposal,
33 thank you. Call on the Staff to present the analysis.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: Okay. We are moving
36 into a series of Unit 22 moose proposals, the first one
37 being Proposal 22-49 presented by Brian Ubelaker.

38

39 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Good
40 afternoon again, Mr. Chair and members of the Board.
41 Once, again, for the record my name is Brian Ubelaker
42 and I am a Wildlife Biologist with the Office of
43 Subsistence Management. I'll be giving you a
44 presentation, summary of the analysis for Wildlife
45 Proposal WP22-49, which was submitted by Lance
46 Kronberger of Eagle River. This analysis begins on
47 Page 1138 in your meeting books.

48

49 Wildlife Proposal WP22-49 requests that

50

1 the Federal public lands closure for moose in a portion
2 of Unit 22 north of and including the Tagoomenik and
3 Shaktoolik River drainages referred to as Unit 22A
4 north be rescinded September 1st through the 20th to
5 coincide with the State's non-resident moose season.

6
7 The proponent states that Federal
8 public lands which are remote and difficult to access
9 compromise a large portion of this hunt area while the
10 communities in the area are surrounded by State managed
11 land. He states that the Federal public land closure
12 serves to concentrate all moose hunting activities on
13 to the small area of State managed lands and that
14 rescinding the closure would reduce the potential for
15 conflicts in the field.

16
17 In recent regulatory history the Board
18 of Game extended the State non-resident season in 22A
19 north in 2017 and then in 2018 the proponent submitted
20 a similarly worded proposal to the Federal Subsistence
21 Board for the first time. The Board considered this
22 proposal and opted to open Federal public lands to all
23 Federally-qualified subsistence users stating that
24 although the moose population was growing, densities
25 were too low to open to all users. In 2020 the
26 proponent submitted the same request again to the
27 Federal Subsistence Board. The Board rejected this
28 proposal stating the biological information was lacking
29 for the area. The Board committed to working with
30 ADF&G to conduct moose surveys in Unit 22A in 2020.

31
32 The moose population in Unit 22A is
33 considered to be increasing. In 2020 ADF&G estimated
34 the total Unit 22 moose population at 6,775, which
35 falls within their management objective. The most
36 recent 22A population estimate is 2,043 moose. Due to
37 budgetary restrictions, information concerns and time
38 constraints Unit 22A surveys are conducted in the
39 Unalakleet River drainage and population estimates are
40 extrapolated for adjacent areas from these surveys.
41 ADF&G estimates the 22A north population at 645 moose
42 with a density of .35 moose per square mile. The
43 extrapolated data appears to show this population has
44 been increasing since 2003. Recruitment is estimated
45 for the area and is characterized as adequate and the
46 observed bull to cow ratio is above State population
47 objectives.

48
49 Reported moose harvest in Unit 22A has
50

1 increased over the last 20 years. The average yearly
2 harvest from 2003 to 2018 is 27 moose per year with 72
3 percent being harvested by Federally-qualified
4 subsistence users, seven percent by non-local residents
5 and 18 percent by non-residents. But since 2014 the
6 average has been 39 moose harvested per year, with 66
7 percent going to Federally-qualified subsistence users
8 and 24 percent being reported by non-residents. Moose
9 harvest among sub-units of 22A is not distributed
10 equally with the population throughout sub-units. In
11 22A central, for example, home to 36 percent of Unit
12 22A residents claim 64 percent of the reported moose
13 harvest. One explanation of this inconsistency may be
14 the fact 22A central requires a registration permit
15 which has a failure to report punishment and 22A north
16 uses a harvest ticket which has no report requirement
17 associated with it. This is of interest because
18 household surveys show higher annual harvest than ADF&G
19 harvest reports. ADF&G estimates that as many as 20
20 moose are harvested annually and not reported in 22A
21 north. And there are currently five permitted guides
22 in 22A north.

23

24 If the closure in 22A north is
25 rescinded all users would be allowed to hunt moose on
26 Federal public lands, including the five guides that
27 operate in the area. Lifting the closure may increase
28 moose harvest by non-local and non-residents in Unit
29 22A north. This increase in harvest may be detrimental
30 to the moose population which, in turn, would affect
31 Federally-qualified subsistence users ability to meet
32 their needs. The Shaktoolik River is the main artery
33 used to access Federal public lands and increased use
34 by sporthunters may lead to increased pressure in user
35 conflict. Limited understanding of population limits
36 the ability to judge if an increase in harvest will
37 affect the moose population in Unit 22A north. But the
38 very high bull to cow ratio suggests the population
39 could withstand more bull harvest. Rescinding the
40 closure may alleviate some hunter pressure and user
41 conflict by spreading non-resident hunters out to
42 Federal public land not easily accessed except by plane
43 which may take pressure off of river corridors but with
44 the population appearing recovered, the original
45 conservation concern is over.

46

47 Therefore, OSM's conclusion is to
48 support WP22-49.

49

50

0325

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 I would be happy to answer any
4 questions.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
7 questions from the Board.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
12 we'll take any public comment received during the
13 proposal period. Thank you.

14

15 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, there were no
16 comments submitted regarding this proposal. Thank you.

17

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
20 Operator, we'll now provide an opportunity for the
21 public to speak to this agenda item, if anyone online
22 who would like to be recognized please let the Operator
23 know.

24

25 OPERATOR: Absolutely. As a reminder
26 if you would like to make a public comment please press
27 star, one.

28

29 (Pause)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
32 hearing none we'll go ahead and move on. Nobody online
33 so move on to the Regional Advisory Council.

34

35 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
36 the Board. My name is Neesa Pilcher, Council
37 Coordinator for Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
38 Council. I'll be providing the Council's
39 recommendation for Chairman Green.

40

41 The Council opposes WP22-49 because the
42 idea of opening Federal lands to non-residents if the
43 locals are not able to hunt there due to the access
44 difficulties still does not favor the subsistence user.
45 The population estimate is not based on data from Unit
46 22A north but rather it's extrapolated from data over
47 -- excuse me -- from data from the neighboring hunt
48 area, Unit 22A central. The Council considers it wiser
49 to protect resources for subsistence users until proven
50

0326

1 they can support sport uses as well.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
6 other Regional Advisory Councils.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: I believe that's the
9 only one, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
12 you, Sue. We'll move on to the tribal consultation
13 summary. Orville.

14

15 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
16 of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine standing in for
17 Tribal Liaison Orville Lind. There were no comments or
18 recommendations during the consultation on this closure
19 review.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22

23 Or actually, sorry, this proposal 22-
24 49. Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
27 We'll go ahead and move on to the State Liaison, Ben
28 Mulligan.

29

30 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
31 record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports
32 this proposal. Biological circumstances that warranted
33 the initial closure of Federal public lands in 2003 no
34 longer exist. Recent regulatory changes have been
35 adopted by both the Alaska Board of Game and this Board
36 as well. In 2017 the State non-resident season in 22A
37 north was extended from September 1st to September
38 14th, to September 20th. The Federal Subsistence
39 Board, through WP18-38 with modification to open
40 Federal public lands for the harvest of moose by all
41 Federally-qualified users, which includes all residents
42 of GMU 22. In looking at these extensions of the
43 regulatory hunt cycles, neither of these most recent
44 changes have resulted in an increase in moose harvest
45 from the 22A north hunt area and so the State believes
46 you can lift this closure.

47

48 Thank you, sir.

49

50

0327

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
2 questions for the State.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
7 We'll call on the InterAgency Staff Committee.

8
9 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
10 of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine. The InterAgency
11 Staff Committee has the following comments.

12
13 Adoption of Proposal 22-49 would open
14 Federal public lands within the Unit 22A north moose
15 hunt area to all users September 1st through 20th a
16 period that coincides with the State's non-resident
17 season. Recent surveys completed in 2020 and 2021 in
18 Unit 22A central, adjacent to the area in question show
19 extremely high bull to cow ratios and a population
20 estimate that is above State management objectives.

21
22 Additionally, low reported harvest and
23 estimates of total harvest that are below the
24 harvestable surplus indicate that the Unit 22A north
25 moose population can withstand increases in harvest
26 that may result for rescinding the closure during
27 September. Furthermore, current hunting pressure seems
28 to focus on the area of more easily accessible State
29 lands along the river corridors whereas Federal lands
30 are more remote and more difficult to access. Part of
31 the Board's rationale for not rescinding the closure in
32 2020 was due to the lack of recent biological
33 information for the Unit 22A north hunt area. The
34 Board now has current biological metrics from an
35 adjacent hunt area to make an informed decision on
36 WP22-49.

37
38 The Board's closure policy states that
39 Federal public lands and waters should be reopened as
40 soon as practicable once the conditions that originally
41 justified the closure have changed to such an extent
42 that the closure is no longer necessary.

43
44 The original justification for the
45 closure in this area was due to conservation concerns.
46 Recent surveys indicate that these conservation
47 concerns may no longer exist warranting rescinding of
48 the current closure.

49
50

0328

1 It should be noted that BLM does not
2 limit the number of guides permitted in the area or the
3 number of hunters that they can bring in, therefore,
4 guided hunts do have the potential to take more moose
5 from 22A north if Federal lands are opened. Harvest in
6 this area by non-Federally-qualified users should be
7 closely monitored if the closure is rescinded.

8
9 The Seward Peninsula Subsistence
10 Regional Advisory Council opposes this proposal because
11 poor access to the area in question makes hunting
12 difficult for Federally-qualified subsistence users and
13 because the biological metrics used to justify
14 rescinding the closure are based on extrapolations on
15 the adjacent Unit 22A central hunt area. Recent
16 surveys indicate that rescinding the current closure
17 would not violate recognized principles of fish and
18 wildlife conservation and retaining the closure is not
19 supported by substantial evidence, both of which are
20 consistent with ANILCA Section .805(c).

21
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
25 Robbin. Any questions for ISC.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none
30 that opens up the floor for Board deliberation.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
35 open for Board action.

36
37 MR. HEINLEIN: Mr. Chair, Tom Heinlein,
38 BLM.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
41 the floor Tom.

42
43 MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
44 move to adopt Proposal 22 -- Wildlife Proposal 22-49
45 and if I get a second I'll explain why I intend to vote
46 in support of my motion.

47
48 MS. PITKA: This is Rhonda, I'll
49 second.

50

0329

1 MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. Recently
2 completed surveys in 2020 and 2021 in Unit 22A central
3 adjacent to the area in question showed extremely high
4 bull/cow ratios and a population estimate that is above
5 State management objectives. In addition, the
6 estimates of the total harvest that are below the
7 harvestable surplus indicate that the moose population
8 in Unit 22A north can sustain additional harvest
9 pressure that may result from rescinding the closure to
10 non-Federally-qualified users.

11
12 Current harvest pressure has been
13 mostly focused on the more easily accessible State
14 lands adjacent to river corridors and not the more
15 remote and difficult accessed Federal lands in the
16 area. The last time this came before the Board part of
17 the rationale for not lifting the closure was a lack of
18 recent biological data. This is no longer the case and
19 the Board's closure policy states: That Federal public
20 lands and waters should be reopened as soon as
21 practicable once the conditions that originally
22 justified the closure have changed to such an extent
23 that the closure is no longer necessary.

24
25 Since the closure was originally put in
26 place due to conservation concerns continuing the
27 closure is no longer supported by substantial evidence
28 and recent biological metrics indicate that opening the
29 closure to non-Federally-qualified users would not
30 violate recognized principles of fish and wildlife
31 conservation.

32
33 The BLM takes the concerns of the
34 Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
35 seriously and acknowledges that any additional harvest
36 by non-Federally-qualified users that may take place
37 because of the opening of this closure should be
38 monitored closely to prevent overharvest.

39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
43 further Board questions or discussion.

44
45 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

46
47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
48 floor, Gene.

49
50

0330

1 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 have some questions for BLM. It is mentioned in the
3 analysis that BLM does not limit the number of permits
4 issued to big game guides, nor does it limit the number
5 of clients that are able to be serviced under those
6 permits. Is that because you don't have a mechanism to
7 do it and choose not to, or do you have a mechanism in
8 place to cap the number of clients taken in by
9 permitted guide. And the reason I ask that is that
10 it's -- the ISC had made the recommendation that
11 there's a potential for overharvest in the longrun and
12 if that was to occur, how could BLM address that before
13 -- if the Board was not able to address it in a timely
14 manner. And the reason I ask that is the history of
15 BLM with regard to some discussions in this body in the
16 past, we look at the progression and evolution of the
17 BLM permitting process.

18
19 So thank you, Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay,
22 thank.....

23
24 MR. HEINLEIN: Mr.....

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:you. Any
27 other Board questions or comments, discussion. You
28 have the floor, sorry.

29
30 MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
31 Tom Heinlein, BLM. In response to the BIA question.
32 You know I'd need to do a little more research on that
33 question, Gene. You know I think BLM maintains
34 mechanisms to actually look at, you know, putting in
35 processes and procedures to manage permit numbers in
36 instances where more use were to accelerate, or use is
37 judged to be, you know, expanded. I believe in this
38 case the number of operators, transporters is not at
39 that level but I would be happy to do more leg work on
40 that question if that is in any way unsatisfactory.

41
42 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Gene.

45
46 MR. PELTOLA: And, Tom, the reason that
47 I ask that question is that we -- the Board here in
48 recent history has addressed several proposals and
49 we've opened up some areas, we've had some remain
50

0331

1 closed, we've always looked towards and hoped for
2 survey data but that's not necessarily the case in this
3 situation, I'm a tad uncomfortable, as the Seward Penn
4 Council had stipulated about using adjacent data. I'd
5 be a lot more comfortable to getting closer to
6 supporting the proposal if BLM had a mechanism to
7 address the commercial use of those Federal lands under
8 their purview if required to do so.

9

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
13 other Board questions, comments.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
18 question.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hello, call for
23 the question Board.

24

25 MS. PITKA: Question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, we'll go
28 ahead and do roll call please. Thank you.

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to
31 adopt WP22-49. Start with Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

32

33 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM votes to support.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

36

37 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

38

39 MR. SCHMID: Forest Service will
40 support.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

43

44 Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

45

46 MS. CREACHBAUM: The Park Service
47 supports.

48

49 MS. DETWILER: Sara Boario, Fish and

50

0332

1 Wildlife Service.

2

3 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
4 supports.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola, BIA.

7

8 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports with the
9 statement made by BLM, they'd look in to inquire about
10 their abilities on their permitting system in place, in
11 addition to there are checks and balances with the
12 Federal Program to address it if needed to in the
13 future.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

18

19 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

20

21 MR. BROWER: I support. Thank you.

22

23 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

24

25 Public Member Charlie Brower.

26

27 MR. BROWER: I support. Thank you.

28

29 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

30

31 Chair Christianson.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion
36 passes unanimously.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
39 you, Sue. We'll go ahead and move on to the next
40 agenda, thank you. Call on the Staff.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: The next agenda item is
43 Wildlife Closure 22-09(b) also presented by Brian
44 Ubelaker.

45

46 MR. UBELAKER: Thanks Sue. Good
47 afternoon, again, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board.
48 For the record I am Brian Ubelaker and I am a Wildlife
49 Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I
50

1 will be presenting a summary of the analysis for
2 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-09(b). This analysis
3 begins on Page 1158 of your meeting books.

4
5 Wildlife Closure Review 22-09(b)
6 pertaining to Unit 22A, that portion in the Unalakleet
7 River drainage and all drainages flowing into Norton
8 Sound, north of the Golsovia River drainage and south
9 of the Tagoomenik and Shaktoolik River drainages.
10 Federal public lands are closed to the harvesting of
11 moose except by residents of Unalakleet. This closure
12 was initially established in 1995.

13
14 The moose populations in the Unalakleet
15 River drainage of Unit 22A has been increasing since
16 2011. In 2011 and '12 the harvest quotas were not met
17 during the regular season and they established a winter
18 season for moose. Then in 2013, '14 and '15 the
19 regular season quotas were not met yet again, prompting
20 the State to extend the regular moose season by six
21 days via emergency order. In 2017 the Board of Game
22 permanently established the moose season for 22A
23 central as September 1st through the 20th. That same
24 year with an increase in moose population the State
25 opened, then extended the winter moose season. Then in
26 2018 the State extended the fall moose season through
27 September 30th via emergency order. In 2020 the Board
28 of Game extended the fall season through September 30th
29 and the winter season through January 31st. This
30 closure was last reviewed in 2015 and the Council
31 recommended to maintain status quo.

32
33 The moose population in Unit 22A,
34 Unalakleet drainage has been showing signs of
35 increasing since 2003. Most recent population
36 estimation is 766 moose in the unit, which is
37 approaching the upper end of the State management
38 objective of 800. The bull to cow ratio is also higher
39 than population objectives for the unit at over 120
40 bulls to 100 cows.

41
42 Moose harvest has increased in the
43 Unalakleet drainage since 2008 keeping pace with
44 increasing quotas. Total reported harvest has ranged
45 from 14 to 45 moose during that timeframe. Federal
46 harvest during this time has averaged 16.5 percent with
47 the average Federal success rate at 13 percent.

48
49 This closure could either be modified
50

0334

1 to allow moose hunting on Federal public lands by all
2 Federally-qualified subsistence users or it could be
3 completely rescinded to allow harvest by all users. As
4 the hunt is closely managed by harvest quotas little
5 conservation concerns exist for overharvest if this
6 closure is completely lifted. The moose population and
7 harvest quotas have increased in Unit 22A central and
8 the bull/cow ratio is high indicating surplus bulls a
9 available for harvest. Therefore, providing harvest
10 opportunity for all Federally-qualified subsistence
11 users in the central portion of Unit 22A is warranted.
12 Opening to only Federally-qualified subsistence users
13 rather than all users represents a conservative
14 incremental approach that is consistent with Board
15 action in Unit 22A north and 22A remainder in 2018.

16

17 Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to
18 modify the closure to allow all Federally-qualified
19 users to hunt on Federal public lands.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 I'd be happy to answer any questions
24 anyone may have.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
27 questions from the Board.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing no
32 questions was there any public testimony during this
33 proposal process.

34

35 MR. UBELAKER: No, Mr. Chair, there
36 were no written public comments submitted.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
41 Operator, at this time we'll make available anybody
42 online who would like to speak to this agenda item,
43 this is their opportunity.

44

45 OPERATOR: Again, for recollection, if
46 you'd like to make a public comment press star, one.

47

48 (Pause)

49

50

0335

1 OPERATOR: There are no comments in the
2 cue.

3
4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
5 We'll move on at this time to Regional Advisory Council
6 recommendations.

7
8 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
9 the Board. My name is Neesa Pilcher, Council
10 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
11 Council. I'll be providing the Council's
12 recommendation for Chairman Green today.

13
14 The Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
15 Council voted to support this proposal. I will note
16 that it was actually a split, which is not -- it
17 appears not to be very usual for this Council. The
18 majority of the Council felt that the residents of the
19 Unalakleet rely the most on moose in Unit 22A central
20 therefore they deserved the majority of the harvest.
21 Moose harvest is improving for residents of Unalakleet
22 but it is still not like it was historically.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
27 Native Tribal Liaison.

28
29 MS. LAVINE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
30 Members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine standing
31 in for Tribal Liaison, Orville Lind. There were no
32 comments or recommendations during consultation on this
33 item. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
36 We'll move on to the State Liaison, Ben Mulligan.

37
38 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
39 record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports
40 the elimination of the current closure prohibiting non-
41 Federally-qualified users from hunting for moose on
42 Federal public lands in GMU 22A central. The current
43 composition and historical harvest levels indicate that
44 additional harvest opportunity is warranted. There is
45 no concern that the harvest of moose by non-resident
46 hunters in the area would increase because there is no
47 non-resident season in the area. Dramatic increases in
48 the harvest of moose by resident hunters are not likely
49 to occur because of challenges associated with
50

0336

1 accessing the hunt area. Even the substantial harvest
2 of bulls by non-Federally-qualified users that are
3 Alaska residents would have little effect on the
4 population due to the extremely high bull/cow ratio
5 with the latest in 2020 being 122 bulls to 100 cows
6 respectively, well above the management objective of 30
7 bulls to 100 cows. Furthermore, ADF&G has the
8 authority to issue emergency order closures as needed
9 to maintain harvest at sustainable levels within the
10 hunt area eliminating any overharvest concerns.

11

12 Thank you, sir.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
15 questions for the State.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll go
20 to the ISC recommendation.

21

22 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair. This is
23 Robbin LaVine. For Wildlife Closure Review 22-09(b),
24 the ISC provided their standard comment.

25

26 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
29 That opens up the floor for Board discussion, questions
30 with State Liaison or ISC.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
35 hearing none, that will open up the floor for Board
36 action on this proposal. Thank you.

37

38 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair, this is Chris
39 McKee, can you hear me?

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Chris, you
42 have the floor.

43

44 MR. MCKEE: Yeah, just to note that Tom
45 is going to have to step away from the meeting for
46 about the next 90 minutes so I'll be standing in for
47 him and I'll be making the motion for this.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,

50

0337

1 Chris. Welcome.

2

3

4 MR. MCKEE: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I
5 move to modify the closure to moose hunting in the Unit
6 22A central hunt area to open to all Federally-
7 qualified subsistence users and if I get a second I'll
8 explain why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

MR. MCKEE: Thank you. Moose
populations and the harvest quotas have increased in
the hunt area and bull/cow ratios are extremely high
all of which indicates that there is a surplus of bulls
available for harvest. Opening the area to all
Federally-qualified subsistence users is a conservative
and appropriate incremental approach consistent with
past Board actions in other areas of Unit 22 in 2018.
Additionally, given the improved biological metrics
keeping the area open to only a subset of Federally-
qualified subsistence users is not supported by
substantial evidence as stated in ANILCA Section
.805(c).

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
more questions or discussions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Did we get a
second for that -- sorry, Chris.

MR. MCKEE: I believe BIA seconded.

MR. PELTOLA: Yes, BIA did second.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Okay,
thank you, so the floor is open for discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for
question.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Sue,

0338

1 please.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to modify the closure to open to all Federally-qualified subsistence users. We'll start with BLM, Chris McKee.

MR. MCKEE: BLM supports.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

BIA, Gene Peltola.

MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports for reasons articulated by BLM in their motion.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Fish and Wildlife Service Sara Boario.

MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service supports.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Sarah Creachbaum, Park Service.

MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service supports.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service supports with the justification provided by BLM.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

MS. PITKA: I support, thank you.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

Public Member Charlie Brower.

MR. BROWER: I support.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

0339

1 And Chair Christianson.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion
6 passes unanimously.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sorry, I got
11 spaced out there, are we still voting on this.

12

13 MS. DETWILER: Yes, we just concluded
14 the vote and the outcome was to retain the closure with
15 the modification to include all subsistence users.

16

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
18 We'll go ahead and take a five minute break here. My
19 attention span got a little stretched out there so
20 we'll take a five minute break and we'll come back.

21

22 (Off record)

23

24 (On record)

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll go ahead
27 and get started, Sue, whenever everybody makes it back
28 on the line. Thank you.

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Okay, I'll go ahead and
31 see who's back on the line.

32

33 National Park Service, Sarah
34 Creachbaum.

35

36 MS. CREACHBAUM: Hi, Sue, I'm here.

37

38 MS. DETWILER: Great.

39

40 BLM, Thomas Heinlein.

41

42 MR. MCKEE: Hi, Sue, this is Chris
43 standing in for Tom.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Oh, thank you for
46 reminding me Chris.

47

48 Okay, Fish and Wildlife Service, Sara
49 Boario.

50

0340

1 MS. BOARIO: I'm here, Sue, thank you.

2

3 Forest Service, Dave Schmid.

4

5 MR. SCHMID: I'm here, Sue, thanks.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: BIA, Gene Peltola.

8

9 MR. PELTOLA: BIA is back on, thanks.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda
12 Pitka.

13

14 MS. PITKA: Hi, I'm here.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Charlie
17 Brower.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 MS. DETWILER: And Chair Anthony
22 Christianson.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm on,
25 thank you, Sue.

26

27 MS. DETWILER: Okay. It looks like
28 everybody's on except one member.

29

30 (Pause)

31

32 MS. PITKA: Did I get cut off?

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, you're
35 still on.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: You're still on Rhonda.

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I think we're
40 just letting everybody get back on the line here and
41 then we'll get started where we left off, Sue, thank
42 you, when we're ready.

43

44 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Just let me know
45 when you're ready.

46

47 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, I'm
48 ready, Sue.

49

50

0341

1 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Let's see where
2 we left off was we were just going to be starting off
3 Wildlife Closure Review 22-11/12 and that will be Brian
4 Ubelaker again.

5
6 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Hello,
7 again, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board. For the
8 record, Brian Ubelaker, Wildlife Biologist with OSM. I
9 will be presenting a summary of the analysis for
10 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-11/12. This analysis
11 begins on Page 1173 of your meeting books.

12
13 Wildlife Closure Review 22-11 and 12
14 pertaining to Unit 22B west of the Darby Mountains.
15 WCR22-11 closes Federal public lands to the harvest of
16 moose during the fall season except by Federally-
17 qualified subsistence users. WCR22-12 closes Federal
18 public lands to the harvest of moose to all except
19 residents of Golovin and White Mountain for the winter
20 hunt. This closure was initially established in 2002.

21
22 These closures were enacted -- sorry, I
23 am getting some notes that it is hard for people to
24 hear me. Is this any better.

25
26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I can hear you
27 fine, thank you.

28
29 MR. UBELAKER: Okay, great, I will
30 continue then. These closures were enacted to conserve
31 a declining population of moose. ADF&G had closed this
32 hunt by emergency order several times when the harvest
33 quota of 20 moose was met. Last year the Board of Game
34 changed permit availability by only allowing them to be
35 picked up in person in an effort to limit the number of
36 hunters. These closures have been reviewed by the
37 Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council at their
38 winter meetings in 2011 and 2015.

39
40 The moose population in Unit 22 is
41 estimated at 6,775, which is within State management
42 objectives. ADF&G considers the moose population in
43 Unit 22B to be stable to increasing but below
44 management objectives. The last estimate completed for
45 22B west was 728 moose in 2016. A composition survey
46 from 2015 determined the bull/cow ratio to be 41 bulls
47 to 100 cows which is above the State management
48 objective.

49
50

0342

1 Most of the moose harvested in 22B
2 occurs under State regulations with a State permit.
3 Only one moose was reported harvested by Federal permit
4 in 2001 and since 2014 harvest has met or exceeded
5 quotas in all years except for 2018.

6
7 One alternative considered is an
8 incremental opening of the closure to allow all
9 Federally-qualified subsistence users from Unit 22B --
10 excuse me, from Unit 22 to hunt in 22B west during the
11 winter hunt. The possible increase in hunting pressure
12 and competition from Federally-qualified subsistence
13 users within Unit 22 alone would likely reach the quota
14 within several days as most State hunts in Unit 22
15 currently do. If these closures are rescinded non-
16 Federally-qualified users would be able to harvest
17 moose on Federal public lands within Unit 22B west of
18 the Darby Mountains. Unit 22B west moose population is
19 currently below State management objectives. But as
20 moose harvest in Unit 22B west is managed by harvest
21 quotas, rescinding or modifying these closures would
22 likely result in a zero to minimal increase in harvest.
23 However, competition with non-Federally and other
24 Federally-qualified users on Federal lands could reduce
25 harvest opportunity for residents of White Mountain and
26 Golovin.

27
28 Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to
29 maintain status quo.

30
31 Thank you much.

32
33 And I would be happy to answer any
34 questions anyone might have.

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
37 questions from the Board.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, did
42 we receive any public comment during this proposal
43 period. Thank you.

44
45 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, no, there
46 were no comments submitted. Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
49 Operator, at this time we'll provide a line for anybody
50

0343

1 online if they want to provide public testimony at this
2 time to this agenda item.

3

4 OPERATOR: If you would like to ask or
5 make a comment please press star, one. Once again, for
6 any comments, please press star, one.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 OPERATOR: I'm showing no comments at
11 this time, sir.

12

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
14 We'll go ahead and move on to Regional Advisory Council
15 Chair recommendation.

16

17 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
18 the Board. For the record, Nissa Pilcher, Council
19 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
20 Council. I'll be providing the Council's
21 recommendation for Chairman Green.

22

23 The Seward Regional Advisory Council
24 voted to support this closure. The Council believes
25 that since the moose population is below State
26 management objectives and the recruitment is low,
27 Federal lands should remain closed to all but local
28 residents. This will allow for the continuation of
29 subsistence uses.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Is
34 there any other Regional Advisory Council who would
35 like to speak to this.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none
40 we'll move to Tribal Native Liaison.

41

42 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Tribal Liaison
44 Orville Lind. There were no comments or
45 recommendations during the consultation on this review.

46

47 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,

50

0344

1 we'll move on to the Alaska Department of Fish and
2 Game. Ben.

3
4 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
5 record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports
6 the elimination of these two closures. The measures
7 the Department and the Board of Game have taken in
8 managing moose populations in GMU 22B west makes it so
9 that maintaining the closures in this area is unlikely
10 to result providing any additional harvest opportunity
11 to Federally-qualified users or increase any potential
12 increase in non-Federally-qualified users coming into
13 the area. In 2020 the Board of Game directed ADF&G to
14 limit the availability of the pertinent registration
15 hunt permit and are now only available during a set
16 timeframe in the local communities. Given this
17 information the Department is more than capable of
18 sustainably managing this moose population while
19 providing reasonable opportunities for subsistence
20 users.

21
22 Thank you, sir.

23
24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
25 questions for the State.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll move on
30 to InterAgency Staff Committee recommendation.

31
32 MS. LAVINE: Yes, good afternoon, Mr.
33 Chair. This is Robbin LaVine. And for Wildlife
34 Closure Review 22-11/12 the InterAgency Staff Committee
35 provided their standard comment.

36
37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
40 That opens up the floor for Board discussion,
41 deliberation.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
46 none we'll move on. Open the floor for Board action
47 for this proposal. Thank you.

48
49 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair, Chris McKee with
50

0345

1 BLM.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
4 Chris, you have the floor.

5

6 MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
7 move to maintain the status quo for the closure to
8 moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in Unit
9 22B west of the Darby Mountains. And if I get a second
10 I'll explain why I intend to vote in support of my
11 motion.

12

13 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, second.

14

15 MR. MCKEE: Thank you. The moose
16 population in Unit 22B west hunt area continues to be
17 below State management objectives with continued low
18 recruitment, therefore, the closure to non-Federally-
19 qualified users should remain in place to allow for the
20 continuation of subsistence uses of the moose resource
21 during both the fall and winter hunts and is consistent
22 with the Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory
23 Council.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
28 Chris. Did we get a second for Chris.

29

30 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, BIA seconded.

31

32 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, thank you.
33 The floor is open now for discussion.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for.....

38

39 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON:the
42 question. Thank you, Gene. We'll go ahead and do roll
43 call, Sue, thank you.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion on the
46 floor is to maintain the status quo on this closure.
47 Chris McKee, BLM, your vote.

48

49 MR. MCKEE: BLM supports.

50

0346

1 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

2

3 Gene Peltola, BIA.

4

5 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports to maintain

6 the status quo as recommended by the Seward Penn

7 Council.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

10

11 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

12

13 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service

14 supports.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

17

18 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park

19 Service.

20

21 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service

22 supports.

23

24 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

25

26 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

27

28 MR. SCHMID: Forest Service supports in

29 deference to the RAC and the justification provided by

30 BLM.

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

33

34 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

35

36 MS. PITKA: I support in deference to

37 the Regional Advisory Council and as stated by BLM.

38 Thank you.

39

40 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

41

42 Public Member Charlie Brower.

43

44 MR. BROWER: I support.

45

46 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

47

48 Chair Christianson.

49

50

0347

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support, Sue.
2 Thank you.

3
4 MS. DETWILER: Motion passes
5 unanimously.

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, Sue,
8 we'll call on the next proposal to be presented by
9 Staff. Thank you.

10
11 MS. DETWILER: Wildlife Closure Review
12 22-13, again, Brian Ubelaker.

13
14 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Hello,
15 Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. I promise, you
16 only have to listen to me one more time after this --
17 well, for today anyways. Sorry. For the record my
18 name is Brian Ubelaker, I'm a Wildlife Biologist with
19 the Office of Subsistence Management. I'll be
20 presenting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife
21 Closure Review WCR22-13 and this analysis begins on
22 Page 1185 of your meeting books.

23
24 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-13
25 pertaining to Unit 22D within the Kougarak, Kuzitrin
26 and Pilgrim River Federal public land (indiscernible -
27 cuts out) residents of Units 22D and 22C. This closure
28 was initially established in 2002.

29
30 This enclosure was enacted to restrict
31 heavy hunting pressure to conserve a declining
32 population of moose. Since then the season has been
33 shortened on three separate occasions. Overharvest
34 from the herd has occurred in 2003, 2004 despite
35 efforts to close the hunt by ADF&G. The Seward
36 Peninsula RAC reviewed this closure in 2011 and 2014
37 and recommended to maintain status quo.

38
39 (Teleconference interference -
40 participants not muted)

41
42
43 MR. UBELAKER: The moose population in
44 Unit 22 is estimated at 6,775 moose.

45
46 Sorry, was that a question.

47
48 REPORTER: I think people need to mute,
49 star, six, you're talking over Brian. Star, six.

50

0348

1 MR. UBELAKER: Okay. Let's see, the
2 moose populations in Unit 22 is estimated at 6,775,
3 which is within State management objectives. ADF&G
4 considers the moose population in Unit 22D to be
5 decreasing to stable with population estimates below
6 their management objective. The bull/cow ratio has
7 averaged 26 bulls to 100 cows, which is above their
8 management objective.

9
10 No non-resident harvest has occurred in
11 22D since the non-resident season closed in 2002. All
12 harvest under State regulations has occurred on non-
13 Federal lands. Moose harvest in Unit 22D are managed
14 by quotas. Between 2014 and 2019 reported moose
15 harvest has exceeded harvest quotas. Since 2017 the
16 season has closed in five days or less.

17
18 If this closure were rescinded, non-
19 Federally-qualified users would be able to harvest
20 moose on Federal public lands within Unit 22D, that
21 portion within the Kougarak, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River
22 drainage. As the State hunt is managed by harvest
23 quotas rescinding the closure would likely result in
24 zero to minimal increase in harvest. Unit 22D moose
25 population is below management objectives, bull to cow
26 ratios are relatively low indicating few surplus bulls
27 available for harvest and calf and cow ratios are very
28 low indicating a declining population. Increased
29 hunters would lead to decreased harvest opportunity for
30 Federally-qualified subsistence users by increasing
31 competition for a small, quickly met quota of
32 harvestable moose.

33
34 Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to
35 maintain status quo on this closure.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 I am available for questions.

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, did
46 we receive any public comment during this proposal
47 period, thank you.

48
49 MR. UBELAKER: No, sir, there were no
50

0349

1 public comments submitted. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

4 Move on to anybody online who would like to be
5 recognized at this time, Operator, this is the time for
6 them to speak to this agenda item.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 OPERATOR: As a reminder star, one if
11 you would like to make a comment.

12

13 (Pause)

14

15 OPERATOR: Once again that is star, one
16 for any comments.

17

18 (Pause)

19

20 OPERATOR: No comments at this time,
21 sir.

22

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
24 We'll go ahead and move on to RAC Chair recommendation.

25

26 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
27 the Board. For the record, Nissa Pilcher, Council
28 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
29 Council. I'll be providing the Council's
30 recommendation in the absence of Chairman Green.

31

32 The Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
33 Council voted to maintain the status quo for WP22-13.
34 The Council felt that with population below State
35 management objectives and a low bull/cow and calf/cow
36 ratios the population in the unit is declining. And
37 with the State managing harvest using a quota system
38 that is usually met or exceeded, the closure should be
39 maintained at this time.

40

41 That is all, thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
44 That'll open the floor for Tribal Native Liaison.

45

46 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Orville Lind.
48 There were no comments or recommendations during the
49 consultation on this closure review.

50

0350

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

4 Move on to the State Liaison, Ben Mulligan.

5

6 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
7 record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports the
8 elimination of this closure. Elimination of the
9 Federal public lands closure in this area is unlikely
10 to result in any changes to the harvest opportunities
11 for Federally-qualified users. In order to hunt in
12 this area ADF&G administers Registration Permit RM840
13 with harvest quotas. These seasons are subject to
14 emergency order closures once on the quota is met and
15 successful hunters are required to report their harvest
16 within a day of the kill. This registration permit is
17 only available in person at licensed vendors within the
18 area during the timeframe of July 25th to August 25th,
19 making it a high bar for those outside the area to hunt
20 in this particular hunt.

21

22 Thank you, sir.

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
25 questions for the State.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
30 none we'll move on to ISC recommendation.

31

32 MS. LAVINE: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is
33 Robbin LaVine. And for Wildlife Closure Review 22-13
34 the ISC provided the standard comment.

35

36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
39 That opens the floor for Board discussion.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
44 that opens the floor for action. Thank you.

45

46 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair, Chris McKee for
47 BLM.

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the

50

0351

1 floor, Chris.

2

3

4 MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 move to maintain the status quo for the closure to
6 moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in Unit
7 22D with the Kougarak, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River
8 drainages and if I get a second I'll explain why I
9 intend to vote in support of my motion.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

12

13 MR. MCKEE: Thank you. The moose
14 population in Unit 22D is below State management
15 objectives with relatively low bull/cow ratios showing
16 a lack of surplus bulls available for harvest. Low
17 cow/calf ratios in the area indicate a declining
18 population with State hunting quotas often being
19 exceeded. Maintaining the closure will help ensure
20 harvest opportunities for Federally-qualified
21 subsistence users and is consistent with the
22 recommendation of the Seward Peninsula Subsistence
23 Regional Advisory Council.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
28 Chris. Any questions, comments or discussion from the
29 Board.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
34 question.

35

36 MR. PELTOLA: Question, BIA.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call,
39 please, Sue.

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Okay. The motion is to
42 maintain the status quo on this closure.

43

44 Chris McKee, BLM.

45

46 MR. MCKEE: BLM supports.

47

48 MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola, BIA.

49

50 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports maintaining

0352

1 status quo as recommended by the Seward Penn RAC.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Sara Boario, Fish and
4 Wildlife Service.

5

6 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
7 supports.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

10

11 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park
12 Service.

13

14 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
15 supports.

16

17 MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, Forest
18 Service.

19

20 MR. SCHMID: Yeah, the Forest Service
21 supports in deference to the RAC and as stated by BLM.

22

23 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

24

25 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

26

27 MS. PITKA: I support as stated by BLM.
28 Thank you.

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

31

32 Public Member Charlie Brower.

33

34 MR. BROWER: I support.

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

37

38 Chair Anthony Christianson.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support.

41

42 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Motion
43 passes unanimously. And the next item on the agenda is
44 Wildlife Closure Review 22-14 and I believe that is Tom
45 [sic] Ubelaker once more.

46

47 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Sue. Yes.
48 Hello again, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Brian
49 Ubelaker, Wildlife Biologist with OSM. And you'll be
50

0353

1 getting a summary of the analysis for Wildlife Closure
2 Review WCR22-14, which the analysis begins on Page 1197
3 of your meeting books.

4
5 Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-14
6 covering Unit 22D west of the Tisuk River drainage and
7 Canyon Creek. Federal public lands are closed to the
8 harvesting of moose except by residents of Units 22D
9 and 22C. This closure was initially established in
10 2002.

11
12 This analysis is for a small portion of
13 Unit 22D that abuts 22D Kuzitrin that was analyzed in
14 the previous presentation. The regulatory history and
15 biological data and harvest information is identical
16 with that analysis so for brevity I will refrain from
17 restating the same information, however, if anybody has
18 any questions regarding this please let me know and I
19 will be happy to answer them.

20
21 Jumping ahead to effects. If this
22 closure is rescinded, non-Federally-qualified users
23 would be able to harvest moose on Federal public lands
24 within Unit 22D west of the Tisuk River drainage and
25 Canyon Creek. Unit 22D west moose population is below
26 State management objectives and metrics point to a
27 declining population. Federally-qualified subsistence
28 users may experience increased competition and
29 decreased harvest success if this closure is rescinded.

30
31 Therefore, it is OSM's conclusion to
32 maintain status quo.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 And if anybody has any questions,
37 please let me know.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom
40 [sic] Any questions from the Board for Tom [sic].

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, hearing
45 none, Tom [sic] did we get any public comment during
46 this proposal period. Thank you.

47
48 MR. UBELAKER: No, Mr. Chair, no
49 written comments were submitted. Thank you.
50

0354

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
2 thank you, Tom [sic]. And we will move on to anybody
3 online who would like to speak to this agenda item at
4 this time. Operator, at this time would be their time
5 to be recognized.

6
7 OPERATOR: As a reminder, for any
8 comments star, one.

9
10 (Pause)

11
12 OPERATOR: Showing no comments at this
13 time.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
16 We'll move on to the Regional Advisory Council Chair
17 recommendations.

18
19 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
20 the Board. For the record, Nissa Pilcher, Council
21 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
22 Council. I'll once, again, be providing the Council's
23 recommendation for Chairman Green.

24
25 For WCR22-14 the Council requested to
26 maintain status quo. The Council feels, again, that
27 with populations below State management objectives and
28 low bull/cow and calf/cow ratios that the population in
29 Unit 22D is declining. If the State is managing
30 harvest with a quota then the moose population is not
31 strong enough to support removing the closure and
32 should be maintained at this time.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
37 questions for the RAC.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Moving on to
42 Tribal Native Liaison.

43
44 MS. LAVINE: This is Robbin LaVine
45 standing in for Orville Lind. There were no comments
46 or recommendations during the consultation on this
47 item. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

50

0355

1 We'll go ahead and move on from there to State Liaison.
2 Thank you.

3

4 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
5 record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports
6 this -- supports the rescinding of this closure. It's
7 the same reasons. Because the same registration permit
8 is involved for our comments pertaining to WCR22-13 so
9 I will just reference those. And our support for
10 elimination of the closure.

11

12 Thank you, sir.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
15 questions for the State.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: ISC
20 recommendation.

21

22 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Members of the Board. This is Robbin LaVine. And for
24 Wildlife Closure Review 22-14 the InterAgency Staff
25 Committee provided the standard comment.

26

27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
30 That opens the floor for Board discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
35 open for Board action.

36

37 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair, Chris McKee for
38 BLM.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: You have the
41 floor.

42

43 MR. MCKEE: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I
44 move to maintain the status quo for the closure to
45 moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified users in Unit
46 22D west of the Tisuk River drainage and Canyon Creek
47 and if I get a second I'll explain why I intend to vote
48 in support of motion.

49

50

0356

1 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, second.

2

3

4 MR. MCKEE: Thank you. The moose
5 population in Unit 22D is below management objectives
6 with relatively low bull/cow ratios showing a lack of
7 surplus bulls available for harvest, low calf/cow
8 ratios in the area indicate a declining population with
9 State hunting quotas often being exceeded. Maintaining
10 the closure will help to ensure harvest opportunities
11 for Federally-qualified subsistence users and it's
12 consistent with the recommendations of the Seward
13 Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

13

14

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15

16

17

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Chris. Anybody, questions or comments or discussion.

18

19

(No comments)

20

21

22

MR. PELTOLA: BIA calls for the
question.

23

24

25

26

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
called. Sue, I'll just do an all in favor on this one,
signify by saying aye.

27

28

IN UNISON: Aye.

29

30

31

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
sign.

32

33

(No opposing votes)

34

35

36

37

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
unanimously. Thank you. We'll go ahead and move on
to the next proposal there, Sue, thank you.

38

39

40

41

MS. DETWILER: Yes. The next proposal
is Wildlife Proposal 22-50 and we're moving into the
Northwest Arctic region.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

MR. PLANK: Thank you, Sue. Hello, Mr.
Chair. Members of the Board. My name is Tom Plank and
I am a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of Subsistence
Management. I will be presenting a summary of the
analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-50 submitted by the
Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
requesting the beaver harvest limit be changed from 50

50

1 and 30 beaver in Unit 23, Kobuk and Selawik River
2 drainage and Unit 23 remainder, respectfully, to no
3 harvest limit in both trap areas.

4
5 This one was removed from Volume I so
6 it's starting on Page 420.

7
8 The proponent states that the proposed
9 changes would align Federal beaver trapping regulations
10 with the more liberal state regulations as well as
11 provide increased harvest opportunity for Federally-
12 qualified subsistence users.

13
14 There has been a general trend for
15 liberalizing trapping and hunting regulations in Unit
16 23. In 1999 the Alaska Board of Game adopted a year-
17 round hunting season for beavers in Unit 23 with no
18 harvest limit or sealing requirements. In addition the
19 trapping season was extended to year-round with no
20 harvest limit and no sealing requirements. In 2007 the
21 Board adopted a proposal requesting a hunting season
22 for beavers in Unit 23 with no closed season and no
23 harvest limit.

24
25 Arctic landscapes are in transition due
26 to changes in the climate. Increased warmth in the
27 summer and longer growing seasons are contributing to
28 the increasing Tundra productivity and shrub dominated
29 vegetation. Beavers have increasingly moved into
30 Tundra areas during the last 20 years. Beaver numbers
31 remain high in Unit 23 particularly in the Selawik and
32 Kobuk River drainages where beavers have fully occupied
33 high quality habitat and now widely occur in large
34 areas as well.

35
36 Current harvest data is limited because
37 few people have sealed pelts since ADF&G made beaver
38 sealing requirements voluntary for Unit 23 in 2000.
39 The most recent community harvest surveys in the
40 community subsistence information system is in 2014,
41 the data suggests that beaver harvesting varies greatly
42 by year and community as you can see in Figure 1 and
43 Table 1 on Page 423.

44
45 If this proposal is adopted the beaver
46 harvest limit would be changed from 50 and 30 beaver
47 per season in Unit 23 the Kobuk/Selawik and Unit 23
48 remainder respectfully to no harvest limit in both trap
49 areas. No impacts to the beaver population or user
50

0358

1 groups are expected as Federally-qualified subsistence
2 users can already trapped an unlimited number of
3 beavers on most Federal lands under the more liberal
4 State regulations. Additionally, adoption of this
5 proposal would align Federal and State regulations
6 reducing the regulatory complexity for users.

7
8 The OSM's conclusion is to support
9 Proposal WP22-50 with the modification to combine Unit
10 23 trap areas.

11
12 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
13 Board.

14
15 I'd be happy to field any questions.

16
17 (Pause)

18
19 MS. PITKA: Hello, did I get cut off.

20
21 MS. DETWILER: You are still on, I
22 think we're waiting for Chair Christianson. I'm not
23 sure if got dropped off or not.

24
25 OPERATOR: He disconnected, yes.

26
27 MS. PITKA: Oh, okay.

28
29 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

30
31 MS. PITKA: Well, then how about we go
32 to the next thing on the list Sue.

33
34 MS. DETWILER: Which would be summary
35 of written public comments on this closure -- on this
36 closure review.

37
38 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much.

39
40 MS. DETWILER: Or, I'm sorry, proposal.

41
42 MS. PITKA: Uh-huh.

43
44 MR. PLANK: Thank you, Madame Chair and
45 Sue. This is Tom Plank with OSM. There were no
46 written public comments for this proposal. Thank you.

47
48 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much for
49 that. I'd like to open the floor now for public
50

0359

1 comment.

2

3 OPERATOR: And, once, again, star, one
4 for any comments.

5

6 (Pause)

7

8 OPERATOR: Once again that is star, one
9 for any comments.

10

11 (Pause)

12

13 OPERATOR: No comments at this time.

14

15 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much.
16 Regional Advisory Council recommendation. I believe
17 that's Robbin LaVine, or wait, no, what I am I thinking
18 I'm sorry, Western Interior.

19

20 MR. REAKOFF: Madame Chair. Jack
21 Reakoff here, Western Interior Regional Advisory
22 Council. The Council supports as modified by OSM.
23 The Council feels that some residents of the area use
24 beaver for meat, particularly before caribou migrations
25 migrate into the area.

26

27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28

29 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much, I
30 appreciate that. Seward Peninsula.

31

32 MS. PILCHER: Madame Chairman. Members
33 of the Board. For the record, Nissa Pilcher, Council
34 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
35 Council. I'll be providing the Council's
36 recommendation for Chairman Green.

37

38 The Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
39 Council voted to support with modification suggested by
40 OSM. The Council supports this proposal as modified
41 because beaver are populous and expanding further
42 northward. The Council said they are concerned the
43 dams created by beaver will have a negative impact on
44 salmon and salmon streams. This proposal would aid in
45 keeping beaver populations in check, thereby helping
46 salmon populations.

47

48 Thank you.

49

50

0360

1 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much.
2 Northwest Arctic.

3
4 MS. MCDAVID: Thank you, Madame Chair.
5 This is Brooke McDavid, the Council Coordinator for the
6 Northwest Arctic Council. I will be standing in and
7 presenting the recommendation for all of the Northwest
8 Arctic proposals today on behalf of Chairman Baker who
9 is unable to make it.

10
11 The Northwest Arctic Council submitted
12 WP22-50 and supports this proposal. Beavers are
13 extremely abundant across the region and are continuing
14 to expand their range way up into river tributaries.
15 Beaver dams are negatively affecting fish, fishing
16 access and water quality. Additional beaver harvest
17 opportunity supports subsistence and may help to keep
18 the beaver population in check.

19
20 Thank you.

21
22 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much.
23 North Slope.

24
25 MR. BROWER: This is Gordon Brower with
26 the North Slope Regional Subsistence Advisory Council.
27 We chose to support WP22-50 for our neighbors. The
28 Council justification. Beavers are extremely abundant
29 in Unit 23 and their range keeps expanding. The
30 Council fully supports increased subsistence
31 opportunities to harvest the super abundant beaver
32 population in Unit 23.

33
34 And that's the end of our comment.

35
36 MS. PITKA: Thank you, I appreciate all
37 of your comments from the Regional Advisory Councils.
38 Right now we are at tribal, Alaska Native Corporation
39 comments and I believe that's Robbin LaVine.

40
41 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
42 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Orville Lind.
43 There were no comments or recommendations during the
44 consultation on this proposal.

45
46 Thank you, Madame Chair.

47
48 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much for
49 that. I appreciate that. Next on the list would be
50

0361

1 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments. State
2 Liaison.

3

4 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Madame Chair.

5 For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
6 supports this proposal. We have no conservation
7 concerns as users could already participate under our
8 more liberal State bag limits and it -- but in the end
9 it will align State and Federal regulations, which
10 eliminates user confusion, which we always support.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much for
15 that. I appreciate that. Now we're on InterAgency
16 Staff Committee comments.

17

18 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
19 This is Robbin LaVine. And for Wildlife Proposal 22-50
20 the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the standard
21 comment. Thank you, Madame Chair.

22

23 MS. PITKA: Thank you, I appreciate
24 that. We're at Board discussion with Council Chairs
25 and State Liaison now.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MS. PITKA: Hearing none, I'll open the
30 floor for Federal Subsistence Board action.

31

32 MS. CREACHBAUM: Madame Chair, Sarah
33 Creachbaum, National Park Service.

34

35 MS. PITKA: Yes, go ahead.

36

37 MS. CREACHBAUM: Madame Chair. I vote
38 to approve Wildlife Proposal WP22-50 with the OSM
39 modification to combine the Unit 23 trap areas to
40 reduce confusion in the regulations. And with an
41 additional modification to set the harvest limit at 100
42 beaver per person. If I get a second I'll explain why
43 I intend to vote in support of my motion.

44

45 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

46

47 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. The
48 National Park Service understands that beavers are
49 increasing in range and activity in Unit 23 and the
50

0362

1 surrounding region. However, setting unlimited harvest
2 limits on National Park Service lands without
3 population estimates or robust harvest information
4 violates our recognized principles of fish and wildlife
5 conservation as referenced in ANILCA, Title VIII,
6 Section .805(c) and is laid out in the NPS Management
7 Policy, Chapter 4.4.2. The Service will assess the
8 results of managing plant and animal populations by
9 conducting follow up monitoring or other studies to
10 determine the impacts of the management methods on non-
11 targeted and targeted components of the ecosystem.
12 Approving an unlimited harvest without a system in
13 place to monitor impacts to the beaver's population
14 would be unwise given the history of overharvesting the
15 species in other parts of their range.

16

17 We do, however, recognize that the
18 consistent observations of abundant beavers may
19 represent an increased opportunities for subsistence
20 and creates concerns of environmental impacts to fish
21 streams and other important resources for subsistence
22 users in the region. Affected Councils voiced concerns
23 of beaver dams to have negative impact on salmon and
24 salmon streams and to be negatively affecting fish,
25 fish access and water quality. Therefore, our
26 additional modification is to set the harvest limit at
27 100 beaver per person.

28

29 Thank you, Madame Chair.

30

31 MS. PITKA: Hello, can you hear me.

32

33 REPORTER: Hi, Rhonda, yes.

34

35 MS. PITKA: Okay.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Yes. Rhonda, this is
38 Sue, may I just step in and make sure we got the mod --
39 the -- the prop -- I'm sorry, the motion correct, which
40 was to adopt the proposal as modified by OSM to combine
41 the Unit 23 trap areas with additional modification to
42 set the harvest limit at 100 beaver per person. I just
43 want to make sure we're correct on that.

44

45 MS. CREACHBAUM: That's correct.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Thank you, very
48 much.

49

50

0363

1 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you.

2

3 MR. PELTOLA: Madame Chair, BIA.

4

5 MS. PITKA: Thank you, go ahead, BIA.

6

7 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Madame Chair.

8 I was wondering if I could get a clarification if I
9 heard correctly that I thought I heard in the
10 justification, the history of overharvest potentially
11 of beaver, is that correct?

12

13 MS. CREACHBAUM: Yes, that's correct,
14 and I referred to other areas, overharvest in other
15 areas.

16

17 MR. PELTOLA: Okay. So I thought this
18 would be a very, very quick proposal to take up since
19 it's supported by several Regional Advisory Councils
20 although in other GMUs throughout the state I know of
21 numerous individuals that harvest more than 100 per
22 year, which not only provides a high important local
23 individuals to utilize, beaver's excellent table fare
24 in addition to its high fat content and high protein
25 and context for dogs, I personally have processed 64 in
26 one day before. And I'm not quite sold on the limit of
27 100 per person.

28

29 Thank you, Madame Chair.

30

31 MS. PITKA: Thank you. Was there any
32 amendment to that or was that just a comment under
33 discussion.

34

35 MR. PELTOLA: It's a comment that I was
36 considering. So at this time I'd like to move to make
37 a motion to remove the modification of 100 per person.
38 Thank you, Madame Chair.

39

40 MS. PITKA: Thank you. So there's a
41 motion on the table to amend -- to remove the limit of
42 100 beaver per person.

43

44 MR. BROWER: Second.

45

46 MS. PITKA: Seconded by Charlie Brower.
47 Now we're under discussion on the motion.

48

49 (No comments)

50

0364

1 MR. BROWER: Question.

2

3 MS. PITKA: Question's been called.

4 Can we get a roll call on the amendment.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: Sure.

7

8 MS. PITKA: Thank you, so much.

9

10 MS. DETWILER: So the motion on the
11 floor is to amend the original motion to remove the
12 harvest limit modification. And I will start the roll
13 call with the maker of the motion, Gene Peltola from
14 BIA.

15

16 MR. PELTOLA: Support for previous
17 reasons articulated.

18

19 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

20

21 Moving to Sara Boario, Fish and
22 Wildlife Service.

23

24 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
25 supports.

26

27 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

28

29 National Park Service, Sarah
30 Creachbaum.

31

32 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
33 opposes.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

36

37 BLM, Chris McKee.

38

39 MR. MCKEE: BLM supports.

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

42

43 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

44

45 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service
46 supports the amended motion by BIA.

47

48 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

49

50

0365

1 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

2

3 MS. PITKA: I support, thank you.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

6

7 Member Charlie Brower.

8

9 MR. BROWER: I support.

10

11 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

12

13 Chair Anthony Christianson, have you
14 come back online.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 MS. DETWILER: It looks like the motion
19 to amend has passed by seven to one.

20

21 MS. PITKA: Okay, now we're back to the
22 main motion. Now the main motion would read as
23 modified by OSM to combine Unit 23 trap areas.

24

25 MR. BROWER: Question.

26

27 MS. DETWILER: Yes, that's my
28 understanding Madame Chair.

29

30 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much. And
31 I believe Member Brower just called the question.

32

33 MR. BROWER: That's right.

34

35 MS. PITKA: Okay. Can we get a roll
36 call vote then, thank you.

37

38 MS. DETWILER: Okay. So the roll call
39 we'll start with Park Service, Sarah Creachbaum.

40

41 MS. CREACHBAUM: Because the no bag
42 limit is outside NPS policy I am -- I will have to
43 oppose.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

46

47 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

48

49 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service

50

0366

1 supports.

2

3

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

4

5

Gene Peltola, BIA.

6

7

MR. PELTOLA: Support.

8

9

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

10

11

Chris McKee, BLM.

12

13

14

MR. MCKEE: BLM supports in deference
to the Western Interior and Seward Penn RACs.

15

16

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

17

18

Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

19

20

21

22

23

MR. SCHMID: Forest Service supports in
deference to the RACs. And with all due respect to the
Park Service within -- working and operating within
their policies.

24

25

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

26

27

Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

28

29

30

MS. PITKA: I support in deference to
the Regional Advisory Councils. Thank you.

31

32

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

33

34

Public Member Charlie Brower.

35

36

MR. BROWER: Support.

37

38

MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

39

40

41

And Chair Christianson, were you able
to make it back online.

42

43

44

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, can you
hear me, Sue, I support.

45

46

47

48

49

MS. DETWILER: Yes, okay, thank you.
So the vote is seven to one in favor of the main motion
which is to adopt the proposal as modified by OSM.

50

0367

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
2 Sorry, I keep getting dropped down here. I think we're
3 having sun flares, that's what I'm going to blame it on
4 today.

5
6 MS. DETWILER: That must be a tough
7 problem to have down there.

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I'm sorry
10 to brag guys but sun shining in Southeast and the fish
11 eggs are spawning and so that's a little update from
12 the Chairman here. So thank you, Sue, I'm sorry I keep
13 getting dropped. My phone ran out of power and thank
14 you to Rhonda for picking it up. So we'll go ahead and
15 move on to the next one, Sue, thank you.

16
17 MS. DETWILER: That would be Wildlife
18 Closure Review 22-18 and that will be Kendra Holman
19 presenting that.

20
21 MS. HOLMAN: Can you hear me.

22
23 REPORTER: Yes.

24
25 MS. PITKA: Yes, go ahead.

26
27 MS. HOLMAN: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
28 of the Board. My name is Kendra Holman and I'm a
29 Wildlife Biologist with the Office of Subsistence
30 Management. This proposal -- or this closure review
31 can be found on Page 22 -- 1210 of your meeting book.

32
33 Unit -- the closure location is Unit 23
34 south of Rabbit Creek, Kiyak Creek and Noatak River and
35 west of the Cutler and Redstone Mountains, Baird
36 Mountains. Federal public lands are closed to the
37 taking of sheep except by Federally-qualified
38 subsistence users hunting under those regulations. A
39 map of this location can be found on Page 1211 of your
40 meeting book. The initial Federal subsistence hunting
41 regulation in 1991 were established by adopting the
42 existing State harvest limit of one ram with a 7/8ths
43 curl in the fall hunt and one sheep with a harvest
44 quota of 30 animals in the winter hunt. In 1991 and
45 1992 special actions adopted by the Federal Subsistence
46 Board closed the sheep harvest south and east of the
47 Noatak River. In 1998 the Board adopted the State's
48 sheep harvest zones of Unit 23 dividing it into the
49 Baird and DeLong Mountain ranges and closing Federal
50

1 public lands to non-Federally-qualified users in the
2 Baird Mountains. In 1999 a designated hunter permit
3 system was adopted by the Board in the Baird and DeLong
4 Mountain areas -- hunt areas of Units 23 and 26A. In
5 2014 both Federal and State sheep seasons were closed
6 in Units 23 and 26A. In 2016 a may be announced sheep
7 season in the Baird and DeLong Mountain hunt areas of
8 Unit 23 and delegated authority to open and close the
9 season, determine annual harvest quotas.

10

11

12 The dall sheep of the Baird Mountains
13 of Unit 23 are at the northwestern margin of the range
14 in Alaska and because of the -- the past weather events
15 affect their populations more than sheep populations in
16 other areas with more of -- than habitat and stable
17 range conditions. Severe weather in the 1990s resulted
18 in a high natural mortality dramatically reduced sheep
19 area -- sheep numbers in the area and caused the
20 closure of the general and subsistence hunts between
21 1991 and 1995. The sheep population ranged from 643
22 sheep in 2011 to 140- -- 74 sheep in 2019 representing
23 a 73 percent population decline. This is shown on
24 Figure 1 on Page 1216 of your met -- meeting book.
25 Between 2011 and 2019 the lamb per ewe-like sheep ratio
26 ranged from one to 52 lambs per 100 ewe-like sheep.
27 This can be seen on Figure 2 on Page 1216 of your
28 meeting book. Low lamb reproductivity in 2013 was
29 partially attributed to the long and cold 2012 and 2013
30 winter, late spring and record cold temperatures in May
31 2013. Between 2011 and 2019 the total number of rams
32 per ewe-like sheep ranged from 17 to 29 lambs per ewe-
33 like sheep seen on Figure 2, found on Page 1216 of your
34 meeting book. Between 2011 and 2018 the full curl ram
35 per ewe-like sheep ratio ranged from one to nine full
36 curl rams per 100 ewe-like sheep. These low ratios
37 indicate there are very few to no large rams available
38 for harvest. Low sheep abundance resulted in closures
39 of both the State and Federal hunting seasons in the
40 Baird Mountains from 1991 to 1994. The Federal
41 subsistence hunt was opened in the 1998/99 regulatory
42 year and harvest occurred each year through 2014 except
43 the 1999/2000 and the 2000/2001 regulatory years when
44 low numbers of full curl rams were observed during
45 surveys and the hunt was -- was closed.

46

47

48 No sheep harvest has occurred in the
49 Baird Mountains under State or Federal regulations
50 since 2014 when the seasons were closed due to
conservation concern. Between 2004 and 2014 the annual

50

0369

1 reported sheep harvest in Unit 23 and 26A averaged 23
2 animals under both State hunting and Federal
3 subsistence regulation. The majority of this harvest
4 came from Federal subsistence regula -- registration
5 hunts in Unit 23.

6
7 The sheep population in the Baird
8 Mountains remains low declining 17 -- 73 percent since
9 2011 with few large rams and no harvestable surplus.
10 If this closure were lifted no Federally-qualified
11 subsistence users would be allowed to hunt sheep on
12 Federal public lands in the Baird Mountains.

13
14 The closure would be maintained -- this
15 closure should be maintained due to conservation
16 concerns.

17
18 The Western Arctic National ParkLands
19 Superintendent has a delegated authority letter to
20 announce the Federal in-season sheep maintaining the --
21 the may be announced season and delegated authority
22 allows for flexible -- hunt flexibility and harvest
23 opportunity in the event that the sheep population
24 recovers and a harvestable surplus exists. The
25 delegation of authority letter is attached as Appendix
26 1 found on Page 1222 of your meeting book.

27
28 Preliminary conclusion is -- the OSM
29 conclusion is to maintain the status quo.

30
31 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
32 Board. I'd be happy to address any questions.

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
35 questions from the Board.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
40 thank you. Hearing none, did we receive any public
41 comment during the proposal period, thank you.

42
43 MS. HOLMAN: Mr. Chair, this is Kendra
44 Holman. There were no written comments received.

45
46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
47 Operator, at this time if there's any public that would
48 like to be recognized this is their time to speak to
49 this agenda item. Thank you.

50

0370

1 OPERATOR: And if you would like to
2 make a comment please press, star, one.

3
4 (Pause)

5
6 OPERATOR: I'm showing no comments at
7 this time.

8
9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
10 Operator. We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council
11 Chair comments.

12
13 MS. MCDAVID: Mr. Chair, this is Brooke
14 McDavid, Northwest Arctic Coordinator.

15
16 The Northwest Arctic Council voted to
17 maintain the status quo on Wildlife Closure 22-18. The
18 sheep population remains very low and needs to continue
19 to be protected. The Council noted that the population
20 has been too low even for a to be announced winter
21 season for Federally-qualified subsistence users.
22 Local observations indicate a low and dwindling sheep
23 population that is stressed by challenging winter
24 weather conditions and predation. The Council requests
25 ongoing monitoring of the sheep population.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
30 We'll move on to Tribal Native Liaison.

31
32 MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Oh, yes, sorry,
35 there's other RACs, go ahead, Eva, you have the floor.

36
37 MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
38 members of the Board. I do believe North Slope
39 Regional Advisory Council Chair, Gordon Brower, is
40 online to provide recommendation. Thank you.

41
42 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Eva. And we
43 are on WCR22-18.

44
45 MS. PATTON: Yes, correct. Thank you,
46 Mr. Chair.

47
48 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You
49 know we heard some concerns in Unit 23 and, in fact,
50

0371

1 I'd like to thank Jack Reakoff for attending the North
2 Slope Regional Subsistence Advisory Council meeting to
3 express some concerns that we heard in our village in
4 the Anaktuvuk area, having some Federally-qualified
5 subsistence users identified.

6
7 So the Council recommendation is to
8 maintain status quo.

9
10 Justification. The sheep population
11 remains very low and needs to be continued to be
12 protected. The Council supported maintaining the
13 closure due to continuing conservation concerns. The
14 Council member from Point Hope, that's Steve Oomittuk,
15 noted that sheep haven't been seen locally in the
16 DeLong Mountains or Cape (Indiscernible) in quite some
17 time as their population declined. Those were his own
18 personal knowledge regarding that.

19
20 So with that, that would be the end of
21 our comments for WCR22-18.

22
23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Mr.
24 Brower. Are there any other RACs who would like to
25 speak to this.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
30 We'll move on to tribal consultation, Native Liaison.

31
32 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Tribal Liaison
34 Orville Lind. There were no comments or
35 recommendations during the consultation on this
36 proposal.

37
38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
41 We'll move on to State Liaison.

42
43 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
44 record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports
45 the elimination of this closure because as of right now
46 currently no open State season for sheep within GMU 23
47 and what harvest does occur, the superintendent of the
48 Western Arctic National ParkLands has the delegated
49 authority on Federal public lands to provide
50

0372

1 opportunity to Federally-qualified users when
2 appropriate. ADF&G would not consider any hunting
3 under State regulations until such a time until the
4 population reaches the appropriate size.

5

6 Thank you, sir.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

9 We'll go on to ISC recommendation.

10

11 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 This is Robbin LaVine, Policy Coordinator and
13 InterAgency Staff Committee Chair. For Wildlife
14 Closure Review 22-18, the ISC provided the standard
15 comment.

16

17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18

19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,

20 Robbin. That opens the floor for Board discussion.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is

25 open for Board action.

26

27 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National

28 Park Service.

29

30 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have

31 the floor, Sarah.

32

33 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. Mr. Chair,

34 the National Park Service moves to maintain status quo
35 for Wildlife Closure Review WCR22-18 which keeps Unit
36 23 closed to the taking of sheep except by Federally-
37 qualified subsistence users. Following a second I will
38 explain why I intend to support my motion.

39

40 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, second.

41

42 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. The sheep
43 population in the Baird Mountains remains low and has
44 been declining by 73 percent since 2011 with few large
45 rams and no harvestable surplus. Further, the State
46 sheep season has been closed since 2014 and the Western
47 Arctic National ParkLand superintendent has delegated
48 authority to announce a Federal sheep season and to
49 close sheep hunting to non-Federally-qualified users,
50

0373

1 when necessary. No Federal sheep hunting season has
2 been announced since 2015 due to conservation concerns.
3 In case the sheep population would recover to the
4 degree that a harvestable surplus exists harvest
5 opportunities can be created through the delegation of
6 authority in place.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
11 further discussion by the Board.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
16 question.

17

18 MR. PELTOLA: BIA, question.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Question's been
21 called. All in favor of the motion as presented
22 signify by saying aye.

23

24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25

26 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
27 sign.

28

29 (No opposing votes)

30

31 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
32 unanimously. Thank you. We'll go ahead and move on to
33 the next one, Sue.

34

35 MS. DETWILER: That would be Wildlife
36 Closure Review 22-45 and that will be presented by
37 Hannah Voorhees.

38

39 MS. VOORHEES: Hello, Mr. Chair and
40 members of the Board. This is Hannah Voorhees,
41 Anthropologist with Office of Subsistence Management.
42 And I'll be presenting Wildlife Closure Review 22-45
43 located in Unit 23. The analysis begins on Page 1226
44 of the Board book.

45

46 A description of the closure reads
47 Federal public lands within a 10 mile wide corridor,
48 five miles either side along the Noatak River from the
49 western boundary of Noatak National Preserve up stream

50

1 to the confluence with the Cutler River within the
2 northern and southern boundaries of the Eli and Agi
3 River drainages respectively, and within the Squirrel
4 River drainage are closed to caribou except by
5 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

6
7 This is a year-round closure that was
8 initiated in 2018 and has not been reviewed since.

9
10 All Federal public lands in Unit 23
11 were closed to caribou hunting by non-Federally-
12 qualified users for the 2016 to 2017 regulatory year.
13 That closure was due to conservation and the impact of
14 non-local hunting. Beginning in 2017 the current
15 targeted Noatak closure went into place, first as a
16 special action and then as a standard regulation in
17 2018.

18
19 In other regulatory context that did
20 not make it into the Board book, on May 30th [sic] this
21 year, the Board approved Wildlife Special Action 21-
22 01(a) with modification to close Noatak National
23 Preserve including the Nigu River portion of the
24 Preserve in Unit 26A in BLM-managed lands between the
25 Noatak and Kobuk Rivers in Unit 23 to caribou hunting
26 by non-Federally-qualified users from August 1st
27 through September 30th during the 2022 to '23 and 2023
28 to 2024 regulatory years.

29
30 In terms of biological background, the
31 Western Arctic Herd peaked near 500,000 caribou in 2003
32 declining to about 200,000 in 2016. In recent years
33 the herd seemed to be recovering with approximately
34 244,000 caribou in 2019 but the most recent photo
35 census in 2021 estimated the herd at only 188,000.
36 Local hunters account for approximately 95 percent of
37 the total herd harvest.

38
39 The next -- effects of the closure to-
40 date. The most recent subsistence survey of caribou
41 harvest in Noatak dates to 2016 to 2017, there are no
42 new data available that would allow for a comparison of
43 household harvest before and after implementation of
44 the closure. However, testimony reflecting the success
45 of the closure for Noatak has been given by Northwest
46 Arctic Council members every year since the closure was
47 implemented. If the closure is lifted, non-Federally-
48 qualified users would be able to hunt caribou on
49 Federal public lands along the Noatak River and within
50

0375

1 the Squirrel, Eli and Agi River drainages. Of note,
2 since the approval of WSA21-01(a) following production
3 of your Board book, this would apply except for August
4 and September during the next two years when the
5 targeted closure, currently under review, will be
6 encompassed by and duplicated by the new larger
7 temporary closure area. If the closure is lifted this
8 could result in more user conflict and interfere with
9 caribou harvest by Federally-qualified subsistence
10 users.

11
12 The OSM conclusion is to maintain the
13 status quo with the following justification. The
14 current closure is still necessary to continue
15 subsistence uses of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd for
16 Federally-qualified subsistence users, specifically
17 Noatak residents. The underlying factor leading to the
18 closure, user conflict, has persisted overall in Unit
19 23 but has been mitigated in the closure area.
20 Additionally the herd is now being managed at the
21 preservative declining level under the Western Arctic
22 Caribou Herd Working Group management framework.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 That concludes my presentation and I'm
27 happy to answer any questions.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Any questions
30 for Staff.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
35 was there any public testimony given during this
36 proposal period. Thank you.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Was there any
41 public testimony received during this proposal period,
42 thank you.

43
44 MS. VOORHEES: Mr. Chair, my apologies,
45 I had an issue with mute. This is Hannah Voorhees
46 again. A written public comment was received from
47 Resident Hunters of Alaska. The group supports
48 eliminating the closure because it excludes non-local
49 residents of Alaska. They suggest eliminating access
50

0376

1 to non-resident hunters through the Board of Game
2 process instead.

3
4 The Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working
5 Group submitted the following brief comment to the
6 Federal Subsistence Board on February 3rd, 2022. The
7 working group voted to support WCR22-45 and the
8 continuation of the current closure.

9
10 And that was the extend of the
11 comments.

12
13 Thank you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
16 Operator, at this time is there anybody online who
17 would like to be recognized to speak to this agenda
18 item, now would be the time to be recognized.

19
20 Thank you.

21
22 OPERATOR: And as a reminder, for any
23 comments please press star, one.

24
25 (Pause)

26
27 OPERATOR: I'm showing no comment, sir.

28
29 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
30 We'll move on to Regional Advisory Council
31 recommendation.

32
33 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, there were
34 several Regional Advisory Councils that had comments on
35 these and might start with Western Interior.

36
37 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Jack
38 Reakoff.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Jack, you
41 have the floor and Sue will call it from here forward.
42 Thank you.

43
44 MS. DETWILER: Okay.

45
46 MR. REAKOFF: The Western Interior
47 chose to defer this to back to the affected region, we
48 didn't take any comments on it.

49
50

0377

1 Thank you.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Northwest Arctic.

4

5 MS. MCDAVID: For the record, Brooke
6 McDavid, Northwest Arctic Council Coordinator. The
7 Northwest Arctic Council voted to maintain the status
8 quo for WCR22-45. The Council recommended maintaining
9 the targeted caribou closure in Unit 23 as the success
10 of this closure has been time tested now and protects
11 the opportunity of subsistence hunters along the Noatak
12 River and other river drainages.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 MS. DETWILER: North Slope.

17

18 MR. BROWER: Good afternoon, Gordon
19 Brower, Regional Advisory Council Chair for the North
20 Slope. And the North Slope did make a recommendation.
21 The Council recommendation is to maintain status quo.
22 Justification. The Council recommended maintaining the
23 targeted caribou closure in Unit 23 in support of
24 Noatak to continue to reduce previously significant
25 user conflict in the area and because the targeted
26 closure provides a needed priority for subsistence
27 users to put food on the table.

28

29 That's the end of our comment.

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Seward Peninsula.

32

33 MS. PILCHER: Mr. Chairman. Members of
34 the Board. For the record, Nissa Pilcher, Council
35 Coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
36 Council. The Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
37 Council voted to maintain the status quo for WCR22-45.
38 The Council recommended maintaining the status quo
39 because the closure is still necessary to continue
40 subsistence uses of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and
41 due to the proximity of Unit 23 to the closure area --
42 excuse me -- and due to the proximity of the Unit 23
43 closure area to Unit 22.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 MS. DETWILER: Mr. Chair, I believe
48 those are all the Regional Advisory Council
49 recommendations.

50

0378

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
2 questions from the Board for any RAC Chair.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
7 we'll move on to the State -- I mean the Tribal Native
8 Liaison.

9
10 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Orville Lind.
12 There were no comments or recommendations during the
13 consultations on Wildlife Closure Review 22-45.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
18 State Liaison, Mr. Mulligan.

19
20 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. For the
21 record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports
22 the elimination of this closure. Harvest by non-
23 Federally-qualified users is minuscule when compared to
24 the overall harvest on the Western Arctic Herd. Bulls
25 are overwhelmingly harvested by non-Federally-qualified
26 users and the herd's bull to cow ratio is above the
27 objective and there is still a harvestable surplus
28 available to meet the amount necessary for subsistence.
29 If migration of the herd is a consideration of this
30 closure caused by non-Federally-qualified users hunting
31 practices, and/or airplane activity, then, as we have
32 previously stated on comments on this issue before,
33 there are more appropriate mechanisms through the
34 State's public regulatory process available to address
35 those issues.

36
37 Thank you, sir.

38
39 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
40 questions for the State.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Moving on, ISC
45 recommendation.

46
47 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48 This is Robbin LaVine. And for Wildlife Closure Review
49 22-45 the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the
50

0379

1 standard comment.

2

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

6 That opens up the floor for Board deliberation,
7 comments or questions.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
12 open for Board action.

13

14 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National
15 Park Service. Mr. Chair, the National Park Service
16 moves to maintain status quo for Wildlife Closure
17 Review WCR22-45. Following a second I will explain why
18 I intend to support my motion.

19

20 MR. BROWER: Second.

21

22 MS. PITKA: I'll second.

23

24 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. The Board
25 enacted the current closure for the continuation of
26 subsistence uses of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.
27 The underlying factor leading to the closure in 2018,
28 user conflict, has persisted in Unit 23. Feedback from
29 Noatak residents indicates that the current closure has
30 reduced user conflicts resulting in more successful
31 caribou hunts and allowing for the continuation of
32 subsistence uses. Further, the Western Arctic Caribou
33 Herd Management Plan indicates the population to be at
34 a preservative declining level and the Federal
35 Subsistence Board just supported the special action
36 request, WSA21-01 to close large proportions of Federal
37 lands in Unit 23 to non-Federally-qualified subsistence
38 users for one regulatory cycle.

39

40 Since the closure has been enacted user
41 conflicts within the closure area have been reduced and
42 the hunt experiences and harvest success of Federally-
43 qualified subsistence users have improved.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46

47 (Teleconference interference -
48 participants not muted)

49

50

0380

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. All
2 right, the floor is open now for any Board questions,
3 comments, or discussion on this motion.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
8 question.

9
10 MR. PELTOLA: Question, BIA.

11
12 MR. BROWER: Question.

13
14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, all in
15 favor.....

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Sue, do you
20 want to do roll call on this one, it got quiet there.
21 Thank you.

22
23 MS. DETWILER: I was just wondering if
24 I got cut off here. I'll try roll call then.

25
26 Starting with -- the motion on the
27 floor is to maintain the status quo on this closure and
28 I'll start out with the National Park Service, Sarah
29 Creachbaum.

30
31 MS. CREACHBAUM: National Park Service
32 supports.

33
34 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

35
36 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

37
38 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
39 supports.

40
41 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

42
43 Gene Peltola, BIA.

44
45 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports based on the
46 recommendation by the affected Regional Advisory
47 Councils.

48
49 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

50

0381

1 Chris McKee, BLM.

2

3 MR. MCKEE: BLM supports in deference
4 to the Councils.

5

6 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

7

8 Dave Schmid, Forest Service.

9

10 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service also
11 supports in deference to the Councils.

12

13 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

14

15 Public Member Rhonda Pitka.

16

17 MS. PITKA: I support in deference to
18 the Regional Advisory Councils. Thank you.

19

20 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

21

22 Public Member Charlie Brower.

23

24 MR. BROWER: I support as stated.

25

26 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Charlie.

27

28 Chair Christianson.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Did we lose you Tony.

33

34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: No, I'm here,
35 thank you. I said, yes, I support.

36

37 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you. The
38 motion passes unanimously. I believe that brings us to
39 our final two proposals on the non-consensus agenda.
40 Eastern Interior's items were all on the consensus
41 agenda and so that brings us to North Slope with their
42 two proposals, WP22-54 and that will be presented by
43 Kendra Holman, if you're ready to go on, Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, we'll go
46 on, thank you. Kendra, you have the floor.

47

48 MS. HOLMAN: Hello, Mr. Chair. Members
49 of the Board. This is Kendra Holman and I'm a Wildlife

50

1 Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.
2 Wildlife Proposal WP22-54 submitted by the North Slope
3 Regional Advis -- Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
4 can be found on Page 1253 of your meeting book.

5
6 This proposal requests modification of
7 the hunt area boundary for moose in Unit 26A identified
8 on Map 1 on Page 1256 of your meeting book.

9
10 The proponent states that the moose
11 hunt opportunity in this is -- in this -- is
12 particularly beneficial in the community of Atqasuk and
13 Utqiagvik that have the closest access to the hunt
14 area. The current boundary of 156 west longitude is a
15 70 mile trip by boat up the Ikpikpuk River for
16 residents of Utqiagvik and expanded -- an expanded hunt
17 area would allow moose harvest west of the Alaktak
18 River and would be beneficial to the local community
19 hunters that don't have to -- that have to travel so
20 far.

21
22 The Council recommends establishing
23 this new boundary to follow the natural landscape
24 feature of the Alaktak River which is a tributary to
25 the Ikpikpuk River and runs north/south to Admiralty
26 Bay. The Alaktak River is well known by local
27 communities and will provide a natural hunt area
28 boundary that is easy to identify rather than the
29 current abstract 156 west longitude that is very
30 difficult to locate on the ground. Establishing the
31 hunt area west of the Alaktak River would help local
32 communities and families that hunt and have cabins on
33 the Chipp River and have access to this moose hunt
34 area. Council members have related their experiences
35 of how that encountering a moose in the area is
36 opportunistic and therefore the harvest is anticipated
37 to still be low.

38
39 From 1991 to 1996 there was a 75
40 percent moose population decline prompting stricter
41 State regulation. In '96 the Federal Subsistence Board
42 closed moose hunting to -- on all Federal public lands
43 in Unit 26A except in that portion of the Colville
44 River drainage down stream from the mouth of the -- the
45 -- the Anaktuvuk River. The area did remain open to
46 Federally-qualified subsistence users. From 2002 to
47 2014 State and Federal hunting regulations were
48 liberalized as the moose population had started
49 increasing. In 1998 [sic]. In 2014 the season was
50

1 reduced in length and the non-resident draw hunt closed
2 due to the moose population decline.

3
4 Prior to the 1940s the moose were
5 scarce along the North Slope. Subsequently populations
6 expanded along the limited riparian habitat of the
7 major drainages and had become well established in the
8 southeast portion of Unit 26A. The northern extent of
9 the moose's population on the North Slope is limited by
10 habitat availability. Since the late 1970s ADF&G has
11 conduc -- conducted several aerial surveys in all the
12 major drainages of Unit 26A to assess population status
13 and recruitment of short yearlings. Between 1970 and
14 2021 the Unit 26A moose population fluctuated ranging
15 from 294 moose to 1,535 moose. This can be seen on
16 Table 1 on Page 1260 of your meeting book. And the
17 percentage of short yearlings ranged from one to 25
18 percent. The periods of population declines resulted
19 from poor calf survival and high adult -- adult
20 mortality. Moose mortality was likely due to
21 malnourishment, bacterial diseases, mineral
22 deficiencies, predations from wolves and bears, weather
23 factors and competition with snowshoe hare for browse.
24 In 2008 weights of short yearlings averaged 322 pounds,
25 which is the lightest recorded in Alaska and an
26 indicator of malnourishment. Moose harvest levels have
27 responded to popu -- (indiscernible) levels and
28 regulations. The peak estimated abundance of moose was
29 in 1991. The average harvest level at that time was 57
30 moose per year. In 1995 restricted regulations
31 implemented and the harvest dropped to 14 moose. In
32 1996 the use of aircraft in the area was banned and the
33 moose harvest dropped to an average of four moose per
34 year until 2004. In 2006 regulations began to be
35 liberalized including a State draw permit hunt and the
36 use of aircraft to hunt moose which lasted until 2015.
37 Non-resident moose hunting in Unit 26A has been closed
38 since 2014. From 2009 to 2019 the average reported
39 moose harvest was 3.73 per year. This can be found on
40 Table 3, which is on Page 1262 of your meeting book.

41
42 The proposed changes will have effect
43 on the moose population of Unit 26A. Regulations of
44 the affected area would change from one bull during the
45 season of August 1 to September 1 to one moose during a
46 season of July 1st to September 14. The change is not
47 expected to impact the moose population or harvesting
48 levels. The prohibition of harvesting a calf or a cow
49 accompanied by a calf would be applicable and would
50

0384

1 help to mitigate any conservation concerns.

2

3

4 While the moose population in Unit 26A
5 is below State management objectives, adoption of this
6 proposal is not expected to have the -- to affect the
7 population due to very low harvest. Adoption of the
8 proposal also increases hunting opportunity for
9 Federally-qualified subsistence users by providing a
10 longer season and a more liberal harvest limit within
11 the affected area and makes it more feasible for
12 Federally-qualified subsistence users to reach the hunt
13 area. Currently the number of animals reported harvest
14 in Unit 26A is less than one percent of the population.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

OSM's conclusion is to support Proposal
WP22-55 with modification to revise the hunt area
descriptor to Unit 26A, that portion west of the
eastern shore of Admiralty Bay and the Alaktak River to
155 west longitude excluding the Colville River
drainage, one moose, however, you may not take a calf
or -- or -- or cow accompanied by a calf.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
Board.

I'd be happy to address any questions.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
questions from the Board for Staff.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right,
hearing none, any public testimony received during the
proposal period.

MS. HOLMAN: Mr. Chair, this is Kendra.
There was no public -- written public comments received
on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
Kendra. Operator, this is the time anybody online who
would like to be recognized to speak to this agenda
item, now is the time.

OPERATOR: As a reminder, if you would
like to make a comment please press star, one.

0385

1 (Pause)

2

3 OPERATOR: For any comments please
4 press star, one.

5

6 (Pause)

7

8 OPERATOR: No comments at this time.

9

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
11 We'll go ahead and move on, Tribal Liaison.

12

13 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Orville Lind.
15 There were no comments or recommendations during the
16 consultation of this proposal.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
21 Robbin. Did we jump over Regional Advisory Council
22 recommendation, sorry about that guys.

23

24 MS. PATTON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 And we do have the North Slope Subsistence Regional
26 Advisory Council Chair, Gordon Brower, online. Thank
27 you.

28

29 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Madame
30 Coordinator Eva. I'm going to miss calling you that
31 when you move over, was it to the Gates of The Arctic,
32 I think, that you were moving on as our long time
33 Coordinator.

34

35 Yeah, Mr. Chair, Gordon Brower,
36 Regional -- North Slope Regional Subsistence Advisory
37 Council Chair. We deliberated on this more than once
38 before and has been a source of dialogue for many years
39 about the descriptor on moose. The Council supported
40 and it was our proposal with OSM modification
41 clarifying the hunt area boundary descriptor. The
42 Council submitted this proposal to provide easier
43 access to traditional hunting areas along the Alaktak
44 River for Federally-qualified users. It's much easier
45 to look at a land feature and determine whether you're
46 in or out of a boundary than turning on a GPS to
47 determine your outside of the 156 west longitude, which
48 also puts that boundary about two miles to the west and
49 until you reach somewhere around Price River or Price

50

0386

1 or Valley of the Willows area then you can get in the
2 hunt area and there are some more opportunistic
3 provisions we're looking at that once in awhile a moose
4 will come and meander down the river and it's much
5 easier to use the bank of the Alaktak River until it
6 terminates up by Ikpikpuk where the Chipp and Alaktak
7 reach up that way and then -- and -- so right now the
8 subsistence hunters from Utqiagvik and Atqasuk have to
9 travel extremely long distances and when we get to
10 these places we're already committed to bringing
11 probably in excess of, you know, \$700 worth of fuel to
12 get this far to get to go to our hunt areas and long
13 distances to reach the current hunt area, which is
14 difficult to access and prohibitive due to high cost of
15 fuel. And we know that fuel is one of those things
16 that, you know, sometimes families subsidize each other
17 in order to try to be more successful.

18

19 Changing the hunt area boundary so that
20 it follows the natura river corridor rather than 156
21 west longitude will also help the hunters know for
22 certain they are in -- within bounds.

23

24 The Council also noticed that this
25 proposal would not pose a conservation concern because
26 hunters can only travel to the hunt area on occasion
27 due to the high cost and time involved and the moose
28 are not always available for harvest along the river
29 corridors. Council members reported that moose are
30 often in excess of 130 miles from Utqiagvik so harvest
31 is still very opportunistic.

32

33 The Council supports the OSM
34 recommendation to include the eastern coastline of the
35 Admiralty Bay as it clarifies the description of the
36 hunt area boundary where the Alaktak River enters the
37 bay.

38

39 That concludes our comments on the --
40 and our justification for the proposal.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
45 Gordon. Any questions from the Board for Gordon.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Appreciate

50

0387

1 that. Any other RACs wish to speak to this.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay. We'll
6 move on to the Tribal Native Liaison comment.

7

8 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Orville Lind.
10 There were no comments or recommendations during the
11 consultation on this proposal.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
16 We'll move to the State Liaison comment.

17

18 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 For the record, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
20 opposes changing the border for any moose hunt in GMU
21 26A because it will result in a misalignment in Federal
22 and State regulations possibly creating confusion
23 amongst not only the hunters but enforcement officers
24 who are on the ground.

25

26 Thank you, sir.

27

28 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Ben.
29 Any questions for the State.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Hearing none,
34 we'll go ahead and move on. ISC recommendation.

35

36 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 This is Robbin LaVine again. For Wildlife Proposal 22-
38 44 the InterAgency Staff Committee provided the
39 standard comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
42 Robbin. Any Board discussion, deliberation.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
47 open for Board action.

48

49 MR. HEINLEIN: Mr. Chair, Tom Heinlein,

50

0388

1 BLM.

2

3

4

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, Tom, you have the floor.

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. Mr. Chair, this is Tom Heinlein, Bureau of Land Management. I move to adopt Proposal WP22-54 as modified by OSM and if I get a second I'll explain why I intend to vote in support of my motion.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. HEINLEIN: Thank you. If this proposal is adopted it would increase harvest opportunities for Federally-qualified subsistence users by providing for a longer season and more liberal -- liberal harvest limit while also making it more feasible for hunters to reach this new hunt area. Harvest in the area is currently very low and is not expected.....

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted - on hold)

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

MR. HEINLEIN:to affect the moose population. The modified hunt area descriptor does not leave any gaps for ambiguous areas while using a hunt boundary that follows the natural river corridor more easily know where they're located. The modification is also consistent with the recommendation of the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council.

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any other Board discussion, comments or questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the question on the motion.

MR. SCHMID: Question.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: We'll go ahead and -- question's been called. All in favor of the motion as presented signify by saying aye.

0389

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Opposed, same
4 sign.

5

6 (No opposing votes)

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Motion carries
9 unanimously. Thank you. We'll go ahead and go on to
10 the North Slope last proposal. Thank you.

11

12 MS. DETWILER: Yes, Mr. Chair, that's
13 Wildlife Proposal 22-56 and that will be presented by
14 Tom Plank.

15

16 MR. PLANK: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
17 Members of the Board. Again, my name is Tom Plank and
18 I am a Wildlife Biologist in the Office of Subsistence
19 Management and I will be presenting a summary of the
20 analysis for Wildlife Proposal WP22-56 submitted by
21 Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource
22 Commission requesting that brown bear harvest limit for
23 that portion of Unit 26A within Gates of the Arctic
24 National Park be increased from one bear to two bears
25 and that is starting on Page 477.

26

27 The proponent submitted this proposal
28 because residents of Anaktuvuk Pass have observed brown
29 bear populations growing and believe that the harvest
30 is far below sustainable yield. The Commission states
31 that the proposal would afford Anaktuvuk Pass residents
32 hunting brown bears additional harvest opportunities.

33

34 At its January 2020 meeting the Board
35 of Game adopted Proposal 29 to increase the resident
36 State brown bear harvest limit in Unit 26A from one
37 bear per year to two bears per year. The Board of Game
38 concluded that there was no biological concern,
39 furthermore, they concluded that the residents harvest
40 was low and comparing data from eight other units with
41 a two bear harvest limit, the change in harvest limit
42 was not likely to increase bear harvest significantly.

43

44 Densities of brown bear vary widely in
45 Unit 26A with densities highest in the foothills of the
46 Brooks Range and lowest in the northern portion of the
47 unit. The current population estimate for brown bears
48 in Unit 26A is 900 to 1120 bears. Brown bear densities
49 and reproductive output within Gates of the Arctic

50

0390

1 National Park are among the lowest in Alaska. Limited
2 food resources and a short growing season are likely
3 major factors contributing to these demograph patterns.

4
5 The ADF&G management goal is to keep
6 the harvest at or below an average of five percent of
7 the bear population during any two year period. Under
8 these guidelines the maximum allowable harvest would be
9 approximately 151 bears per year.

10
11 Between 2008 and 2018 total reported
12 harvest in Unit 26A ranged from 10 to 31 bears and
13 averaged 20 bears per year. With the resident reported
14 harvest, on average, accounting for eight bears per
15 year. A significant management problem in Unit 26A
16 continues to be unreported harvest and non-compliance
17 with bear hunting regulations, however, community-based
18 harvest assessment studies indicate a potential of
19 three to four harvests of brown bears per year that are
20 not reported but does not appear to be a level that
21 causes a biological problem.

22
23 Current harvest rates are below the
24 State recommended sustainable harvest rate for Unit
25 26A. This proposal may result in some increase in
26 harvest but it is not expected to increase total
27 harvest rates above the minimal sustainable level but
28 it would increase harvest opportunities for Federally-
29 qualified users, specifically within Unit 26A, the
30 portion within the Gates of the Arctic National Park.

31
32 Adoption of this proposal, as submitted
33 would retain the more restrictive harvest limit of one
34 bear per year on other Federal public lands within Unit
35 26A, although under State regulations Federally-
36 qualified subsistence users can already harvest two
37 bears on these Federal lands not within the Gates of
38 the Arctic National Park.

39
40 The OSM conclusion is to support
41 Proposal WP22-56.

42
43 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the
44 Board.

45
46 I'd be happy to field any questions.

47
48 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
49 questions for Staff.

50

0391

1 (No comments)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: All right, was there any public testimony received during the proposal period. Thank you.

MR. PLANK: Yes, Mr. Chair, there were two written public comments, both opposing citing concerns over low density and the low reproductive rates of bears in the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. The commenters are concerned of an increase potential for overharvest.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Tom. Operator, at this time make available anybody online who would like to publicly testify, this is their opportunity to speak to this agenda item.

Thank you.

OPERATOR: Certainly. Once again that is star, one.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: Once again that is star, one if you would like to speak at this time.

(Pause)

OPERATOR: I'm showing no one in the cue at this time, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, very much. At this time, we'll, again, call on our Regional Advisory Council Chair to give us the position. Thank you.

MS. PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I believe that's the North Slope.

MS. PATTON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I believe Gordon Brower is still online.

0392

1 MR. BROWER: Yes.

2

3 MS. PATTON: Great, thank you.

4

5 MR. BROWER: Thank you. Gordon Brower,
6 North Slope Regional Advisory Council Chair. We rose
7 to support WP22-56 on the brown bear in Unit 26A,
8 increase harvest limits. Justification. The Council
9 believes it is important to recognize that this
10 proposal came from the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence
11 Resource Commission based on the request of residents
12 of Anaktuvuk Pass to increase the harvest limit of
13 brown bears. This regulation also -- this regulation
14 change is also consistent with current harvest limits
15 for brown bear in Unit 26A and 24 under State
16 regulations and create more uniformity across different
17 land jurisdictions. Council Member Williams of
18 Anaktuvuk Pass noted that typically they do not harvest
19 many bears but when the brown bear population is
20 increasing they've become more frequent around the
21 village and it would be helpful to have the opportunity
22 to harvest more.

23

24 That is the extent of our comments,
25 thank you.

26

27 MS. PITKA: Thank you for your comment.
28 I'm not sure if Tony Christianson is still online.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MS. DETWILER: Madame Chair. I'm just
33 getting some messages that people have been dropping
34 off. I think it's those solar flares down in
35 Southeast.

36

37 MS. PITKA: Okay. So thank you, Mr.
38 Brower, for your comments. Tribal, Alaska Native
39 Corporation comments.

40

41 MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
42 This is Robbin LaVine standing in for Orville Lind.
43 there were no comments or recommendations during the
44 consultation on this proposal.

45

46 Thank you, Madame Chair.

47

48 MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much. And
49 now we're on to Alaska Department of Fish and Game

50

0393

1 comments, State Liaison.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, Madame Chair. For the record, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game supports this proposal. Harvest of brown bears in GMU 26A is low and very few are reported harvested within the Park boundaries. Only Federally-qualified users of the area are allowed to hunt within the Gates of the Arctic National Park so this increase in the bag limit will only apply to those limited amount of the hunters. In other parts of the state a change in bag limit of brown bears from one two has resulted only in a moderate or no increase in harvest. We also support the proposal as it aligns State and Federal bag limits.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MS. PITKA: Thank you, very much for your comments. InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Madame Chair. This is Robbin LaVine with the InterAgency Staff Committee. The InterAgency Staff Committee forwarded the following comments.

While adoption of Proposal WP22-56 would provide additional opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users, conservation concerns also exist for this brown bear population. Brown bear densities and reproductive out put within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve are among the lowest in Alaska. Limited food resources and a short growing season are likely major factors contributing to these demographic patterns. Based on reported subsistence use within the region there does not appear to be a subsistence need to justify doubling the harvest limit for brown bears from one to two within Gates of the Arctic portion of Game Management Unit 26A. According to harvest survey reports within Anaktuvuk Pass only four to 10 percent of households use brown bears and across Game Management Unit 26A, on average, only eight bears were harvested per year between 1985 and 2014, and, on average, only half of the harvest was by Alaska residents. Reported brown bear harvest has remained consistently low over the last 20 years not reflecting an increasing subsistence need and low density and recruitment within the brown bear population across GMU 26A increases the risk of overharvest.

0394

1 The ISC acknowledges the concern for
2 the conservation of the brown bear population within
3 Gates of the Arctic, this proposal contradicts the
4 affected land management agency's mission where
5 harvesting predators is not permitted when there is no
6 documented subsistence need.

7
8 Thank you, Madame Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
11 Robbin. And so we'll go back to Board discussion,
12 deliberation. Thank you, Rhonda, for stepping in.

13
14 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

15
16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
17 the floor.

18
19 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair. BIA would
20 like to express our utmost concern about the last
21 sentence in the ISC position, or comments, similar to
22 those that I forwarded when we deliberated 22-46 in GMU
23 24B as well.

24
25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you,
28 Gene. Let the record reflect that statement. Any
29 other Board comments, discussion, deliberation prior to
30 Board action.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The floor is
35 open for Board action.

36
37 MS. CREACHBAUM: Mr. Chair, National
38 Park Service.

39
40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, you have
41 the floor.

42
43 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thanks, Mr. Chair.
44 The National Park Service moves to adopt Wildlife
45 Proposal 22-56 with the modification to only adopt this
46 proposal for one full regulatory cycle, 2022 to 2024.
47 Following a second I will explain why I intend to
48 support my motion.

49
50

1 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconds.

2

3

4 MS. CREACHBAUM: Thank you. Wildlife
5 Proposal 22-56 requests that the brown bear harvest
6 limit for that portion of Unit 26A within Gates of the
7 Arctic National Park be increased from one to two
8 bears. The analysis of this proposal points out the
9 sensitive conservation status of this species. Brown
10 bear densities with 33.4 bears per 1,000 square
11 kilometers and reproductive out put within Gates of the
12 Arctic National Park and Preserve are amongst the
13 lowest in Alaska. Limited food resources and a short
14 growing season major are likely factors to contributing
15 to these demographic patterns. From harvest survey
16 reports within Anaktuvuk Pass, four to 10 percent of
17 the households use brown bears. Further, across all of
18 Unit 26A, on average, only eight bears were harvested
19 per year between 1985 and 2014. Although reported
20 brown bear harvest has remained consistently low over
21 the last few decades, low density and recruitment
22 within the brown bear population across 26A increases
23 the risk of overharvest.

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

In support of our Subsistence Resource
Commission submitting this proposal and supporting
North Slope Advisory -- Regional Advisory Council, we
do support increasing the bag limit from one to two
bears per year but only for one regulatory cycle. This
would allow us to better understand both the
subsistence need and the potential ramifications on the
population because we do have a strong conservation
concern for this species in that region. The
information on the level of additional harvest
following the increase in the bag limit is congruent
with our recognized principles of fish and wildlife
conservation as referenced in ANILCA, Title VIII,
Section .805(c) and as laid out in the NPS management
policy, Chapter 4.42 [sic] that states: The Service
will assess the results of managing plant and animal
populations by conducting follow up monitoring or other
studies to determine the impacts of the management
methods on non-targeted and targeted components of the
system [sic].

Thus, we move to adopt this proposal
for two years, one full regulatory cycle to support
those identified immediate needs of the Gates of the
Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
and the North Slope Regional Advisory Council.

0396

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Any
4 other Board discussion, comments, questions.

5

6 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, BIA.

7

8 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, go ahead,
9 Gene.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 BIA would move to modify the existing motion to strike
13 the two year, one regulatory cycle requirement similar
14 to when the Board engaged in a discussion and vote on
15 WP22-46 for GMU 24B as;

16

17 1. In the analysis there was not
18 identified a potential biological problem.

19

20 2. That in the lack of other protein
21 sources bear meat can be utilized supplement those that
22 may not be readily available otherwise, and;

23

24 3. There are precautions in place with
25 the existing Program without putting a temporary
26 limitation on the regulations to address any concerns
27 that may arise.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30

31 MR. BROWER: Second that amendment.

32

33 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, there's a
34 motion on the floor with a motion now to amend the
35 original motion to strike the language of the two year.
36 Any further Board discussion about the modification
37 language.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Call for the
42 question.

43

44 MR. BROWER: Question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
47 Roll call, Sue, on this motion to strike that language
48 on the original motion of the two year. Thank you.

49

50

0397

1 MS. DETWILER: Okay. Yes start with
2 Gene Peltola, BIA.

3
4 MR. PELTOLA: Support.

5
6 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

7
8 Sara Boario, Fish and Wildlife Service.

9
10 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
11 opposes.

12
13 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

14
15 Sarah Creachbaum, National Park
16 Service.

17
18 MS. CREACHBAUM: Since the modification
19 is outside of National Park Service regulation and
20 policy, the Park Service opposes.

21
22 MS. DETWILER: Okay, thank you.

23
24 Thomas Heinlein, BLM.

25
26 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

27
28 MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, Forest
29 Service.

30
31 MR. SCHMID: The Forest Service
32 supports the amended motion.

33
34 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda
35 Pitka.

36
37 MS. PITKA: I support the amendment.

38
39 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

40
41 Public Member Charlie Brower.

42
43 MR. BROWER: I support the amendment.

44
45 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

46
47 Chair Christianson.

48
49 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: I support,
50

0398

1 thank you.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. The motion
4 passes five to two.

5

6 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Sue.
7 We'll go back to the main motion, is there any
8 discussion on the main motion now that it reads, to
9 take the two year cap off.

10

11 MR. LORD: Mr. Chair, if there was a
12 second, I didn't hear it.

13

14 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, there was
15 a second -- sorry, Ken, so the maker of the motion and
16 was seconded.....

17

18 REPORTER: The main motion was seconded
19 by BIA.

20

21 MR. PELTOLA: BIA.

22

23

24 MS. DETWILER: I believe the motion was
25 -- oh, the first.....

26

27 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: The first
28 motion was seconded by BIA, I believe.

29

30 MR. PELTOLA: BIA seconded the
31 motion.....

32

33 MS. DETWILER: Yeah, I.....

34

35 MR. PELTOLA:the first motion and
36 Charlie seconded the amendment. Thank you.

37

38 REPORTER: That's correct.

39

40 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
41 Call for the question on the amended motion.

42

43 MR. PELTOLA: Question, BIA.

44

45 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Roll call, Sue,
46 please.

47

48 MS. DETWILER: National Park Service,
49 Sarah Creachbaum.

50

0399

1 MS. CREACHBAUM: Oppose.

2

3 MS. DETWILER: Sara Boario, Fish and
4 Wildlife Service.

5

6 MS. BOARIO: Fish and Wildlife Service
7 supports.

8

9 MS. DETWILER: Gene Peltola, BIA.

10

11 MR. PELTOLA: BIA supports as
12 recommended by the Regional Advisory Council.

13

14 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

15

16 BLM Tom Heinlein.

17

18 MR. HEINLEIN: BLM supports.

19

20 MS. DETWILER: Dave Schmid, Forest
21 Service.

22

23 MR. SCHMID: Forest Service supports.

24

25 MS. DETWILER: Public Member Rhonda
26 Pitka.

27

28 MS. PITKA: I support, thank you.

29

30 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

31

32 Public Member Charlie Brower.

33

34 MR. BROWER: I support, thank you.

35

36 MS. DETWILER: Chair Christianson.

37

38 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Yes, I support,
39 thank you, Sue.

40

41 MS. DETWILER: Motion passed seven to
42 one.

43

44 CHAIRMAN CHRISTIANSON: Okay, thank
45 you. Well, that motion passes, we'll go ahead and
46 conclude the business for today. That will give our
47 partners there a little time to look at the maps so
48 tomorrow we'll be picking up the final non-consensus
49 agenda item, WP-something-10. So we'll get started
50

0400

1 there first thing in the morning and then we'll move on
2 to adoption of the rest of the agenda items.

3

4

5 So tomorrow look forward to coming back
6 and doing business at 9:00 a.m. Thank everybody today
7 for the diligence and the patience and stepping in
8 where we have dropped calls, thank you, Rhonda and
9 Staff, and we'll catch everyone back here tomorrow at
9:00 a.m.

10

11

MR. BROWER: Goodnight, thank you.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15

16

MS. PITKA: Thank you, have a good
night.

17

18

MR. SCHMID: Thanks all.

19

20

(Off record)

21

22

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

